

## **IMMIGRATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION: THE EU-TURKEY REFUGEE DEAL**

Jaiveer Chadha

Heritage International Xperiential School

DOI: 10.46609/IJSSER.2023.v08i11.022 URL: <https://doi.org/10.46609/IJSSER.2023.v08i11.022>

Received: 18 November 2023 / Accepted: 28 November 2023 / Published: 2 December 2023

### **Introduction**

The European Union's (EU) 2016 deal with Turkey represents a critical confluence in the EU's complex migration policy landscape (Terry, 2021). Conceived as a response to a refugee crisis, the accord has elicited both praise and scrutiny. On the surface, it has achieved its immediate objective: a significant reduction in the influx of asylum seekers into EU territories, thereby alleviating pressure on member states (European Council, 2016). However, the agreement raises ethical and legal questions that challenge the EU's foundational values, such as its commitment to human rights and internal cohesion (UNHCR, 2020). This duality is not a mere contradiction but rather reflects the complex, multifaceted challenges the EU faces in its migration policy. While the deal has been a diplomatic achievement in uniting EU member states under a common cause, it has also been criticised for outsourcing the refugee 'problem' to Turkey (European Parliament, 2020). This outsourcing poses concerns about the EU's adherence to international law and its own ethical standards (Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS), 2019).

The implications of this delicate balancing act are far-reaching, affecting not just the EU's migration policy but also its broader social and political environment. As of 2023, the deal serves as a retrospective gauge for assessing the EU's internal cohesion and broader stability in political and economic spheres (Amnesty International, 2017). It also offers insights into the EU's standing on the global stage, particularly its relationships with other key players in transnational politics (European Council, 2016). This paper aims to delve into the intricacies of the EU-Turkey agreement to contribute to the ongoing discourse on EU migration policy, exploring whether the deal underscores the European Union's need to bolster internal cohesion and prioritise safeguarding the rights of migrants. It will offer a nuanced understanding that could inform future policy decisions, both within the EU and in its dealings with external partners.

## **Literature Review**

Formulated to regulate and control the unprecedented influx of asylum seekers and migrants into Europe, the 2016 EU-Turkey agreement has been a focal point of international discussion. Despite substantial criticism, the agreement has met its primary goal of significantly reducing irregular migration into EU territories, thereby alleviating the immediate pressures on EU borders and member states that were at the frontline of the crisis (Terry, 2021). However, the effectiveness of the deal in managing migration flows is juxtaposed with concerns about its human rights implications. Reports have documented instances of forced returns, subpar living conditions in reception centres, and barriers to accessing asylum procedures, raising concerns about the EU and Turkey's commitment to international refugee protection standards (Human Rights Watch, 2016).

Building on the effectiveness of the deal in managing migration flows, its geopolitical implications are profound. Bialasiewicz and Maessen argue that the agreement has reshaped the geographies of the region, creating divided landscapes that segregate the rights and responsibilities of refugees and European states. This has effectively externalised the EU's border controls to Turkey, a strategy that pushes its borders outward and engages third countries in migration management (Bialasiewicz & Maessen, 2018). Moreover, the ramifications of the deal extend beyond immediate border controls. It has influenced EU-Turkey relations, with Turkey leveraging its position as a gatekeeper to Europe, thereby suffusing migration policies over broader diplomatic and economic relations between the two entities (Terry, 2021). This dynamic underscores the complexities of the EU's approach to migration, where policy decisions intersect with broader geopolitical considerations and the challenges of upholding human rights standards in a rapidly changing global terrain.

While the deal reshaped regional geographies, the broader EU backdrop reveals a different challenge. The European Union, a conglomerate of nations bound by shared values and aspirations, has been grappling with migration, particularly in the face of the recent refugee crisis. The challenges posed by this influx have not only tested the EU's resilience but have also exposed the fissures in its collective response. The fragmentation among EU Member States in their process towards refugees and migrants has been a glaring issue, with countries adopting varied, often conflicting, policies. Such disparities have not only led to logistical challenges but have also raised ethical concerns regarding the treatment of vulnerable populations.

In its comprehensive review, the UNHCR has strongly emphasised the EU's inconsistent approach. It underscores the dire need for a unified asylum and refugee policy, emphasising that the current disjointed responses among EU Member States are detrimental to the very ethos of

the Union (UNHCR, 2020). This call for unity is not just about streamlining processes but is rooted in the fundamental principles of human rights and dignity.

This fragmentation, evident in policy responses, is further complicated when delving into the institutional mechanisms at play. Probing further, the concept of ‘informal institutional governance’ emerges as a pivotal framework. Introduced as a tool to navigate the labyrinthine challenges of crisis management in the EU, it provides a lens through which one can understand the nuances of policy-making and implementation in times of upheaval (Tekin, 2022). The framework indicates that without formal consensus, ad-hoc solutions through informal mechanisms often prevail, potentially misaligning with the EU's broader objectives. Furthermore, the disparities in reception conditions, asylum procedures, and protection standards across Member States highlight the uneven landscape of refugee and migrant experiences in the EU. Such inconsistencies not only jeopardise the well-being of asylum seekers but also challenge the EU's commitment to its foundational values. The urgency of the situation demands a reevaluation of current policies, a move towards greater cohesion, and a renewed undertaking to upholding the rights and dignity of all individuals, irrespective of their migratory status.

Coupled with institutional challenges, the legal subtleties of the EU's migration policies further entangle the situation, albeit inadvertently. The shift towards extraterritorial measures, where responsibilities are outsourced beyond the EU's borders, has raised notable legal and concerns over morality. Such measures, while seemingly pragmatic, often tread a fine line between upholding international human rights norms and asserting state sovereignty.

These legal challenges, particularly those involving extraterritorial measures, form part of a more comprehensive strategy. The extraterritorialisation of immigration control measures, especially by EU Member States and the specialised agency Frontex, has led to a paradigm where responsibilities for asylum seekers are increasingly being shifted away from the EU's direct jurisdiction. This not only complicates the legal arena but also poses challenges to the very essence of international human rights.

The tension between these rights and the prerogative of state sovereignty is palpable, leading to debates on the legitimacy and ethics of such extraterritorial measures (Heschl, 2018). Moreover, the EU-Turkey deal serves as a testament to the EU's reliance on externalising its migration control. By delegating responsibilities to Turkey, the EU has effectively moved its border controls, raising questions about accountability, transparency, and the protection of asylum seekers' rights (Tekin, 2022). Such arrangements, while expedient, often result in asylum seekers being caught in legal limbo, with their rights and protections becoming secondary to political negotiations.

Additionally, the role of Frontex in managing the EU's external borders has come under scrutiny. While tasked with ensuring the effective functioning of the Schengen area, its operations, especially in the Mediterranean, have been criticised for potential human rights violations, further highlighting the legal quandaries posed by the EU's extraterritorial measures (Bialasiewicz & Maessen, 2018). In essence, the EU's migration policies, while aiming to address the challenges of migration, have unwittingly opened a Pandora's box of legal implications. The balance between safeguarding human rights and ensuring state sovereignty remains elusive, necessitating a thorough reevaluation of the EU's approach to migration. Therefore, the EU's migration policies symbolise the involute challenges in balancing geopolitics, institutional dynamics, and legal responsibilities.

While the legal challenges pose considerable dilemmas, the overarching method of the EU to migration, as seen in the deal, encapsulates the multi-dimensional nature of these challenges. The effectiveness of the deal in reducing the influx of migrants into Europe cannot be understated. By forging a partnership with Turkey, the EU managed to create a buffer, thereby alleviating immediate pressures on its borders (Tekin, 2022). However, this pragmatism has been juxtaposed with substantial human rights concerns. The extraterritorial measures, as seen in the operations of Frontex and the delegation of responsibilities to non-EU states, have raised questions about the EU's commitment to upholding international human rights standards (Heschl, 2018). Furthermore, the divided nature of the EU's response to the migration crisis has been a recurring theme in the literature. The lack of a unified stance among Member States, coupled with the challenges of informal institutional governance, underscores the complications of achieving consensus in a diverse union (Bialasiewicz & Maessen, 2018). This lack of unity not only hampers the effectiveness of policies but also risks undermining the very values upon which the EU is founded.

Reflecting on the EU-Turkey deal's achievements and challenges, the broader literature underscores the interconnectedness of geopolitical, institutional, and juridical factors. The literature consistently emphasises the imperative for the EU to recalibrate its migration policies. While managing migration flows is undeniably crucial, it is equally vital for the EU to ensure that its policies are anchored in a human rights-centric framework that respects the dignity and rights of all individuals, irrespective of their migration status (UNHCR, 2020). In synthesising these insights, it becomes evident that the EU's migration policies, while pragmatic in intent, necessitate a more holistic and rights-based reconsideration. The challenges are manifold, but the literature offers a roadmap for a more inclusive, unified, and ethically grounded strategy to migration in the EU.

While existing literature offers a comprehensive understanding of the EU's migration policies, particularly the EU-Turkey deal, it often focuses on either the geopolitical or human rights

implications in isolation. Moreover, the current body of work tends to emphasise the effectiveness of the deal in managing

migration flows, while less attention is given to the internal cohesion within the EU and the rights of migrants. This study aims to bridge this gap by examining the EU-Turkey deal through a multi-faceted lens that incorporates internal EU cohesion and migrant rights. By doing so, this study contributes a nuanced understanding that could inform future decision-making, both within the EU and in its interactions with external partners.

### **Methodology**

This study adopts a qualitative research design to explore the EU-Turkey deal and its implications on migration policies. The qualitative approach allows for an in-depth understanding of the political, legal, and humanitarian aspects of the agreement. The primary data for this research consists of academic articles, policy documents, and reports from reputable organisations. These sources were selected based on their relevance to the EU-Turkey deal, migration policies, and the broader geopolitical context. The data was analysed using discourse analysis techniques. This method was chosen to dissect the language, themes, and narratives present in the selected sources. Discourse analysis helps in understanding not just the explicit content but also the underlying ideologies and assumptions that shape the EU-Turkey deal and migration policies. All sources used in this research are publicly available and cited appropriately to give due credit to the original authors. The study adheres to academic integrity and ethical research practices.

### **Discourse Analysis**

#### **Background Information:**

The European migration landscape has undergone profound transformations in recent years, with the influx of migrants and refugees reshaping both the political and social fabric of the continent (Terry, 2021). This phenomenon has prompted a series of policy responses from the European Union, which has wrestled with the duality of upholding humanitarian values while ensuring border security. The EU's engagement with Turkey, a crucial transit country for many migrants and refugees, has been at the forefront of these policy initiatives. The EU-Turkey Statement, stands as a testament to the EU's strategic approach to managing migration. Initiated with the overarching goal of curbing irregular migration from Turkey to the EU, the statement delineates a series of commitments from both parties (European Council, 2016). Turkey's agreement to accept the rapid return of migrants not requiring international protection was counterbalanced by the EU's pledge to resettle Syrian refugees from Turkey. However, the deal's implementation has been fraught with challenges. The Visa Liberalisation Roadmap, aimed at easing visa restrictions

for Turkish citizens, and the Facility for Refugees in Turkey, designed to provide financial support for refugees and host communities in Turkey, have both been subjects of intense negotiation and debate. These components underscore the often contentious nature of EU-Turkey relations in the realm of migration.

The Dublin System, which has long governed the processing of asylum applications within the EU, has come under heightened scrutiny in light of the recent migration challenges (European Parliament, 2020). The system's principle, which mandates that the first EU country an asylum seeker enters is responsible for processing their application, has been criticised for placing undue burdens on frontline states. Proposed reforms seek to introduce a more equitable distribution mechanism, taking into account the capacities and capabilities of member states. Feedback from advisory committees, national parliaments, and stakeholders has been instrumental in shaping these proposed changes, reflecting the diverse array of perspectives within the EU.

The Centre for European Policy Studies offers a critical examination of the EU's 'Contained Mobility' strategy, which accentuates the containment of migration outside the EU's borders (Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS), 2019). This approach underscores the EU's preference for externalising migration challenges. The Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) provides a broader framework within which the EU's strategy can be understood. The GCR's objectives, which emphasise the importance of offering safe and legal pathways for migrants, resonate with the EU's commitments, albeit with challenges in implementation (UNHCR, 2018).

The Migration and Asylum Package, introduced by the European Commission, represents a comprehensive attempt to overhaul the EU's migration and asylum system. Recognizing the deficiencies of the current system, the package introduces a series of legislative proposals aimed at creating a more resilient, humane, and effective migration management system. Key components include a new pact on migration and asylum, which emphasises solidarity and shared responsibility among member states, and a reinforced mandate for the European Border and Coast Guard Agency. The package reflects the EU's commitment to learning from past challenges and ensuring a more harmonised approach to migration in the future (European Commission, 2020)

### **Findings:**

The EU-Turkey deal was a strategic response to the escalating migration crisis that Europe faced. The deal's inception was driven by the imperative to manage the increasing influx of migrants. This crisis was not driven singularly by Turkish nationals but by a significant influx of migrants and refugees from the Middle East and other regions, using Turkey as a transit point to reach the EU. The deal's primary objective was to curtail this flow of irregular migration. In this

arrangement, Turkey committed to accepting the rapid return of migrants not in need of international protection and to intercept irregular migrants in its territorial waters. In exchange, the EU pledged significant financial support and proposed visa liberalisation for Turkish nationals. However, this deal, while framed with the intent to "end human suffering and restore public order", (European Council, 2016) faced substantial criticism.

While the deal was initially lauded for its effectiveness in reducing irregular crossings, The Centre for European Policy Studies highlighted the myriad issues that impeded the deal's implementation. Concerns arose about the deal's alignment with international refugee rights, potential violations of the non-refoulement principles, and debates over Turkey's status as a 'safe' asylum country. The events at the Greek-Turkish border in February-March 2020 further underscored the practical deficiencies of the deal, with refugees caught in a quagmire of adverse practices and conditions during a global pandemic (Tekin, 2022).

The article 'Bordering through othering: On strategic ambiguity in the making of the EU-Turkey refugee deal' delves into the strategy of ambiguity that underpinned the deal. The EU's bordering strategies, anchored in Foucault's notion of *dispositif*, created a liminal space where migrants found themselves in uncertain conditions without clear legal status. This strategic use of ambiguity had dual implications: ensuring the governability of refugees while reinforcing the EU's distinct identity. The discourse is replete with themes of identity and othering. The EU's bordering practices, as elucidated in the article, serve not just to demarcate physical boundaries but also to establish order within the European community. This demarcation is evident in the portrayal of Syrian asylum seekers, emphasising the EU's external borders as a boundary between two distinct realms (Tekin, 2022).

The ramifications of the deal for refugees in Turkey are profound. Insights from the article, based on interviews and field observations, indicate that refugees face numerous challenges, from accessing basic rights to navigating the labour market and essential services. The deal's inherent ambiguity has influenced their decisions to either settle in Turkey or seek entry to the EU. The Migration Policy Institute highlights the EU's strategy of externalising migration management. By partnering with transit countries like Turkey, the EU aims to manage migration flows at its periphery. While this strategy has reduced irregular arrivals, it raises moral concerns about the EU's commitment to upholding international asylum standards (Terry, 2021).

In our findings, the 'migration paradox' emerges as a pivotal concept that encapsulates the complexities of EU-Turkey relations in the context of migration management. While Turkey has become an essential partner for the EU's offshore border security measures, this cooperation has a dual effect. On one hand, it brings the EU and Turkey closer together as strategic partners in managing migration. On the other hand, it risks straining this relationship and complicating

Turkey's potential accession to the EU. However, actual accession would shift the EU's external borders further east, undermining Turkey's role as a buffer zone and gatekeeper for 'Fortress Europe.' This creates a modus operandi where Turkey's cooperation in controlling migration is encouraged through the promise of EU accession, but the very act of accession would counter the EU's interests in keeping Turkey as a buffer. Moreover, the EU's pragmatic approach to the migration crisis, often at the expense of its human rights commitments, has raised concerns among civil society and international organisations, potentially affecting its relationship with Turkey and the broader accession process. These paradoxical outcomes highlight the need for a more nuanced, long-term strategy that balances immediate migration management needs with ethical considerations and diplomatic relations (Benvenuti, 2017).

### **Implications:**

At the forefront of the deal's implications are humanitarian concerns. The primary objective of the deal, as outlined in the sources, was to manage the migration crisis and reduce the flow of irregular migrants. However, the events at the Greek-Turkish border in February-March 2020, as highlighted in 'Bordering through othering,' showcased the stark realities faced by refugees (Tekin, 2022). Trapped between aggressive border control measures and the desperation to seek a better life, many refugees found themselves in hastily established makeshift camps, exposed to adverse weather conditions and lacking basic amenities. This situation starkly contrasts with the deal's stated aim to "end human suffering." (Ghosh, 2018).

The deal's alignment with international refugee rights and principles has been a significant point of contention. Concerns about potential violations of the non-refoulement principle, which prohibits the return of refugees to places where they face danger, have been raised. The debate over Turkey's status as a 'safe' asylum country further complicates the legal landscape. As the Centre for European Policy Studies points out, these concerns underscore the ethical dilemmas inherent in the deal, questioning the EU's commitment to upholding international asylum standards (Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS), 2019). The political ramifications of the deal are profound. The EU's strategy of externalising migration management, as highlighted by the Migration Policy Institute, indicates a shift in the EU's approach to handling migration. By partnering with transit countries like Turkey, the EU is effectively managing migration flows at its periphery, thereby reducing the immediate pressures on its member states (Terry, 2021). However, this strategy also places significant responsibility on transit countries, potentially leading to strained diplomatic relations. Such practices have profound socio-cultural implications, influencing public perceptions and attitudes towards migrants and refugees. The inherent vagueness in the deal's terms creates challenges in its practical execution, leading to discrepancies between its stated aims and actual outcomes. This ambiguity also sets a precedent for future agreements, raising questions about the efficacy and ethicality of such deals.



### **Evaluation:**

The analysis undertaken thus far offers a comprehensive insight into the EU-Turkey refugee deal, drawing from an array of sources that encompass diverse perspectives. However, like all research endeavours, it is essential to critically evaluate the depth, breadth, and potential biases inherent in the analysis. Firstly, the depth of the analysis, while extensive, could benefit from a more granular examination of the individual experiences of refugees and migrants affected by the deal. While the sources provide a macro-level overview of the situation, personal narratives and testimonies could offer a more nuanced understanding of the on-ground realities. For instance, the Migration Policy Institute and Centre for European Policy Studies provide valuable policy perspectives, but they might not capture the lived experiences of those directly impacted. Secondly, the breadth of the analysis, though wide-ranging, predominantly focuses on the EU and Turkish perspectives. Incorporating viewpoints from other key stakeholders, such as neighbouring countries or international organisations, could provide a more holistic understanding of the deal's regional implications.

Potential biases are another critical consideration. The sources, while reputable, represent a specific subset of the academic and policy discourse. There might be other voices, particularly from grassroots organisations or alternative academic perspectives, that could offer a counter-narrative to the prevailing discourse. For instance, the narrative presented in 'Bordering through othering' is inherently critical of the EU's policies, and while it provides a necessary critique, balancing it with other perspectives would enhance the analysis's robustness. Furthermore, the strategic ambiguity highlighted in the sources, raises questions about the clarity and transparency of the deal's terms. While ambiguity might be a deliberate policy tool, it also poses challenges for analysis, as interpretations can vary widely based on the reader's perspective. The analysis also explores the 'migration paradox,' revealing the circuitous interplay between cooperation and conflict in EU-Turkey relations. This concept introduces new ethical dilemmas, such as the risk of skewing the analysis towards a more critical stance. Balancing this with viewpoints from EU policymakers could provide a more robust understanding of the deal's implications. In conclusion, while the analysis provides a thorough examination of the EU-Turkey refugee deal, it is essential to approach the findings with a critical lens which considers potential gaps and biases.

### **Results**

The EU-Turkey deal, emblematic of the European Union's migration policies, underscores the delicate equilibrium of border security, human rights, and geopolitical nuances. As a countermeasure to the unprecedented wave of asylum seekers and migrants into Europe, the EU-Turkey deal exemplifies the EU's layered strategy in migration management. The EU-Turkey

deal has led to a significant reduction in the number of irregular migrants entering the EU (Terry, 2021).

From a geopolitical standpoint, the EU-Turkey deal has influenced both migration trends and the region's geographical dynamics. The deal has reshaped the geographical dynamics of the region, effectively pushing the EU's borders outward and engaging Turkey in the management of migration. This externalisation of the EU's border controls to Turkey effectively pushes its borders outward, engaging third countries in the intricate lattice of migration management. This strategy has broader implications, influencing EU-Turkey diplomatic relations and intertwining migration directives with larger economic and interstate considerations (Bialasiewicz & Maessen, 2018).

However, zooming out to view the broader EU landscape reveals another layer of complexity. There is a lack of cohesion among EU Member States in their approach to migration, as highlighted by the UNHCR's call for a unified asylum and refugee policy, which explicates the urgency of the situation, emphasising that the current disjointed responses among EU Member States are not only inefficient but also counterproductive to the Union's foundational principles (UNHCR, 2020). This fragmentation is further illuminated by the emerging concept of 'informal institutional governance', which emerges as a framework for understanding the EU's ad-hoc and often reactive measures in migration management (Tekin, 2022).

The deal raises questions about its alignment with international human rights norms, particularly in the use of extraterritorial measures. The increasing inclination towards extraterritorial measures, while offering a solution to immediate problems, raises profound legal and ethical concerns. Such measures, although effective in the short term, often find themselves at the crossroads of international human rights norms and state sovereignty. The ensuing tension between these rights and state prerogatives has sparked debates on the ethical ramifications and the very legitimacy of such extraterritorial measures, calling for a more balanced approach (Lehner, 2019).

Synthesising insights from both the literature and discourse analysis, a clear picture emerges. The EU's migration policies, while rooted in pragmatism, necessitate a more comprehensive and rights-based reconsideration. These obstacles are multifaceted, but the literature offers a roadmap, suggesting a more inclusive, unified, and ethically grounded strategy for migration in the EU.

The EU-Turkey deal attests to the EU's practical stance in handling the extraordinary surge of migrants and asylum seekers. The ethical consequences of such agreements, especially when viewed against the backdrop of international human rights norms, underscore the inherent

tensions between state sovereignty and individual rights. Moreover, the geopolitical effects of the agreement are profound. The creation of divided geographies has reshaped the very dynamics of the region. This reconfiguration of borders, both physical and metaphorical, has led to a reimagining of the responsibilities and rights of refugees and European states alike. The segmented responses among EU Member States to the recent surge in refugees and migrants further highlight the complexities of formulating a unified procedure to asylum and refugee policy. The legal intricacies of the EU's migration control measures, especially in the context of extraterritorial measures, have added another layer of analysis. The tension between international human rights norms and state sovereignty provides a nuanced understanding of the legal hurdles involved in migration control measures. Fundamentally, the EU's migration strategy, highlighted by the EU-Turkey deal, intertwines global, institutional, and legal elements. While the deal has been instrumental in managing migration flows, it has also raised significant human rights concerns and highlighted the fragmented nature of the EU's response to the migration crisis. The lessons learned from the EU-Turkey deal can serve as a guidepost for future policy formulations. As we've navigated through the complex landscape of the EU-Turkey deal, the next section will further explore what these findings mean for the broader discourse on migration policy.

## **Discussions**

The research problem at the heart of this study is the pressing need for the European Union to fortify its internal cohesion through a strategy that not only manages migration effectively but also upholds the rights of migrants. This is particularly crucial in the context of the EU-Turkey deal, an agreement that has been both praised for its effectiveness in controlling migration and criticised for its ethical implications. The major findings of this study indicate that the EU-Turkey deal has indeed been effective in reducing the number of irregular migrants entering the EU. However, this effectiveness comes at the cost of human rights violations and a piecemeal strategy among EU Member States. The deal has also led to the extraterritorialisation of migration control measures, shifting responsibilities and creating legal ambiguities (Lehner, 2019).

The significance of these findings cannot be overstated. First and foremost, the effectiveness of the EU-Turkey deal in controlling migration flows underscores the potential for bilateral agreements to manage complex geopolitical issues. However, the human rights implications and the divided responses among EU Member States reveal critical areas for improvement. The extraterritorial measures employed have not only shifted responsibilities but have also created a legal grey area that could be exploited, thereby undermining international human rights norms. These findings are crucial as they provide a nuanced understanding of the complexities involved in migration policies, especially in a geopolitical hotspot like the EU. They highlight the urgent need for a more unified, rights-centric approach to migration, one that balances effectiveness

with ethical considerations. The study serves as a clarion call for policymakers to consider the multifaceted implications of migration deals, beyond just immediate effectiveness in controlling migrant flows.

The findings of this study resonate with existing literature on the subject, adding a nuanced layer to the ongoing discourse on the EU's migration policies, particularly the EU-Turkey deal. Previous studies have also highlighted the effectiveness of the deal in reducing the influx of irregular migrants into the EU. However, they have often critiqued the ethical drawbacks and human rights implications that come with such bilateral agreements. For instance, the study by Bialasiewicz and Maessen delves into the cross-border ramifications of the deal, echoing our findings on the divided geographies and the shifting of responsibilities that the agreement has engendered (Bialasiewicz & Maessen, 2018). Moreover, the lack of unity among EU Member States, as highlighted in the UNHCR report, finds a parallel in our study (UNHCR, 2020). The lack of a unified strategy not only hampers the effectiveness of migration control measures but also raises questions about the EU's commitment to human rights norms. Our study aims to complement existing research by shedding light on the extraterritorialisation of migration control measures, an aspect that hasn't been extensively covered in the current literature.

However, it is crucial to consider alternative explanations for the observed results. While the study posits that the EU-Turkey deal has been effective but fraught with ethical dilemmas, it is possible that the reduction in migrant inflow could be attributed to other factors such as changes in geographical conditions, or even shifts in migration patterns that are unrelated to the deal. Additionally, the disjointedness among EU Member States could be a reflection of broader institutional challenges within the EU, rather than being solely a consequence of migration policies. The human rights implications could also be viewed through a different lens. One could argue that the EU is caught in a dilemma where it has to balance its commitment to human rights with its responsibility to protect its borders and ensure the safety of its citizens. Therefore, while the study provides compelling evidence for its conclusions, it acknowledges that these are not the only interpretations or explanations for the observed phenomena.

While this study offers valuable insights into the complexities surrounding the EU-Turkey deal and EU's migration policies, it is not without limitations. One of the primary constraints is the focus on policy documents and academic literature, which may not capture the lived experiences of migrants and asylum seekers affected by these policies. Additionally, the study is limited in its geographical scope, concentrating mainly on the EU and Turkey, thereby limiting its generalizability to other migration corridors or policy frameworks. Methodological challenges also arose in the analysis of data, particularly in reconciling differing viewpoints and methodologies across various sources.

Given the limitations, there are several avenues for future research. Following studies could include interviews with policy-makers, migrants, and other stakeholders to provide a fuller picture of the impact and effectiveness of the EU-Turkey deal. Additionally, comparative studies involving other migration agreements could offer a broader understanding of the challenges and opportunities in managing migration flows. Research could also examine the long-term impacts of such policies on the social and economic fabric of both sending and receiving countries.

### **Conclusion**

The study set out to investigate the nuances of the EU-Turkey deal, focusing on its effectiveness, ethical implications, and the fragmented approach among EU Member States. Utilising a diverse array of sources, from policy documents to academic literature, the study found that while the deal has been effective in controlling migration, it raises significant ethical and human rights concerns. These findings contribute to the existing body of knowledge by offering a comprehensive understanding of the deal's impact, particularly in the areas of legal responsibilities and human rights. The study also puts forth the need for a more unified approach to migration policy within the EU, one that balances effectiveness with ethical considerations. Overall, the research underscores the complex coaction of geopolitical, institutional, and legal factors that shape the EU's migration policies, offering both a snapshot of current practices and a foundation for future scholarly inquiry.

### **Bibliography**

1. Terry, K. (Migration Policy Institute). (2021). The EU-Turkey Deal, Five Years On: A Frayed and Controversial but Enduring Blueprint.
2. European Council. (2016). EU-Turkey Statement.
3. UNHCR. (2020). Better Protecting Refugees in the EU and Globally.
4. European Parliament. (2020). Reform of the Dublin System.
5. Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS). (2019). The EU's Role in Implementing the UN Global Compact on Refugees.
6. Amnesty International. (2017). A Blueprint for Despair: Human Rights Impact of the EU-Turkey Deal.
7. Human Rights Watch (HRW). (2016). EU Policies Put Refugees at Risk.
8. Bialasiewicz, L., & Maessen, E. (2018). Scaling rights: the 'Turkey deal' and the divided geographies of European responsibility. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 52(2/3), 210– 230.

9. Tekin, B. cagatay. (2022). Bordering through othering: On strategic ambiguity in the making of the EU-Turkey refugee deal. *POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY*, 98.
10. Heschl, L. (2018). Summary of Findings and Conclusions. In *Protecting the Rights of Refugees Beyond European Borders: Establishing Extraterritorial Legal Responsibilities* (pp. 223-232).
11. UNHCR. (2018). *Global Compact on Refugees (GCR)*.
12. European Commission. (2020). *New Pact on Migration and Asylum*.
13. Benvenuti, B. (2017) *The Migration Paradox and EU-Turkey Relations*
14. Ghosh, B. (2018). 6. In *Refugee and mixed migration flows: Managing a looming humanitarian and economic crisis*.
15. Lehner, R. (2019). *The EU-Turkey-'deal': Legal Challenges and Pitfalls*.