

GLOBAL GOVERNMENTALITY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION:
CASE OF TURKEY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ELİF ZEYTİN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

OCTOBER 2017

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Özlem Tür
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Faruk Yalvaç
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members (first name belongs to the chairperson of the jury and the second name belongs to supervisor)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar İpek (Bilkent University, IR)

Prof. Dr. Faruk Yalvaç (METU, IR)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Şerif Onur Bahçecik (METU, IR)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Elif Zeytin

Signature :

ABSTRACT

GLOBAL GOVERNMENTALITY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION: CASE OF TURKEY

Zeytin, Elif

M.S, Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Faruk Yalvaç

October 2017, 143 pages

This thesis examines how neoliberal globalization shapes the policies concerning international migration. With the help of the global governmentality approach of Jonathan Joseph, ‘migration management’ discourse is elaborated as the stimulation of a broader process of ‘management’ of human mobility through governmental interventions on the state behaviors. In particular, re-conceptualization of international migration as a global policy issue in the effective migration management framework is evaluated as the promoted mode of governance which has been designed as both restrictive and facilitative to maximize economic gains and to minimize negative effects. Through the cooperation mechanisms, this mode of governance is promoted to individual states in which all related international and regional organizations such as UNHCR, IOM and the EU are involved in the process as they present themselves as the formal body of expertise. These arguments have been tested in the case of Turkey. It is argued that Turkey has continued to pursue its traditional migration policy based on the political identity of Turkishness no matter how migration patterns have altered. When Turkey is granted the candidacy status to

join the European Union at the Helsinki Summit in 1999, a process of transformation has begun. New migration management regime of Turkey has been established in response to the pre-accession requirements of the EU rather than being a domestic necessity to reform. However, the establishment of a new migration management system is not considered exclusive to EU-Turkey relations but as the reflection of global promotion of the effective migration management through the international and regional organizations.

Keywords: Neoliberal Globalization, Neoliberal Governmentality, Global Governmentality, International Migration Management, Turkey

ÖZ

ULUSLARARASI GÖÇ'ÜN KÜRESEL YÖNETİMSELLİĞİ; TÜRKİYE ÖRNEĞİ

Zeytin, Elif

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Faruk Yalvaç

Ekim 2017, 143 sayfa

Bu çalışma, neoliberal küreselleşmenin uluslararası göç politikalarını nasıl şekillendirdiğini incelemektedir. Jonathan Joseph'in neoliberal-küresel yönetimsellik yaklaşımının yardımıyla, 'göç yönetimi' söylemi, devletler üzerindeki yönetsel müdahaleler yoluyla insan hareketliliğinin daha geniş bir 'yönetim' sürecine uyarılması olarak değerlendirilir. Özellikle, etkili göç yönetimi modeli, uluslararası göçün küresel bir politika konusu olarak yeniden kavramsallaştırıldığı ve ekonomik kazanımları en üst düzeye çıkarmak ve olumsuz etkileri en aza indirmek için hem kısıtlayıcı hem de kolaylaştırıcı olarak tasarlandığı bir yönetim biçimi olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Bu göç yönetimi modeli, kendilerini göç alanında uzman olarak sunan BMMYK, IOM ve AB gibi ilgili uluslararası ve bölgesel örgütler tarafından işbirliği mekanizmaları vasıtasıyla tüm dünyaya yayılmaktadır. Çalışmanın son bölümünde, bu argümanlar Türkiye örneği üzerinden incelenmiştir. Türkiye'nin uluslararası göç politikaları incelendiğinde, ülkeyi etkileyen göç dalgalarının zamanla değişime uğramasına rağmen, 'Türk' siyasi kimliğine dayalı geleneksel göç politikasının sürdürülmeye devam ettiği görülmektedir. 1999'da yapılan Helsinki Zirvesinde Türkiye resmi olarak Avrupa Birliği'ne katılması

mukadder bir aday devlet olarak tanımlanınca, ülkenin uluslararası göç politikasında bir dönüşüm süreci başlamıştır. Türkiye'nin yeni göç yönetimi rejimi, reform yapılması gereken yerli bir gereklilik olmaktan ziyade AB'nin katılım öncesi ihtiyaçlarına yanıt olarak oluşturulmuştur. Fakat bu çalışmada, Türkiye'de yeni bir göç yönetimi rejiminin kurulması, AB-Türkiye ilişkilerine özel bir durum olarak değil, etkili göç yönetimi modelinin uluslararası ve bölgesel örgütler aracılığıyla küresel düzeyde yayılmasının bir yansıması olarak görülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Neoliberal Küreselleşme, Neoliberal Yönetimsellik, Küresel Yönetimsellik, Uluslar arası Göç Yönetimi, Türkiye

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

After an intensive year of reading, learning, thinking and writing, I am finally able to finish this thesis. Herein, I would like to acknowledge the people who have supported me during this period.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis advisor Prof. Dr. Faruk Yalvaç of the Department of International Relations at the Middle East Technical University. I must single out him for his wisdom and recognized competence in IR theories. He has always steered me in the right direction whenever I needed his help. With his valuable guidance, I have been able to frame the topic I wanted to study with the theoretical position I hold.

I am very grateful for Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özgehan Şenyuva for his caring and patience even when I did not get the simplest points on the research methodology. Likewise, my sincere thanks go to Hacer Eriş and Deniz Uçak for keeping to showing me the path whenever I got lost.

I also thank Senay Selin Arıyürek, Betül Usta and Dilara Bozkurtoğlu. They were always enthusiastic about what I was doing and how I was progressing, although I could never completely explain what it was all about.

Finally, I must express my deepest gratitude to my parents and my sister for providing me continuing support and encouragement throughout my education life. Without their moral and emotional support, I would never have been able to finish my dissertation. You are always there for me. Thank You.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Research Questions.....	3
1.2 Type of Research and Methodology.....	3
1.3 Theoretical Framework: Neoliberal Form of Global Governmentality.....	5
1.4 Governmentalization of International Migration at the Global Level.....	7
1.5 The Case State of Turkey.....	9
2. GOVERNMENTALITY AND GLOBAL GOVERNMENTALITY.....	13
2.1 Studies of Governmentality.....	15
2.1.1 Conceptualization of Government.....	15
2.1.2 Conceptualization of Governmentality.....	17
2.2 Road to Neoliberal Governmentality.....	20
2.2.1 Liberal Governmentality.....	21
2.2.2 Neoliberal Governmentality.....	25
2.2.3 Contemporary Elaboration of Neoliberal Governmentality: the Neo-Foucauldian Approach.....	31
2.3 Governmentality Approach in IR.....	35
2.3.1 Foucault in IR.....	35
2.3.2 Global Governmentality.....	38

2.4 Conclusion.....	44
3. GLOBAL GOVERNMENTALITY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION	46
3.1 International Migration at the Global Agenda	50
3.1.1 What is International Migration Management?	50
3.1.2 Scaling up; 'Globalization' of the International Migration Management	52
3.1.3 Critical Evaluation of the Global Regime of International Migration Management	55
3.2 Analytics of Governmentality; Global Governmentality of International Migration	57
3.2.1 Visibility of International Migration	59
3.2.2 Means to Guide: Mechanisms of Cooperation	62
3.2.3 Specific Way of Migration Management	67
3.2.4 Individual States and Migrants: Necessary Qualifications	70
3.3 Conclusion.....	73
4. GLOBAL PROMOTION OF MIGRATION MANAGEMENT: CASE OF TURKEY	76
4.1 Turkey's Traditional Policies on International Migration; 1923-1999 ..	77
4.1.1 Depiction of the Reality; Political identity of 'Turkishness'	78
4.1.2 Legal Basis and Institutional Structure	79
4.1.3 Migration Policy from 1980s to 2000s; New Challenges Same Policies	83
4.2 The EU Governmentality of International Migration	86
4.2.1 Development of the EU Common Migration and Asylum Policy.....	87
4.2.2. European Union; a Unique Case of Global Governmentality...	91
4.2.3 The EU Accession Process and the New Migration Management Regime of Turkey.....	94
4.2.4 Legal and Administrative Developments.....	95

4.3 Analogy between the Global Framework on Effective Migration Management and International Migration Management Regime of Turkey	99
4.3.1 Depiction of International Migration	100
4.3.2 Migration Management for Development.....	101
4.3.3 Migration Management for Security	103
4.3.4 Cooperation on Migration Management	105
4.4 Conclusion	108
5. CONCLUSION	109
REFERENCES.....	116
APPENDICES	
A. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET	132
B. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	143

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 1 Essentials of liberal and neoliberal governmentality	30
Table 2 Turkey's new legal regulations on international migration	97
Table 3 Central and Local Administration Units on Migration Management	99
Table 4 Merits of the Migration Management in the Global Discourse, the European Union and Turkey.....	107

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES

Figure 1 Promotion of the Migration Management Framework: Case of Turkey ... 86

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFSJ	Area of Freedom, Security and Justice
ARCP	Arab Regional Consultative Process on Migration
ASAM	Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families
DESA	United Nations Population Division of the Department of Economics and Social Affairs
EU	European Union
EUROPOL	European Police Office
FOM	Federal Office for Migration
FRONTEX	European Border and Coast Guard Agency
GATTs	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GCIM	Global Commission on International Migration
GFMD	Global Forum on Migration and Development
GMDAC	Global Migration Data Analysis Centre
GMG	Global Migration Group
HLD	High Level Dialogue
IBM	Integrated Border Management System
ICMPD	International Center for Migration Policy Development
ICPD	International Conference on Population and Development
IDM	International Dialogue on Migration

IGOs	Intergovernmental Organizations
ILO	International Labor Organization
IMF	International Monetary Foundation
IOs	International Organizations
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IR	International Relations
IRF	Interregional Forums on Migration
MIDSA	Migration Dialogue for South Africa
MIDWA	Migration Dialogue for West Africa
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NIROMP	New International Regime for Orderly Movements of People
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PICMME	Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movements of Migrants from Europe
RCP	Regional Consultative Process
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refuges
UNHCHR	United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
US	United States
USA	United States of America

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Neoliberal globalization is a sociopolitical and economic process grounded in the free movements of capital, goods, services, information and technology¹ which has been pervading since 1980s². The concept of ‘neoliberalism’ has been originated within the field of political economy for the purpose to achieve sustainable economy by Austrian economists in the post-war context. Yet, the global transformation towards neoliberal political economy has been actively pursued after the failure of Keynesian economics in the late 1970s. In the economic sense, turning towards neoliberal political economy means to liberalize the market economy via deregulation, privatization and minimum state intervention. From then on, the process of neoliberalization has taken place in the institutional, political and social context along with economics in the global scale³. That is to say, the transformations towards the neoliberal globalization have taken multiple forms from market relations to social relations and ‘neoliberalism’ has turned into an ethic in itself in which all sorts of human actions are guided⁴.

Considering the scale and the depth of neoliberalization, proliferation of neoliberal values and norms attracts a great deal of attention in almost all fields of the social sciences. At this juncture, the present study investigates how neoliberal globalization affects the way international migration is regulated. The reason why this issue is chosen to see how neoliberal norms and values are promoted is that

¹ Linda L. Lindsey, “Sharp Right Turn: Globalization and Gender Equity,” *Sociological Quarterly* 55, no. 1 (2014): 1–22, doi:10.1111/tsq.12051., pp. 2-4.

² Immanuel Wallerstein, “2008: The Demise of Neoliberal Globalization | MR Online,” accessed August 23, 2017, <https://mronline.org/2008/02/01/2008-the-demise-of-neoliberal-globalization/>.

³ David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 1st ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

human mobility is presented as the exceptional element in the ‘free movement’ argument of neoliberalism which creates inconsistency⁵ or contradiction⁶ in the globalization narrative. Whereas neoliberalism is marked by the free movement of capital, goods, services and so on between the sectors, regions and countries, free movement of humans across national boundaries is regarded something that should be restricted or widely regulated. In that regard, ‘international migration management’ appears as a proper field to investigate the effects of the neoliberal globalization.

This study has a critical position towards neoliberal globalization which considers the process as the result of the great efforts of the international organizations dominated by advanced liberal societies. In this sense, Neoliberal globalization is regarded as a ‘project’⁷ which has been actively pursued since the early 1980s. From this point of view, the term ‘international migration management’ is considered as a part of the hegemonic project of advanced liberal democracies based on the worldwide promotion of neoliberal values in the field of international migration. Throughout the thesis, it is argued that this process is being carried out by international and regional organizations dominated by those liberal societies. Based on the global governmentality approach of Jonathan Joseph, international migration management is considered as a neoliberal form of governmentality which is globally promoted by international and regional organizations to individual states. In that regard, this study has two main claims; international migration is globally governmentalized and it takes inevitably neoliberal form⁸. In the first instance, governmentalization of international migration at the global level means that the domestic policies of the individual states concerning international migration are

⁵ Ronaldo Munck, “Globalisation, Governance and Migration: An Introduction,” *Third World Quarterly* 29, no. 7 (2008): 1227–46, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01436590802386252>, p. 1227.

⁶ Alba I. León and Henk Overbeek, “Neoliberal Globalisation, Transnational Migration and Global Governance,” in *Handbook of International Political Economy of Migration*, ed. Leila Simona Talani and Simon McMahon (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2015), 37–54., p. 38.

⁷ Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*., p. 11.

⁸ As a result of the restructuring the internationalization of production through neoliberal norms and values. For a further discussion; Adam David Morton, “Unravelling Gramsci: Hegemony and Passive Revolution in the Global Political Economy,” *Pluto Press*, 2007, p. 125.

conducted by international organizations. And considering the scale of neoliberal globalization, this particular mode of ruling takes neoliberal form in which domestic societies are encouraged to ensure that human mobility is regulated through the demands of global capitalist structures.

1.1. Research Questions

This study aims to provide a critical assessment of the new discourse on international migration management from the perspective of global governmentality and to evaluate how the neoliberal mode of international migration management is promoted in Turkey. By approaching international migration as a field of global-governmental interventions and Turkey as a case to investigate this process, I pose two encompassing questions. The first question is the overarching research question guiding this study; 1) how neoliberal globalization shapes the policies of international migration? To be able to answer this question, I determined the global governmentality approach as the theoretical ground to critically evaluate the issue. On this theoretical basis, I ask 1a) what is international migration management; 1b) how is it framed as a management issue at the global level; 1c) what are the characteristics of the global governmentality of international migration, and 1d) how migration management framework is linked to the neoliberal globalization? Secondly, I question whether the recent transformation in Turkey's international migration policy is a global promotion of neoliberal mode of migration management. Accordingly, I ask 2a) what is the traditional migration policy of Turkey? In consideration of the involvement of the European Union in the process of policy change I also question 2c) what is EU's common migration and Asylum Policy and how is it compatible with the global discourse; 2c) what changes did Turkey made in its international migration policy under the influence of the EU? Finally, I ask about 2d) how these changes are consistent with the global discourse?

1.2. Type of Research and Methodology

This study is designed to provide a critical analysis on the new discourse on migration management in order to re-read the new scheme of international migration management on the basis of neoliberal globalization. Throughout the thesis, the objectives of the new global discourse on effective migration management are explained through the requirements of the neoliberal globalization and the spread of this mode of government via the governmentalization of international migration at

the international level. On that ground, the establishment of a new migration management regime in Turkey is explained as an example of the global promotion of effective migration management scheme rather than being only a domestic policy issue. In the end, the thesis does not offer any policy application but presents links between the regulation of the global human mobility and the maintenance of neoliberal capitalist structures, between neoliberal form of global governmentality and the global promotion of the effective migration management, and between EU's hegemonic power to penetrate into third countries and Turkey's new regime of migration management.

The study adopts the discourse analysis method. Discourse in the broader sense means 'anything from a historical monument' involving 'a policy, a political strategy... text, talk, a speech, topic-related conversations'⁹ and so on. While the scope of 'discourse' is rather broader, the issue will be discussed here through written sources such as legal texts, official websites of the formal institutions, policy documents, reports, books and articles prepared by state agencies, the non-governmental organizations, international organizations, researchers and academicians. Due to the limitations of the space as well as the scope of the study, it will not be possible to include a full range of documents referring to the overall literature. Accordingly, there will be the selection of appropriate documents without a claim of scientific representation.

In the final part of the thesis, the arguments developed over the previous parts are tested in the case of Turkey. In that sense, the final part of the study is a single case study with the objective to investigate the effectiveness of the new global discourse in a particular context. Turkey has chosen to see how domestic policies of the individual states on the issue of international migration are directed at the global level because the its recent policy transformations quite resembles to the new scheme on effective migration management and the process has been triggered by the outside interventions of the European Union. In that regard, Turkey appears as a likely case to see how new migration management scheme is promoted to individual states by international and regional organizations.

⁹ Ruth Wodak, "Introduction: Discourse Studies - Important Concepts and Terms," in *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*, ed. Ruth Wodak and Michal Krzyzanowski (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 1–30., p. 1.

1.3.Theoretical Framework; Neoliberal Form of Global Governmentality

Michel Foucault developed his governmentality approach through his investigation on the ‘genealogy of the modern state’ by looking at the specific historical and social conditions of the Europe. Governmentality means the ‘art of government’ in which the act of government roots in a certain political reasoning to guide the individual and collective human conduct to be able to achieve the specific goals. It is a mode of governance in which the population is the main target, political economy is the main source of knowledge and the security apparatuses are the technical mechanisms to govern¹⁰. Foucault uses the approach as an analytical tool to explain how modern state has been shaped in Europe over the problematic of government. Closely related with his conceptualization of power as being relational and dynamic in nature, he suggests that ‘The modern state is born... when governmentality became a calculated and reflected practice’¹¹. By establishing a link between political rationale and governmental practices, Foucault offers an analytical framework to critically elaborate the governmental practices of the modern state.

Foucault does not take neoliberalism as an ideology but as a specific way of rationalizing the act of government. It is not a new form of governmentality but a version of liberal art of government with a renewed emphasis on political economy. Neoliberal art of government pursues the fundamental objective to obtain maximum economic efficiency by preventing excessive governmental practices. Yet, Foucault shows that whereas the main source of inefficiency is presented as too-much-government, Neoliberal governmentality performs excessive governance over human action. With indirect mechanisms, technologies of self and security apparatuses, this art of government shapes the possible field of action via the constant display of security and freedom by giving an impression of minimum government. To be more precise, it is a particular way of governing through the network of institutions and through the governance of individual self-conduct. For this reason, the neoliberal art of government is frequently defined as governance at a distance.

¹⁰ Michel Foucault et al., *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978* (New York: Picador/Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)., pp. 107-8.

¹¹ Thomas Lemke, “Foucault, Governmentality and Critique,” *Rethinking Marxism* 14, no. 3 (2002): 49–64, doi:10.1080/089356902101242288., p. 165

In this art of government, the market is perceived as a fabricated social reality which should be constantly inserted in the all levels of society. In other words, the market exists and functions when the society is conducted in that way. Therefore, the role of the state is to create, foster and stimulate the social conditions for the market operating effectively. However, neoliberal governmentality approach suggests that the state does not conduct direct government but to shape the field of action and to encourage people to actively govern themselves in accordance with market-like rules as an active policy of responsabilization. By this way, the neoliberal way of life becomes ethics so the neoliberal subjectivity is invoked as a moral issue of personal responsibility.

This new understanding on neoliberalism has a considerable potential for analyzing contemporary forms of domination, power relations, individual and totalitarian actions and other significant aspects of the 'social' along with the technical and technological mechanisms of control. For the very reason, the approach is ever-increasingly utilized in the social sciences to be able to reveal the enclosed reflections of neoliberalism. Following the same trend, application of the governmentality approach in IR provides a new perspective to analyze globalization process and the role of the individual states in the contemporary era. Herein, the approach is scaled up and applied at the international level in which the globalization is read as a global form of governmentality. Different from the domestic application, at the international level global art of government creates and adopts new goals and methods of governing.¹² Joseph argues that the very purpose of the global governmentality is to shape 'the international' in a certain way so that individual states adopt the policies what is 'good' for the maintenance of the system. Accordingly, the main target of global governmentality is not the population itself but the individual states whom later conduct the population.

With the help of the theory of hegemony¹³, Joseph argues that the present global governmentality inevitably takes the neoliberal form since the Western powers

¹² Jean-Sébastien Guy, "Beyond Global Modernity, Global Consciousness and Global Governmentality: The Symmetrical Anthropology of Globalization," *European Journal of Social Theory* 19, no. 4 (2016): 451–67, p. 452.

¹³ The theory of hegemony was introduced by Antonio Gramsci in order to explain the dialectical relationship between the economic structure and the ideological superstructures and between ruling

successfully transferred their political, economic and social aspects to the international realm. For this reason, he argues that the globalization (or the neoliberal globalization) is a macro-level hegemonic project of the advanced-liberal states to assure the well functioning of neoliberal economic structures at the global level. According to Joseph, the neoliberal art of government is globally promoted through international and regional organizations via projections and conditions they postulate on the individual states. He admits that the global governmentality approach is quite successful to guide the states' behavior towards neoliberalism but the success or failure of governmentality in the domestic level depends on social and historical conditions of these societies. Due to the limitations of the study, this research only deals with how neoliberal form of governance in the field of international migration is promoted to Turkey without making any further discussions whether it is operational in the Turkish context.

1.4. Governmentalization of International Migration at the Global Level

While the international migration is neither a new phenomenon nor a new topic of discussion, it has become a remarkable policy issue of the international politics since the end of the Cold War. The new trend to discuss international migration as a global policy issue has triggered a process of developing a new approach to handle human mobility. On this basis, the term 'migration management' was firstly conceptualized in 1993 by Bimal Ghosh. As a consequence of the growing entanglement of human affairs in the contemporary era, he alleged that states' inherent policies on international migration remain inefficient to overcome the problems arising from the current migratory movement. Accordingly, he suggested that through the principle of '*regulated openness*', international migration should be managed to provide benefits for the sending, receiving and transit countries as well as the migrants themselves¹⁴. From then on, how migration should be managed is a great concern of international organizations within and the outside of the UN system.

and subordination within the capitalist modernity. Morton, "Unravelling Gramsci: Hegemony and Passive Revolution in the Global Political Economy.", p. 95.

¹⁴ Bimal Ghosh, "Towards a New International Regime for Orderly Movements of People," in *Managing Migration: Time for a New International Regime?*, ed. Bimal Ghosh (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 6–27., p. 25.

Despite the fact that the field of migration studies is interdisciplinary by nature and quite extensive with insights coming from distinctive mindsets and depictions, this study focuses on the particular point of international migration management that began to be discussed as a global policy issue in the early 1990s. While admitting their importance, the macro level analysis of international migration management in this study does not focus on the specific discussions on the main drives of international migration like push and pull factors or transnational social relations such as diasporas. With the insights gained from the governmentality approach, this study focuses on the great efforts of the international organizations to develop a standard framework for international migration management at the global level so as that individual states can adopt the ‘best practice’ of migration management. In other words, it is argued that international migration issue has been turned into a field in which the individual states are exposed to constant governmental interventions on their policies towards international migration. Furthermore, it is argued that international migration management has been placed within the hegemonic project of neoliberal globalization as a field to promote neoliberal values.

Global governmentality of international migration means to govern the way migration is managed within the area of state’s jurisdiction. The object of conduct is not the migration itself but the traditional policies regulating migration, thus, the behavior of the individual states. How international migration has been transformed into a field of governmental intervention is examined by way of the analytics of government formulated by Mitchell Dean.¹⁵ By applying the four steps of the analytics of government, how international migration is governmentalized at the global level is detailed by revealing the forms of visibility of migration, cooperation mechanisms as the means of governance, conceptualization of best practice of migration management and the capacities and qualifications that are expected from the individual states. It is argued that the depiction of international migration as the natural consequence of the human existence transformed it to be a technical issue of management. Using some catchwords such as ‘cooperation’, ‘benefit’, ‘flexibility’, ‘unpredictability’, ‘consensus’ and ‘globalization’, international organizations

¹⁵ Mitchell Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, 2nd ed. (London: SAGE Publications, 2010), p. 38.

formulated an effective migration management scheme based on the principle of regulated openness. In this scheme, 'good' governance of international migration is attributed to the establishment of a migration management system to facilitate and restrict international human mobility at the same time. In this scheme, the main objective is to get benefit from the human mobility while mitigating the negative effects. The main argument of this scheme is that the effective migration management would be beneficial if it is managed effectively. This argument is fundamentally grounded on the globalization of the labor market and its new demands on low and high-skilled labor. Therefore, states are expected to develop certain legal and administrative capacities to manage the process in line with the demands of the domestic and global forces of the labor market. By this way, states undertake the maintenance and stipulation of the neoliberal market forces by meeting the demands of the local and global labor market.

As an important remark, in different institutional settings and policy agendas, overarching policies concerning to regulate cross border human mobility take different names such as; international migration management, global governance of migration, global migration management and so on. Similarly, in the migration literature, the international and global distinction is rather vague and the terms are often used interchangeably. Sometimes even in the same text, both 'international' and 'global' are simultaneously used to define the contemporary forms of human mobility. In this study, cross-border human mobility will be labeled as 'international migration' since the migration would only make sense if there is a categorical division on geography such as urban, rural or national. The term 'global', therefore, will be utilized to define world-embracing governance of domestic policies of migration management. Accordingly, the rest of the thesis will keep this terminological distinction and the meaning attributed to it although, in some references, terms are used interchangeably.

1.5.The Case of Turkey

The main tendency to evaluate Turkey's international migration policy is to assess a temporal distinction in terms of the changing nature of human mobility affecting Turkey. Accordingly, the attention is mostly on how Turkey became a migrant-sending country, migrant-receiving country and/or transit country in time. The very objective of this study, therefore, is to show that while this categorical

classification of Turkey in terms of the migratory patterns is quite valid, this categorization fails to reveal the shift in the general understanding of migration regulation (administration or management) and compatible governance practices. To be more precise, this study labels the research object from the international migration flows as an object of government to Turkey's attitudes towards migration. By this way, it is aimed to examine in what direction Turkey is conducted to manage international migration. For this purpose, this study evaluates the recent changes in the Turkey's migration policy and the deepening of its relations with the international and regional organizations as a good example of the worldwide promotion of effective migration management.

General assessment of migration policy of Turkey reveals that from the establishment of the modern state till the Helsinki Summit of 1999, Turkey had pursued unsystematic and reactionary policies towards cross-border human mobility on the ground of ethno-nationalist concerns. Starting from the time when modern Turkey was established in 1923 till the new millennium, international migration has been embraced as an important issue for sovereign regulation with a particular emphasis on national identity and territorial integrity. On the basis of the political identity of 'Turkishness', immigration and emigration patterns have been seen as an important source to promote a strong national state with homogeneous population¹⁶. This position has been legitimized through the legal arrangements. For a long time, Turkey accepted immigrants only whom coming from the Turkish origin and/or attached to Turkish Culture¹⁷. In terms of policies concerning refugees, Turkey expressed any obligation for asylum seekers from outside Europe, which it is still the case for the state's position towards refugees. This quite-limited room left for the 'legal' immigration and the exclusion of the movements outside of this framework resulted in a lack of interest in developing administrative structuring exclusive to international migration. The process had been carried out by the already established central and local administration units. Although international migration patterns have

¹⁶ Ahmet İcduygu and Damla B. Aksel, "Turkish Migration Policies: A Critical Historical Retrospective" XVIII, no. 3 (2013): 167–90, <http://sam.gov.tr/turkish-migration-policies-a-critical-historical-retrospective-ahmet-icduygu-and-damla-b-aksel/>, p. 178.

¹⁷ "The Turkish Law of Settlement," *Official Gazette*, 1934, http://gocdergisi.com/kaynak/1934_2510_settlement_law.pdf.

been significantly changed in time, Turkey continued to pursue its traditional position on the basis of political-nationalist concerns until the establishment of the new framework of migration management in the 2000s.

Turkey began to transform its international migration policy towards the effective migration management model under the great influence of the European Union. Common Migration and Asylum Policy of the Union has begun to be formulated in the early 1990s in parallel with the broader European integration. The central objective was to liberalize the free movement of persons among the member states by abolishing the internal borders and by strengthening the external borders in order to create an area of freedom, security and justice. This ambition was closely linked to the security-driven mode of migration management in which the immigration was seen a threat to the very existence of the EU. Therefore, the initial policy direction was to adopt highly restrictive measures against immigration. This understanding began to be softened in the early 2000s. In consequence of the inclusion of the migration issue into the development agenda, 'legal' labor immigration was presented as the engine of the economic development. In particular, embracing a global perspective, the Union began to engage more in the facilitating immigration policies so as fill the gap in the EU labor market and to attract highly-skilled non-EU citizens. In this new direction, EU's existence was linked to the Union's ability to compete with other global players and one way of achieving this is presented as the effective management of international migration through the demands of the labor market. In this juncture, EU's new orientation towards effective migration management for economic development quite resembles the global discourse. Considering the Union's hegemonic power in the international realm and ability to penetrate into the domestic politics of the third countries, it happens to be an important global actor promoting effective migration management framework.

Turkey is a proper case of global-governmental intervention in the field of international migration since the latest policy direction of the country cannot be analyzed without the enormous influence of the European Union (EU). After the candidacy status was granted in 1999, Turkey was expected to harmonize its international migration policy with the Union as a pre-accession requirement. In other words, the Union has conditioned Turkey to develop a comprehensive 'international migration management' system compatible with EU's common

migration and asylum policy. EU's expectations soon became the objectives of the country and a process of transformation immediately began. Among all the administrative and legal changes, the establishment of Directorate General of Migration Management and the adoption of Law on Foreigners and International Protection in 2013 are sure signs of this tremendous change since they formed the basis of the new migration management system of Turkey. Unlike the previous era, the new system has been created to regulate all aspects of human mobility on the basis of 'good' or 'effective' management of international migration in which the attention has been drawn to economic contribution of the human mobility rather than ethno-nationalist concerns.

When Turkey's new system of migration management was compared with the global discourse, it was assessed that this new system is compatible with the global discourse on effective migration management. By redefining the meaning of 'international migration' as a social reality, human mobility was depoliticized. This shift in the conceptual understanding has enabled to develop a new system based more on managerial and technical governance of international migration. Hence, Turkey realized a 'development-friendly' system of migration management in which the human mobility was intended to be managed to fill the gap in the labor market and to contribute to the economic growth. In particular, the Law on Work Permit for Foreigners of 2003 and the International Labor Force Law of 2016 were designed to attract foreign direct investment as well as high-skilled workforce just as effective migration management scheme suggested. Moreover, as suggested in the effective migration management scheme, Turkey also broadened its framework on migration restriction in order to mitigate the negative effects of international migration. In particular, irregular migration was presented as a problem needs to be fought with since it would damage the dynamics of the labor market and would foster transnational organized crimes such as human and drug trafficking. And finally, Turkey has developed bilateral, regional and global cooperation mechanisms so the country has better engaged in the 'Global Governmentality'. As a 'responsible' actor, Turkey became not only the object of government but also an active agency of 'norm promoter'.

CHAPTER 2

GOVERNMENTALITY AND GLOBAL GOVERNMENTALITY

Global governmentality approach of IR relies on the reading of globalization as a form of governmentality in which the creation and adoption of new goals and methods of governing at the global level are at the center of analysis¹⁸. Among several elaborations of global governmentality¹⁹, in this study, Jonathan Joseph's conception of the neoliberal version of global governmentality has been chosen since Joseph provides a better understanding of contemporary global politics by upgrading the level of analysis. He does not only provide an opportunity to study governmentality in the broader political realm but also enriches the discipline of International Relations. In brief, he suggests that global governmentality is framed by advanced liberal states and its rationality is promoted by international and regional organizations to other parts of the world. Accordingly, global governmentality in the current world politics necessarily takes neoliberal form. Yet, in the different social settings, this global governmentality may not work due to the fact that its rationality represents the mentality of advanced liberal societies. He carefully distinguishes the operation of governmentality at the international domain from the domestic level by arguing that (the neoliberal form of) global governmentality operates well at the international domain in terms of regulating state behaviors while at the domestic level it depends on social conditions. Based on this argumentation, this study concerns to investigate how neoliberal values are promoted in the field of

¹⁸ Jean-Sébastien Guy, "Beyond Global Modernity, Global Consciousness and Global Governmentality: The Symmetrical Anthropology of Globalization," *European Journal of Social Theory* 19, no. 4 (2016): 451–67, p. 452.

¹⁹ Some other conceptualizations of Global governmentality; Wendy Larner and William Walters, "Globalization as Governmentality," *Alternatives* 29, no. 5 (2004): 495–514, ; Doerthe Rosenow, "Decentering Global Power: The Merits of a Foucauldian Approach to International Relations," *Global Society* 23, no. 4 (2009): 497–517.

international migration through the investigation of the global governmental practices concerning international migration.

This chapter consists of two main sections; governmentality approach in general and appropriation of governmentality in the discipline of International Relations. The first part will set out Michel Foucault's lectures on the notion of governmentality and recent contributions of neo-Foucauldians on the framework of neoliberal governmentality in the contemporary world. In this part, how Foucault developed the term governmentality while doing a genealogical analysis of the state specific to Europe will be deeply elaborated. Foucault explicitly acknowledges that governmentality as the art of government emerged dependent on the historical and social conditions specific to Europe. But when it comes to neoliberal governmentality, Foucault had only been able to elaborate on this term till the late 1970s. For that reason, neo-Foucauldians' analysis of neoliberal governmentality where Foucault left off will be covered by the end of this section. By this way, how neo-Foucauldians adopted the approach regarding the new challenges of the contemporary world would be comprehended. The second part will clarify governmentality approach in IR with a particular attention on Jonathan Joseph's conception of global governmentality. It is due to the reason that Joseph's perception of the neoliberal form of global governmentality stands as a better alternative to adopt a governmentality approach in IR. This better alternative will be covered in the final section of this chapter through pointing out the merits of reading Jonathan Joseph's sophistication of the term global governmentality. What makes his analysis valuable is that he has succeeded to bring the state back to the analysis through indicating the linkage between why and how questions. Furthermore, he acknowledges the significance of social and historical conditions which have been disregarded by neo-Foucauldians for the effectiveness of governmental practices. Therefore, he brings 'the social' back to the analysis and able to capture the critical point of Foucault. And finally, he scales up the approach by not falling into overdeterminism and Eurocentricism with the help of the term '*uneven and combined development*'.

2.1. Studies of Governmentality

Michel Foucault developed his prominent concept of governmentality during his lectures at the Collège de France between 1971 and 1984. In particular, the lectures called, ‘Society must be defended’²⁰, ‘Security, Territory and Population’²¹ and ‘the Birth of Biopolitics’²², construct the three main pillars of his concept of governmentality. Although he did not originally publish his works on governmentality, the lecture notes of these courses published later became the basis of the studies of governmentality. It can be said that Foucault did not develop the term, governmentality, in a systematic manner. His initial intention was to talk about biopolitics²³ but his ideas have evolved into the term what we now call governmentality. Governmentality, commonly defined as the art of government, deals with the rational attempt to shape human conduct. It involves not only how we exercise authority over others but also how we govern ourselves and the modification of the space in which the activity of government appears. The popularity of the concept comes from its analytical applicability to almost all social cases and its explanatory power since the term expands the meaning of government with the inclusion of a variety of practices and institutions. Thanks to the novel contributions of other prominent academicians and social theorists, rather than being only a concept, governmentality became a field of study.

2.1.1. Conceptualization of Government

The government in this approach is basically defined as the ‘conduct of conduct’²⁴. Herein, conduct means to lead, to direct or to guide in two ways; one conducts oneself and one is conducted. In the first sense, the experience of individuals either to conduct themselves or others through certain principles becomes

²⁰ Alessandro Fontana, Michel Foucault, Mauro Bertani, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76* (New York: Picador, 2003).

²¹ Foucault et al., *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*.

²² Michel Foucault and Michel Senellart, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

²³ ‘I really did intend to talk about biopolitics, and then, things being what they are, I have ended up talking at length... about neo-liberalism’ Ibid. Michel Foucault, *the Birth of Biopolitics*, p. 185

²⁴ Mitchell Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, 2nd ed. (London: SAGE Publications, 2010), p. 17.

technical practices in which human activity is rendered as a governmental practice²⁵. The other sense of the government distinctively centers upon the very problem of the rule. The questions of who will rule and what will be the means, the goals, and the justification of that rule are the main concerns. Thereby, the second meaning of government centers on the conduct in the political domain. In view of these two uses, government in the most generic sense is ‘a way of acting to affect the way in which individuals conduct themselves’²⁶. To put it differently, the government is an activity not only concerned with the practices of political government but also the practices of self. Therefore, the meaning of government expands in a way to cover all individualistic and totalitarian acts and it includes how individuals see, think and rationalize their actions. This means that government is deeply concerned with private personal relations shaped by the exercise of ruling practices.

Foucault identifies that the first historical track in the systematic transition to the modern state is the changing meaning of the term government. For him, government as the conduct of conduct appears in Europe and takes different forms in different time periods and contexts. When Foucault makes a genealogical²⁷ analysis of the term government, he sees that in the 16th century, general problematic of the government in Europe was to clarify how to be governed, by whom, to what extent, to what ends, and by what methods²⁸. In particular, he identifies an important transformation of the definition of the political form of the government between the middle of the 16th century and 18th century. He realizes that in this time period, the practice of government had multiple forms in Europe; the conduct of oneself, one's family, souls, children and so on. Governing of the state appears not as a unique form of government but as a specific mode of ruling that applied to the state as a whole.

²⁵ Nikolas Rose, “Governing ‘Advanced’ Liberal Democracies,” in *Foucault and Political Reason Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government*, ed. Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas Rose (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), 37–65., p. 41.

²⁶ Graham Burchell, “Liberal Government and Techniques of the Self,” in *Foucault and Political Reason Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), p. 20.

²⁷ Genealogy is a method to evaluate discourses and beliefs for the conditions of their possibility in history.

²⁸ Foucault et al., *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978.*, p. 89.

What is essential therefore is that the existence of the plurality of the forms of government is a kind of departure from the traditional sovereign state and the beginning of the transition to the modern state. As an important element of governmentality, this plurality of the forms of government is substantially internal to the modern state and society.

2.1.2. Conceptualization of Governmentality

Governmentality, in the simplest sense, means the ‘art of government’ in which the act of government bases upon a certain political reasoning to guide the individual and collectivist human action to be able to achieve the specific goals. Foucault suggests that;

By this word “governmentality” I mean three things. First, by governmentality, I understand the ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, calculations, and tactics that allow the exercise 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. Second, by “governmentality” I understand the tendency, the line of force, that for a long time throughout the West, has constantly led towards the pre-eminence over all other types of power—sovereignty, discipline and so on—of the type of power that we can call “government” and which has led to the development of a series of specific governmental apparatuses (appareils) on the one hand, and on the other to the development of series of knowledges (savoirs). Finally, by “governmentality” I think we should understand the process, or rather, the result of the process by which the state of justice of the Middle Ages became the administrative state in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and was gradually “governmentalized”²⁹

This broad evaluation of the term highlights some important elements of the art of government. To begin with, the term governmentality suggests that the activity of government requires ‘craft, imagination, shrewd fashioning, the use of tacit skills and practical know-how, the employment of intuition and so on’³⁰ to be able to better conduct population as a whole. Herein, the notion of the population does not refer to the sum of individuals and families, but a new type of collectivity having its own regularities and its specific collective and economic effects. Clearly, this transformation of the object alters the way how reality is understood, shaped and controlled. In relation to that, the emergence of the term population as a new type of

²⁹ Ibid., p. 108.

³⁰ Burchell, “Liberal Government and Techniques of the Self.” p. 28

collectivity also alters the way of classification. Foucault says that for the first time in history, a man appears as a form of his biological existence and he is classified as 'human species' rather than 'mankind'.³¹ When this collectivity extends beyond its biological ground to the entity that has its opinions, customs, requirements, ways of behavior and so on, population gains a new meaning, namely the 'public'. Hence, governmentality is about the conduct of population on behalf of public interests by providing economic, political and cultural well-being.

According to Foucault, as a result of the replacement of family with population, the attention inevitably shifts from economic government of family to the government of population through political economy. While the economic government of family is grounded on concerns on wealth, political economy is essentially different from that. Rather, it is the 'knowledge of processes that link together variations of wealth and variation of the population on three axes; production, circulation, consumption'³². On the one hand, it is a new science providing necessary information to conduct, on the other hand, it is a form of governmental intervention in population and economy.

Secondly, the emergence of the population as a new object inevitably gives a rise to the new problems in the domain of knowledge and the mechanisms of power. On the one hand, emergence of new forms of knowledge on the population through new scientific techniques such as statistics made possible the population to be an object to conduct. Thus, scientific knowledge became an indispensable element of government. On the other hand, new forms and the techniques of power had an undeniable role in the formation as well as the control of the population. In particular, 'biopower' or 'biopolitics' in the most general sense defined as 'power over life'³³ becomes an important element of the art of government. Being in search of the strict control over the population, specific forms of knowledge imminent to the population such as birth rate, mortality rate, the rate of reproduction and so on becomes an important source of power. It makes the mechanisms of power proceeding different from the time when the population was not the main target. It is

³¹Foucault et al., *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978.*, p. 75

³² Ibid., p. 350.

³³ Ibid., p. 369.

now that human population enters into the general strategy of power³⁴. Although it is an important aspect of governmentality, biopolitics and governmental power are not exactly the same. Governmental power is foremost about guiding which is structuring and shaping the possible field of action of individuals. By this way, Foucault goes beyond coercion or consensus-oriented analysis of power and opens up a new field of investigation³⁵. In that regard, the art of government comes in a view as the art of exercising power over life in the form of economy to guide the individual actions to be able to achieve the public good.

Finally, governmentality explains the birth of modern state in the beginning of the eighteenth century in Europe through the emergence of the specific art of government with its own rationality. Herein, rationality signifies a ‘way of thinking about, calculating and responding to a problem, which is more or less systematic, and might draw upon formal bodies of knowledge or expertise’.³⁶ It does not mean a transcendental and ahistorical thinking but a reason that historical practices rely on. Therefore, it helps to see how the depiction of the modern state has been formed as a natural, universal and ahistorical phenomenon. Although some elements of the governmentality had started to emerge even before the modern state came on the scene, Foucault says that ‘The modern state is born... when governmentality became a calculated and reflected practice’³⁷. Accordingly, the art of government with a proper rationality appears as the historical precondition of the modern (governmentalized) state.

In elaborating these themes Foucault highlights the complexity of the governmental techniques as the characteristics of the modern state. Through the question of how power is exercised, he challenges the idea of the state as a unitary and singular entity and rather draws a picture of the complex set of practices and techniques within a network of relations.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 369-70.

³⁵ Thomas Lemke, “Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique,” *Rethinking Marxism* 14, no. 3 (2002), p. 52.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 107

³⁷ Ibid., p. 165

2.2. Road to Neoliberal Governmentality

Foucault defines neoliberal governmentality as a version of the liberal form of rule that is based on post-war social settings of Germany and Chicago school of the United States. This art of government is the re-formulation of the political rationality of liberal governmentality to be able to achieve maximum governmental efficiency. There is sort of a historical path to modern state in Foucault's works on governmentality in which he tracks turning points in historical transformations of political rule from sovereign state to police state and from police state to liberal state. Yet, he does suggest a linear path of political development for the state in which one mode of governmental practice totally ends when another comes. What he makes is rather to explain how a specific political rationality combined with compatible governmental technologies gradually transforms the very practice of rule by not resulting in an obvious shift from the prevalent mode of government in the previous time. Instead, he shows that particular conjuncture of existing power relations with emergent ones dependent on social characteristics is the crucial point in this transformation of the ruling practices.

To give an example, he suggests that Police state as the first type of governmentality spread in Europe from the 17th century when there was a wide ranging concern about the nature of sovereign power due to uprisings and reformation/counter-reformation movements of the time. It is the social and historical conditions that provided the police state to emerge as an art of government based on the distinctive rationality of *raison d'état*. In order to achieve security in the chaotic environment of revolts, this political rationality prioritized the economic way of government through Mercantilism³⁸. The activity of government has turned into a political form of pastoral power exercised on the population by means of control and disciplinary mechanisms concerning to lead each and every individual to provide a prosperous life. Yet, he carefully mentions that police state was not the end of sovereign power but the modification of the sovereign power³⁹ and administration on the basis of new conditions.

³⁸ Foucault et al., *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978.*, p. 32.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 347.

The point here is that Neoliberal governmentality that Foucault conceptualized is not immune from the historical developments and the social conditions of the society which it operates in. With this in mind, in the following section, only general characteristics of two variants of liberal governmentality will be elaborated. Initially, liberal governmentality will be detailed due to the reason that neoliberal version of governmentality can be better understood afterward. Later, neoliberal governmentality will be discussed by focusing only the conceptual merits of the term without dilating upon the historical and social patterns of Europe.

2.2.1. Liberal Governmentality

Foucault treats Liberalism not as a political ideology but as the political rationality of the specific art of government of the 19th century-Europe. This art of government attempts to govern population in a systematic manner with the objective of maximum governmental efficiency. Accordingly, the main objective is not to improve the strength of the state via the unlimited exercise of power on population but to govern efficiently. Being grounded in the strong critiques towards political reason of the police state, liberal form of the rule makes limited government the main principle of the rule. Particular concern on the legitimacy of sovereign power in the previous time has given way to the adequacy of the governmental practice. With regard to the assumptions of the classical political economy, the good or adequate government is attributed to the achievement of maximum efficiency on limited governmental practice. Consequently, the liberal art of government emerges as the formula of maximum effectiveness by the way of limited government.

Foucault defines the liberal state as the product of the governmentalization of the economics through the integration of political economy to *raison d'état*. As a result of theorization of micro-level economic interactions through the political economy, the perception of the market in the liberal rule has been significantly changed. The market began to be considered as a new regime of truth having its own natural and complex mechanisms. It is believed that economy is a quasi-natural process which has law-like regularities⁴⁰. For that reason, the market is valued as the

⁴⁰Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, p. 63.

site of verification⁴¹ that is able to designate good practice naturally. The argument is that if the natural mechanisms are allowed to operate freely, they would reveal their own truth and find the natural equilibrium. However, the reality and truth are not being considered as transparent as that has been assumed by the police state. Governor cannot have a wide acquaintance with the governed reality so the root of economic problems and inefficiency is found on the governmental intervention, particularly on the market mechanisms. For that reason, the liberal rationality indicates that the objective of government is only to ensure the natural functioning of already available economic structures and institutions.

Noteworthy change on the conception of market altered the essence of the object of government as well. In the liberal rule, governmental power is not exercised on subjects but on the individual and collective interests. Interest is considered as subjective and private will of the individual action. Individual who is the part of the population is presumed to be a natural subject of interest, namely *homo economicus*. Economic egoism is suggested both natural and beneficial for the state. Accordingly, political power not only lets the individuals pursue their own incompatible egoistic interests, but also encourage them to do so⁴². Classical political economy argues that it is not the collective interest of the public will best serve the individual interests. On the contrary, self-interested individuals would be indirectly working on behalf of the public interest. Therefore, it is the problem of the limitation of the exercise of governmental power and respect for the freedom of individual choices. Yet, Foucault expresses that contrary to the popular belief, freedom in liberal context is not attributed to existential rights of birth. Rather,

‘Freedom is not a white surface with more or less numerous black spaces here and there and from time to time. Freedom is never anything other... than an actual relation between governors and governed, a relation in which the measure of the “too little” existing freedom is given by the “even more” freedom demanded. So when I say “liberal” I am not pointing to a form of governmentality which would leave more white spaces of freedom.’⁴³

⁴¹ Foucault and Senellart, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979.*, p. 32.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 301.

⁴³ Foucault, Michel, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*, p. 42.

Accordingly, the liberal art of rule is grounded not on the acceptance of freedom but the constant production of it so as to organize and control the population. It is the very act of the determination of the boundaries of the space of action in the name of freedom. Consequently, liberalism works through the social production of freedom and the management and organization of the conditions in which one can be free. Herein, control is the major standpoint of freedom.

Reconfiguration of individual in reference to classical political economy brings about new problems on the conception of the population. Liberal rule mistrusts the early conceptualization of population because the population is seen not as a quasi-natural totality but as a historically found, self-regulating human species in the broader environment⁴⁴. Population in this art of government is not an independent object in the center of the exercise of the political power. On the contrary, the population is accepted only as a variable depending on other variables such as climate and geography. Individuals who are part of the population on the one hand considered as self-interested economic subjects. In the meantime, they are legal subjects constituted via social contract⁴⁵. It is the dichotomy of the subject in the liberal rule that individuals have both incompatible economic interests and totalizable legal interests⁴⁶. This is the expression of the clear division of private and public domains. The problem of the rule in liberal art is, therefore, how to govern the totality of the legal subjects of right without intervening on individualistic economic actions. To put it differently, it is the question of how to preserve the status of freedom through the principle of laissez faire without disapproving the legitimacy of government. According to Foucault, the answer is to the use of free market as the source of state's enrichment, strength, and power.⁴⁷ Minimum economic intervention is provided through the maximum legal intervention of the state via apparatuses of security.

⁴⁴ Foucault et al., *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978.*, p. 351-2.

⁴⁵ Foucault and Senellart, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979.*, p. 273.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 278.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

The liberal problem of security rests on the determination of to what extent individual interest does not constitute a threat to collective interests. It is also the concern to protect individual interests against collective interests. The government of interest is attained in the Liberal art of rule through the interplay of the mechanisms of security and freedom. Foucault says that ‘Liberalism must produce freedom, but this very act entails the establishment of limitations, controls, forms of coercion, and obligations relying on threats, etcetera.’⁴⁸ Therefore, liberalism constantly produces freedom which stimulates the threat of danger so as to adopt the procedures of control, constraint, and coercion to counterpart different freedoms. Security is not anymore the fundamental precondition of the political authority, but a specific principle of the political method and practice. In other words, security apparatus is a technical mean to deal with a range of possible and probable events and to specify tolerable variations based on the calculations⁴⁹. Instead of direct control, security in liberal art adopts panopticon logic in which the function of control by inspection and surveillance passes from political sovereignty to individuals based on the incentive of private profit. This means that liberal art of government comes into constant surveillance without intervention under the guise of freedom of the individual.

The final point is the international aspect of the liberal art of rule. Different from Mercantilist understanding, competition under the conditions of the free market has been suggested as mutually profitable. It is due to the reason that natural mechanisms of the free market transform the condition of the game from zero-sum basis to the win-win situation⁵⁰. So, based on the idea of mutual enrichment, liberal form of rule follows the objective of collective and unlimited enrichment of Europe. Accordingly, the idea of European equilibrium gives its place to European progress in which the Europe is positioned on the center of the world and market is increasingly extended beyond Europe⁵¹. Consequently, the Liberal art of government

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 64.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 61

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 52-3.

⁵¹ Foucault et al., *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978.*, p. 338.

triggered a process of the globalization of the market and spread of the governmental rationality of liberal rule.

To summarize, Foucault shows that liberal governmentality operates through 'veridiction of the market, limitation by the calculation of governmental utility, and ...the position of Europe as a region of unlimited economic development in relation to a world market.'⁵² His critical evaluation reveals that Liberalism produces more control while promoting the idea of freedom. It is an art of government to have a maximum state with minimum intervention.

2.2.2. Neoliberal Governmentality

Once again, Foucault does not take neoliberalism as an ideology but as a specific way of rationalizing the act of government marked by three theoretical schools of German ordoliberalism, the Austrian school characterized by Hayek, and American neoliberalism in the form of the Chicago School. It is not a new form of governmentality but a version of liberal art of government with a renewed emphasis on political economy. Both versions agree on that the fundamental objective of the rule is to obtain maximum economic efficiency and they root the origin of inefficiency in excessive governmental practice. Accordingly, the classical and neoliberal form of rule is concerned to limit the state's involvement in the individual conduct. Yet, Foucault shows that Neoliberal governmentality, like the classical version, performs excessive government over human action while pretending as if it is not so. With indirect mechanisms, technologies of self and security apparatuses, both versions of governmentality shape the social field by giving an impression that there are no governmental practices. While the essential maxim of 'minimum government' has been accelerated frequently, Foucault shows that liberal versions of governmentality obtain a strong control over the population by creating and consuming a regime of 'freedoms'⁵³.

When Foucault examines the political economy of Germany⁵⁴ from 1942 to 1962 and later, American neoliberalism of the Chicago School, he suggests that both

⁵² Foucault and Senellart, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*, p. 61.

⁵³ Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas S. Rose, *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), p. 8.

⁵⁴ For the time being; West Germany

cases began the analysis with the serious criticisms of the obligations of the state to directly govern society extensively. New economic model, therefore, should minimize governmental practices and narrow down the scope of government. For Germany, it was about building a new state without falling into the excessive state power of Nazism ever again⁵⁵. And American neoliberalism has been developed as a reaction to the welfare state. In this environment, new political economy adopted the fundamental principles of the classical political economy such as laissez faire, individualism, rational choice, and freedom. Yet, the neoliberal political economy did not acknowledge the essential distinction of state practices from the economic realm. It is due to the reason that neoliberal political economy has considerably altered the depiction of the market and reconceptualized it as an artificial reality. Therefore, the primary responsibility of government was defined not to provide the absolute autonomy of the market but to maintain the market.

18th century liberalism defines the market on the principle of exchange which is the natural behavior of human beings. While admitting the spontaneity of exchange, Neoliberal rationality argues that what renders market possible is the social structure of competition. Therefore, the market is not perceived as a natural but as a fabricated social reality on account of the condition of competition.⁵⁶ It is a quite significant acknowledgment that intimate modification of the essence of the market inevitably alters the way of practicing. In this juncture, the state should not let the market forces to operate spontaneously for the sake of maximum economic efficiency. On the contrary, it is the primary obligation of the state to fulfill the social conditions that make the market function and to actively reinsert the market values and principles at all levels of society. To be more precise, the market exists and functions only if the society is conducted in order for it to be. Therefore, the role of the state is to create conditions for the market to operate effectively before to foster and stimulate it⁵⁷. The market is stimulated and sustained by the means of the

⁵⁵ Foucault and Senellart, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979.*, p. 106.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 120-1.

Rule of Law through the fundamental notions of individual rights, property rights and contractual freedom that constitute the framework of state intervention.

In a close connection with the new conceptualization of the market, *homo economicus* in neoliberal context is not granted as a naturally self-interested individual. Rather, it is defined as a specific form of subjectivity produced under certain social conditions. It is not a top-down practice of subject creation but a strategy of the production of the self-producing subjects encouraged by different forms of knowledge and relations of power. The objective is to create entrepreneurial and self-responsible subjects who discipline themselves. In that regard, the neoliberal conception of *homo economicus* is an artificial subject of free and autonomous ‘atom’ of self-interest. It is the individual who internalized the market-values, who is fully responsible for his own well-being, who is the entrepreneur of himself, and who has sufficient quantity of ‘human capital’ to be in competition with others.⁵⁸ Accordingly, neoliberal *homo economicus* is imminently governable subject maintained through social mechanisms of subjectification. It is important to note that dynamics of neoliberal subjectification strategy does not force individuals to discipline and optimize themselves. Rather, it is presented as the ethical way of life, based on the moral behavior of the individuals. Foucault expresses this process as the ‘contact point’ of techniques of self and technologies of coercion and domination⁵⁹ where individuals are driven to conduct themselves as moral responsibility.

Civil society for Foucault is a ‘transactional reality’⁶⁰ in the history of governmental technologies precisely in the liberal art of government. As the solution of the juridical problem of how to govern population according to rule of law without interfering with economic behavior of individuals, the civil society of 17th and 18th century emerged as a political entity to set a limitation on the exercise of

⁵⁸ Trent H Hamann, “Neoliberalism, Governmentality, and Ethics,” *Foucault Studies*, no. 6 (2009), p. 38.

⁵⁹ Burchell, “Liberal Government and Techniques of the Self” p. 20.

⁶⁰ Foucault defines transactional realities such as madness, civil society and so on as the figures which have not always existed but nonetheless real. They are born from the interplay of relations of power between governors and governed. Foucault and Senellart, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*, p. 297.

political power. Yet, Foucault argues that it turned in the exact opposite direction in a way that society began to be formulated on political foundations of liberal rationality. To be more precise, rather than being a sphere of autonomous individuals exclusive to political power, civil society turned to be the field of political activity for the purpose of constant governmental intervention. Accordingly, civil society (or only society) turns to be the ‘surface of transfer of governmental activity’⁶¹. It is the sphere of governmental activity to be able to shape the population in accordance with the market economy. Liberal society of 18th century was the society of exchange through the principle of laissez faire. Yet, neoliberal society⁶², for Foucault, is the society of enterprise that has to be actively intervened to reassert the social constructed-principle of pure competition. It is a type of intervention on the fabric and depth⁶³ of the society concerning ‘to introduce market regulation as the regulatory principle of society’⁶⁴.

By virtue of civil society, market regulations are deliberately enlarging on the entire social realm through interventionist strategies. It is particularly the American variant of neoliberalism that the rationality of the market expands to the domains which are not exclusively or not primarily economic: the family and the birth rate, for example, or delinquency and penal policy⁶⁵. In fact, the logic of the market, based on the enterprise model is gradually spreading through the operation of the state apparatuses. Consequently, the political government began to be conceptualized as an enterprise with the responsibility to further the game of competition in the social realm. In particular, the state in the neoliberal form of rule is ‘a simple external guarantor of the progress of society towards that of a manager

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 330.

⁶² ‘I process of civil society - in a recasting of the interface between state and society in the form of something like a second-order market of governmental goods and services. It becomes the ambition of neoliberalism to implicate the individual citizen, as player and partner, into this market game’. Colin Gordon, “Governmental Rationality: An Introduction,” in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 36.

⁶³ Foucault and Senellart, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*, p. 145.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 146.

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 323.

directly responsible for society's destiny'.⁶⁶ Both public/private and political/personal distinctions are gradually getting blurred, reversed or totally removed.⁶⁷ In consequence, neoliberal rationality whose principles are adopted in every social realm becomes a lifestyle.

Security is understood by Foucault as a social value rather than a fundamental human condition⁶⁸. In that sense, security is valued for the use of the governmental strategies and techniques to shape of the human subjectivity and behavior in social apparatuses (dispositif⁶⁹). Being dependant on permanent governmental intervention, the neoliberal society of enterprise is a relentless society of security. Security in modern society, therefore, is better understood when it is compared with the notion of freedom. As mentioned before, Foucault shows that the liberal form of rule constantly produces and consumes the 'freedoms' to control the population in the environment full of uncertainties. Therefore, to be able to shape the unpredictable events, security dispositifs get on the stage as calculated strategies to restrict relevant freedoms and to eliminate the possibility of threats.⁷⁰ Dillon suggests that it is an art to govern population through the governance of contingency.⁷¹

⁶⁶ Jacques Donzelot, "The Mobilization of Society," in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 174.

⁶⁷ Hamann, "Neoliberalism, Governmentality, and Ethics", p. 39.

⁶⁸ Ricky Wichum, "Security as Dispositif: Michel Foucault in the Field of Security," *Foucault Studies* 1, no. 15 (2013), p. 164.

⁶⁹ Foucault uses the word dispositif instead of apparatus. According to Deleuze, dispositif is a 'tangle and multilinear ensemble... [that] is composed of lines, each having a different nature.' (p. 159) Those lines get in order in the social apparatus and each line proceeds from one unique point to another. Deleuze adds that 'We belong to social apparatuses [dispositifs] and act within them ... In each apparatus [dispositif], it is necessary to distinguish what we are (what we are already no longer) and what we are in the process of becoming'. (p. 164) Accordingly, What Foucault tries to do is to track those lines to reveal the imminent effect on the dimensions of power and knowledge and on the line of subjectification. (some examples are; Panopticon apparatus, Pastoral apparatuses of subjectification etc.) Gilles Deleuze, "What Is Dispositif?," in *Michel Foucault, Philosopher: Essays*, ed. Timothy J. Armstrong (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992), 159–68.

⁷⁰ Wichum, "Security as Dispositif: Michel Foucault in the Field of Security", p. 167.

⁷¹ Michael Dillon, "Governing through Contingency: The Security of Biopolitical Governance," *Political Geography* 26, no. 1 (2007): 41–47, doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2006.08.003.

After all, Foucault's elaboration of the neoliberal art of governance reveals a critical account of the political rule of the contemporary society by revealing complex relations of power, freedom, and security. Once again, the neoliberal art of rule strictly controls population not by the way of coercion but through the shape of the field of action via the constant display of security and freedom. With the technologies of the self, governmental practice designates the ethical way of individual conduct so as to assure the self-production and modification of subjectivities. Contrary to what is claimed, neoliberalism concerns to the extensive government but from a distance. Consequently, governmentality approach enables to uncover complex power relations and mechanisms of subordination hidden in modern society. Before proceeding to elaborate the essentials of neoliberal governmentality in the contemporary era, the main elements of liberal and neoliberal governmentality have been summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Essentials of liberal and neoliberal governmentality

	Liberal State	Neoliberal State
Main Problematic	Over-government	Over-government
Main objective	Maximization of economic and social well-being Liberation of the market from state domination	Maximization of economic and social well-being Arrangement of social and economic realms on the basis of pure competition
Rationality	Combination of free market with <i>raison d'état</i>	Artificial pure competition & enterprise
Target of power	Population through individual interest	Population through lifestyles
Economic policy	Classical Political Economy- Laissez Faire	Neoliberal Political Economy- Constant governmental intervention on the market regulations
Market	Quasi-natural reality Field of verification	Actively constructed by the government
Means	Indirect mechanisms Technologies of Self, Security Apparatuses	Indirect mechanisms Technologies of Self, Security Apparatuses

2.2.3 Contemporary Elaboration of Neoliberal Governmentality: the Neo-Foucauldian Approach

There is rapidly growing enthusiasm in the usage of the governmentality approach in the studies of sociology, anthropology, political science, administrative sciences and international relations among other disciplines for analyzing social processes and the modes of the activity. Consequently, the governmentality approach has been further sophisticated through the contributions of prominent philosophers and academicians from those disciplines. Considering that *Birth of Biopolitics* first translated to English in 2008, it is obvious that the worldwide popularity of the term has been achieved through the secondary literature. In particular, the three publications in English; Gordon (1980)⁷², Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982)⁷³ and Burchell et al. (1991)⁷⁴ along with later works on Neo-Foucauldians made Foucault widely known in the broader academia. From then on, governmentality approach captivated numerous social scientists and it has been widely utilized.

By Neo-Foucauldians, it is mainly referred to a number of British and Australian scholars (such as Burchell, Dean, Rose and Gordon) who further elaborated the concept of governmentality and integrated the approach into the contemporary neoliberal form of governmental practices. As it has been mentioned earlier, Foucault's works on neoliberal governmentality deal with the governmental practices of the late 1970s. It is an important concern of the secondary literature that new challenges of the today's world particularly, globalization of economics, the emergence of the new forms of expertise and the change of the form of relation between people and authorities call forth to reconsider governmental practices. In an attempt to improve the governmentality approach, Neo-Foucauldians trace present problems of government through elaboration of governmental rationalities and

⁷² Michel Foucault and Colin Gordon, "Power, Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972 - 1977," ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980).

⁷³ Michel Foucault, Hubert L. Dreyfus, and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983).

⁷⁴ Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (The University of Chicago Press, 1991).

technologies in the case of ‘advanced liberalism’⁷⁵. Especially, Nikolas Rose’s comprehensive works on ‘advanced liberal democracies’ furthers Foucault’s analysis of neoliberal governmentality by characterizing governmental practices since the 1990s. In that regard, an investigation on the present form of neoliberal governmentality would be incomplete without addressing Neo-Foucauldian elaboration of the government of the contemporary politics.

Their initial contribution is to make a distinction between governance and government. Whereas they consider the term ‘government’ that only deals with the technical interests of the form of practice as the concrete form of conduct, ‘governance’ arises as the content of the process of governing⁷⁶. It is rather a wider definition which regards governance as ‘a kind of catch-all to refer to any strategy, tactic, process, procedure or programme for controlling, regulating, shaping, mastering or exercising authority over others in a nation, organization or locality’⁷⁷. Particularly, in the context of neoliberalism, they argue that neoliberal form of rule endorses minimum role of the state in government in terms of delivering services through the policies of deregulation, privatization, and neo-corporatist arrangements⁷⁸. Yet, the state also ensures maximum governance via policy settings. Accordingly, the fundamental political strategy in this art of government has been fixed to the steering rather than rowing.⁷⁹ This type of political rule has been specially labeled as ‘good governance’ that is grounded as the best way of political rule.

Secondly, Neo-Foucauldians shift the focus of analysis from the hegemony of the modern state to complex set of institutions through Foucault’s understanding

⁷⁵ The term ‘advanced liberalism’ was first introduced by Nikolas Rose, Nikolas Rose, “Government, Authority and Expertise in Advanced Liberalism,” *Economy & Society* 22, no. 3 (1993): 283–99.

⁷⁶ Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas S. Rose, *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), p. 173-174.; Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2004).

⁷⁷ Rose, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, p. 15.

⁷⁸ Jan Kooiman, “Governance and Governability: Using Complexity, Dynamics and Diversity,” in *Modern Government: New Government-Society Interactions*, ed. Jan Kooiman (SAGE Publications: London, 1993), p. 35.

⁷⁹ Rose, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, p. 16.

of power. Unlike traditional understanding, power for Foucault is not a substance that is given and that can be possessed or transformed. Rather, power is a relationship of force that only exists in action and appears when it is exercised⁸⁰. Then, in search of an explanation for the operation of power, Foucault's each work expresses specific techniques and technologies of power. In that regard, Foucault focused on mechanisms of power that shows how power is exercised either in a psychiatry clinic or within the prison as concrete forms of institutional practice. On the basis of Foucault's definition of power, Neo-Foucauldians argue that political power in the globalized world is widely dispersed across numerous institutions. Accordingly, the image of the spatialized nation-state is now so fragmented because of the globalization of the flow of cultures, goods, ideas, money and so on.⁸¹ Therefore, they suggest that the functionality of the state has been inevitably changed in a way that state is no longer the hub of political power but only one component of the complex unity of relations. To be more precise, they argue that contemporary political power is not structured into the hegemony of the sovereign state anymore. Rather, political power extends the state in a way that now it is articulated through the complex set of networks and relations between state and non-state actors.⁸² While they do not deny the existence and the legitimacy of the state, they argue that state activities are reduced only to applicable political programs and projects along with non-state actors.⁸³ It is a shift in the focus from the governmental technologies employed by the state to the broader policy programs. For that reason, rather than the macro-level practice of government, they prefer to investigate power relations on the micro-level for the management of human conduct.

By looking at micro-level governmental practices, neo-Foucauldians investigate new forms of governance materialized as the assemblage of specific procedures, mechanisms, and tactics in governmental programs. They develop this

⁸⁰ Foucault, Bertani, and Fontana, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*, p. 36.

⁸¹ Rose, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, p. 2.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁸³ Nikolas Rose and Peter Miller, "Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government," *British Journal of Sociology* 61, no. SUPPL. 1 (2010): 271–303.

approach by focusing on particular policy fields such as health-care, education and social welfare. For neo-Foucauldians, the nature of ‘social’ has considerably changed since the gradual interference of economic and social resulted up with ‘hybridized social domains’. Considering the ideal of maximum governance of the neoliberal form of rule exclusively concerns about the governance of the social⁸⁴, they argue that the social field is shaped by state apparatuses along with informal apparatuses. As a result of their dissatisfaction with the concentration on centralized state, neo-Foucauldians prefer to work on the governance of social field through governmental technologies within sub-national institutions. For instance, Ian Hacking concentrates on information security with a particular interest in risk as social engineering manipulation⁸⁵. Similarly, Daniel Defert and François Ewald work on insurance and the problem of industrial accidents⁸⁶. By this way, they draw an alternative way to study government as a practice of political power through non-state organizations at the local level.

While the rejection of the centrality of the state on the analysis increases the tendency to stand out local governance, this also results with the more emphasis on neoliberal governance at the global level. Characterization of the Anglo-American neoliberal model as a global way of governing under various guises through Bretton Woods institutions and other formations like Washington Consensus hinges on the arguments around global governance. Particularly after the 2000s, neoliberalism began to be linked to the process of global transformation to governing in a neoliberal way through the spread of neoliberal values such as privatization, financial deregulation, flexibility and so on. Ongoing tendency to track down neoliberal governmental practices at the international domain in governmentality

⁸⁴ Wendy Larner, “Globalization, Governmentality and Expertise: Creating a Call Centre Labour Force,” *Review of International Political Economy* 9, no. 4 (2002): 650–74.; Neo-Liberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality; *Studies in Political Economy*, 63, (2000).

⁸⁵ Ian Hacking, *Hacking the Human: Social Engineering Techniques and Security Countermeasures* (Hampshire: Gower Publishing Limited, 2008).

⁸⁶ Daniel Defert, “ ‘Popular Life’ and Insurance Technology,” in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller (The University of Chicago Press, 1991), 211–35.; François Ewald, “Insurance and Risk,” in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller (The University of Chicago Press, 1991), 197–211.

studies got attention in the discipline of International Relations. Recent attempts to conceptualize ‘global governmentality’ provided a new perspective both for the studies of governmentality and International Relations. Accordingly, in the final section of this chapter, the reflections of Foucault and governmentality approach in IR will be elaborated.

2.3. Governmentality Approach in IR

2.3.1. Foucault in IR

Foucauldian concepts have begun to be utilized in the discipline of International Relations in the 1980s and 90s by scholars such as Richard Ashley⁸⁷ (1988), RBJ Walker (1993)⁸⁸, and Jim George (1995)⁸⁹. Through the poststructuralist position, they tended to adopt Foucault’s works selectively to deconstruct the neorealist concepts of anarchy, sovereignty, and national interest through the power effects of discourse. Indeed, this poststructuralist account of IR tends to decentralize meta-narratives through Foucault’s particular epistemological standpoint on power/knowledge connection by prioritizing the practice over his political theory⁹⁰. This post-structuralist IR position, therefore, does not reveal the specificity of Foucault’s broader theoretical sweep and loosens the depth of political analysis of Foucault⁹¹. Recent studies, however, treat Foucault more effectively in a way that rather than a political practice of knowledge production, governmentality approach has been appropriated to advance global political analysis of IR without loosening the critical account. In particular, elaboration of international relations as global

⁸⁷ Richard K. Ashley, “Untying the Sovereign State: A Double Reading of the Anarchy Problematique,” *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 17, no. 2 (1988): 227–62, doi:10.1177/03058298880170020901., Richard K. Ashley and Rob B. J. Walker, “Speaking the Language of Exile: Dissident Thought in International Studies,” *International Studies Quarterly* 34, no. 3 (1990): 259–68, doi:10.2307/2600569.

⁸⁸ Rob. B. J. Walker, *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

⁸⁹ Jim George, “Realist ‘Ethics’, International Relations, and Post-Modernism: Thinking Beyond the Egoism-Anarchy Thematic,” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 24, no. 2 (1995): 195–233.

⁹⁰ Doerthe Rosenow, “Decentering Global Power: The Merits of a Foucauldian Approach to International Relations,” *Global Society* 23, no. 4 (2009): 497-517,

⁹¹ For the further critique on post-structuralist IR on Foucault; Jan Selby, “Engaging Foucault: Discourse, Liberal Governance and the Limits of Foucauldian IR,” *International Relations* 21, no. 3 (2007): 324–45, doi:10.1177/0047117807080199.

governmentality enriches the discipline by both providing a new perspective to study the ‘global’ as a governmental project and bringing back ‘the state’ without falling into a narrow description of black-box.

Global governmentality approach of IR relies on the reading of globalization as a form of governmentality in which the creation and adoption of new goals and methods of governing at the global level are at the center of analysis⁹². Among several elaborations of global governmentality⁹³, this study utilizes Jonathan Joseph’s historical materialist reading of global governmentality.

The first reason why Joseph’s approach of global governmentality has been chosen is that Joseph overcomes the practical problem of dissimilar nature of domestic and international realms despite the arguments on irreducibility of international realm into the Foucault’s elaboration of liberal society⁹⁴. While scaling up governmentality approach at the global level, he does not directly employ governmental practices of the domestic arena of (neo- or advanced) liberal societies. Instead, what he acknowledges that governmentality operates differently in national and international domains. He does not examine how governmentality works in particular countries or places (at domestic level) but he is concerned with the operation of governmentality at the transnational level.⁹⁵ At this level, he suggests that governmentality is directed less at local populations and more at state behavior.

Secondly, Joseph develops a governmentality approach in the domain of international politics without falling into Eurocentrism by touching upon the importance of social conditions to explain the applicability of governmental

⁹² Jean-Sébastien Guy, “Beyond Global Modernity, Global Consciousness and Global Governmentality: The Symmetrical Anthropology of Globalization,” *European Journal of Social Theory* 19, no. 4 (2016): 451–67, p. 452.

⁹³ Some other conceptualizations of Global governmentality Foucauldian reading of Global Governance and ;Wendy Larner and William Walters, “Globalization as Governmentality,” *Alternatives* 29, no. 5 (2004): 495–514, ; Doerthe Rosenow, “Decentering Global Power: The Merits of a Foucauldian Approach to International Relations,” *Global Society* 23, no.4, 497-517.

⁹⁴ Selby disapproves the ‘scaling up’ attempts in IR by suggesting that global interrogation of liberal governmentality necessitates a double reading: liberal reading of global politics and subsequent critical reading of it. This characterization of contemporary global politics remunerates liberal account of world politics. ; Jan Selby, “Engaging Foucault: Discourse, Liberal Governance and the Limits of Foucauldian IR,” *International Relations* 21, no. 3 (2007): 324–45, p. 334.

⁹⁵ Jonathan Joseph, *The Social in the Global: Social Theory, Governmentality and Global Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 18.

practices and techniques. By admitting that Foucault's governmentality approach relies on specific forms of governmental practices developed through social and historical conditions that European powers experienced, Joseph argues that assuming that the concept would reveal the same consequences in the other parts of the world would be misleading. He rightfully highlights 'if the exploration of the social basis of governmentality tells us such things as the type of society in which governmentality exists in a particular society, then an investigation of the international aspect of governmentality tells us where governmentality works best and highlights variation in social context in order to explain differences in its operation.'⁹⁶ With this in mind, Joseph prioritizes uneven and combined character of international in which particular social conditions to operationalize governmentality may not be found in every society. By this way, his theoretical position provides a useful tool explain why governmentality operates well in some parts of the world but not in others.

Finally, Joseph theoretically advances governmentality approach by providing an ontological basis. By looking for the underlying social structures, processes and the conditions of governmentality to understand why a specific type of governmentality has emerged in certain time and space, he completes the picture through the historical materialist reading of neoliberal governmentality. He argues that whereas Foucault hints the ontological conditions of governmentality at the development of the capitalist economy, Foucauldian scholars so far did not try to find out underlying forces and causes. Rather, they focused more on the surface of the social problems strategies and the technologies of governmentality. By including the importance of productive forces of capitalism on deeper structures on the analysis, he reaches out a more comprehensive analytical level through the connection of micro and macro by relating 'how' questions to the 'why'.

Throughout the reasons explained above, this study employs the Global Governmentality approach advanced by Jonathan Joseph. In the following section, his theoretical framework will be elaborated in detail.

⁹⁶ Ibid,, p. 16.

2.3.2. Global Governmentality

Jonathan Joseph's principal aim is to build a sociological reading of International Relations to be able to better understand/explain the practices of global governing. With the engagement of social theory in IR, he moves out ahistorical and asocial interpretation of state behavior that is the dominant position of mainstream IR theories. Joseph offers 'global governmentality' as an alternative to the liberal perception of global governance that mainstream IR theories follow. In line with recent 'social turn in IR', he attempts to put governmentality in its appropriate place in IR. By specifying governmentality in two ways; 'governmentality's place in the wider social ontology' and its 'liberal character' for the most useful application of the term in international politics⁹⁷, he strengthens the critical position of the approach not only to elaborate global politics but also to analyze domestic-level governmental practices. Initially, he develops a historical materialist elaboration of governmental practices and provides a social basis to explain how a certain type of governmentality exists and operates in a particular society. By this way, he points that the specific social, historical and geopolitical conditions rooted in capitalist development determines how governmentality operates effectively. Later, he scales up the governmentality approach with the help of Gramsci's theory of hegemony. Joseph argues that neoliberal form of global governmentality is a hegemonic project that is promoted by advanced liberal societies and international organizations worldwide in the name of good governance. Yet, being aware of the uneven nature of international domain, the level of effectiveness in different social settings may be different. Accordingly, this section will clarify how Joseph specified his specific conceptualization of global governmentality.

Joseph suggests that the term governmentality is more meaningful in IR when it is seen in its specifically neoliberal form.⁹⁸ Neoliberal evaluation of governmentality makes the term more coherent because he argues that in the neoliberal context, relations between micro and macro physical powers become more challenging in the global scale. Joseph's particular evaluation relies on a

⁹⁷ Jonathan Joseph and Olaf Corry, "Jonathan Joseph and Olaf Corry Review Each Other's Books on Governmentality and Global Politics and Then Respond to Each Other's Reviews," *European Political Science* 13, no. 1 (2014): 124–30, p. 128.

⁹⁸ Joseph, *The Social in the Global: Social Theory, Governmentality and Global Politics*, p. 29

Historical Materialist reading of neoliberal governmentality which stands out the process of production in which power in production determines the conditions of governmental practices. This particular reading encounters Foucault with Marx in a way that the conceptualization of modern state and the specific relations between politics and economics are defined alongside the development of capitalist society. It is due to the reason that Joseph suggests ‘Marx is better at providing the motive for capitalist control, and Foucault is better at explaining the means.’⁹⁹ In this conjunction, he provides an opportunity to better elaborate dynamic and complex power relations in the modern society.

Marx-Foucault connection in this framework does not result in a reductionist kind of Marxist understanding in which everything is degraded to the economic mode of production. Instead, in line with contemporary approaches of Marxism, material mode of production and social formation are considered as two indispensable component of capitalism. He starts his evaluation with the most fundamental characteristic of capitalism. On account of dynamic and expansionary nature of capitalism, the main problematic is the uncertain nature of capital accumulation. The stable capital accumulation, Joseph advocates, necessitates constant governmental interventions through the mixture of economic and extra-economic means to secure social and institutional conditions.¹⁰⁰ It is a mode of regulation depends on ‘the right balance between economy, state and civil society’ as a ‘structured combination of institutions, norms, and values’¹⁰¹ to be able to stabilize the accumulation in the global level. Accordingly, to be able to explain how governmental practices via particular political rationalities stabilize global capital accumulation by shaping the field of action, Marxist reading of governmentality not only provides a state theory but also requires it¹⁰². Herein, the state is not considered as a narrow sense of domination over capitalist relations of production. Rather, it is Gramsci’s view of the state in which political society combined with civil society or hegemony protected by coercion.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 33.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 38.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., p. 39

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 53

Joseph does not identify the state as an agent with a collective consciousness¹⁰³ but an assemblage of institutions shaping actions through certain projects. What he disagrees, therefore, is the diminishing importance of the role of the state in the contemporary governmental practices. Referring to Bob Jessop's conception of the state, Joseph argues that although state is an institutional assemblage together with the others, what renders state specific is that it is totally charged with the responsibility to maintain social formation¹⁰⁴ in accordance with neoliberal rationality. Accordingly, increasing limitations on the role of the state in the contemporary era do not mean the decline of the importance of the state. On the contrary, the state has the hegemony to determine social conditions that other institutions have to fulfill. With this explanation of the link between capital accumulation and social governance, it is possible to study how and why in certain societies neoliberal form of governmentality exists and operates. Yet, in the global domain, it necessitates further elaboration on the characteristics of international.

The state-centered analysis that Joseph adopts is considerably different from the realist conception of state in IR. In addition to the sociological model of the state, the way how international realm has been characterized is significantly different. In rejection with the general understanding of international domain as one single domain in which states are unified entities pursuing their own interests for survival, Joseph adopts Justin Rosenberg's interpretation of international. In parallel with Trotsky's idea of *uneven and combined development* that was originated to understand the capitalist development of Russia, Rosenberg argues that international is interwoven and multidimensional set of relations between many different societies. International is inter-societal coexistence in the sense that there is intrinsic 'socio-historical unevenness of human existence'¹⁰⁵ among different societies in terms of 'socio-cultural forms, development levels, geographical scales and

¹⁰³ He criticizes Wendt's idea of the state as a person and adds that state can be an agent only as the emergent sense like other institutional assemblages.

¹⁰⁴ Jonathan Joseph, "Poverty Reduction and the New Global Governmentality," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 35, no. 1 (2010): 29–51, doi:10.2307/40645277, p. 33

¹⁰⁵ Justin Rosenberg, "Why Is There No International Historical Sociology?," *European Journal of International Relations* 12, no. 3 (2006): 307–40, p. 313.

historical temporalities'.¹⁰⁶ Yet, at the mean time, these societies are 'combined' through their interconnected development patterns 'in the triple sense of geographically interconnected, temporally compressed and sociologically hybridized'.¹⁰⁷ Joseph argues that as international is uneven; the previous explanation of the relation between capital accumulation and social regulation cannot be employed directly to the international domain. Relying on this portrayal of international, Joseph appropriates the governmentality in the wider context of institutions and practices with a renewed emphasis on state power with the help of the term hegemony.

According to Joseph, governmentality approach should be applied in IR with the help of the theory of hegemony. Joseph adopts Gramsci's theory of hegemony because he argues that Hegemony provides a link between social context and the governmental practices by explaining how social groups achieve dominance by way of fabrication of hegemonic projects to articulate diverse interests.¹⁰⁸ Hegemony is not the pure and simple domination of ruling group over subordinate but it is 'based on the decisive function exercised by the leading group in the decisive nucleus of economic activity'.¹⁰⁹ Whereas Hegemony is powerful to explain why the neoliberal form of governmentality is dominant in the advanced liberal societies, 'governmentality approach is better at to explain the discursive power and provides an account of rationalities of governance that is missing from Gramscian approaches.' To put it differently, governmentality and hegemony complement each other and they reveal more comprehensive explanations on global governance. It is due to the reason that governmentality approach which is already good at to uncover micro-level power relations can expose macro-level practices with the help of the theory of hegemony. Especially, in the context of neoliberalism, their combination

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 316

¹⁰⁷ Justin Rosenberg, "Kenneth Waltz and Leon Trotsky: Anarchy in the Mirror of Uneven and Combined Development," *International Politics* 50, no. 2 (2013): 183–230, p. 198.

¹⁰⁸ Jonathan Joseph, "Combining Hegemony and Governmentality to Explain Global Governance," *Spectrum: Journal of Global Studies* 6, no. 1 (2012): 1–15, p. 2.

¹⁰⁹ Antonio Gramsci quoted in Joseph, *The Social in the Global: Social Theory, Governmentality and Global Politics*, p. 40.

better explain the development of neoliberalism in a way that micro practices has gradually ended up with macro-level governmental practices.

Hegemony in the international domain has three aspects; political, economic and social. It is related to the political order among the states, global economic order as the dominant mode of production penetrating into all countries and the social order connecting social classes in different countries.¹¹⁰ In the international system, particular states are dominant depending on their power in relation to the dynamics of capitalism and their capacity to transfer the features of their social relations to the broader institutional context¹¹¹. In this wider framework, Governmentality can be examined best via looking at the mechanisms of global governance that ‘helps condition and shape[s] the types of hegemonic projects that can emerge’¹¹². In that regard, Joseph argues that neoliberal mode of regulation is a hegemonic project of advanced liberal states which has been ‘governmentalized’ by creating/promoting the conditions of possibility through several stages¹¹³ by the means of international and regional organizations. By project he means ‘the key aspects that define neoliberalism – a rough list of which would include deregulation, privatization, internationalization and devolving state activities to market forces- do not happen automatically but have to be actively pursued in the policy realm’. Therefore, key aspects of neoliberalism do not happen automatically but have to be actively pursued in the policy realm.

By comparing Foucault’s analysis of neoliberalism and Gramsci’s analysis of Americanism and Fordism, Joseph argues that the development of capitalist world

¹¹⁰ Joseph, “Combining Hegemony and Governmentality to Explain Global Governance” p. 3.

¹¹¹ Joseph, *The Social in the Global: Social Theory, Governmentality and Global Politics*, p. 44.

¹¹² Joseph and Corry, “Jonathan Joseph and Olaf Corry Review Each Other’s Books on Governmentality and Global Politics and Then Respond to Each Other’s Reviews,” p. 129.

¹¹³ Joseph divides the international development of the neoliberal form of governmental practices into three stages. The first stage is the crisis period of the Keynesian mode of regulation of the 1970s. Then, he suggests that neoliberal mode of regulation has begun to be applied in what he calls as the ‘aggressive phase’ of the 1980s when the ideas of privatization, tax cuts, curbing the power of labor unions and strict monetary policy have been politicized forcefully applied. This policy has been promoted to international organizations as well. He gives the example of structural adjustment policies of the time to support his idea. In the 1990s, the period of normalization has begun and more technocratic and managerial approaches depoliticized the neoliberal mode of regulation. This period has been characterized as the softer ideas of conduct. Joseph, *The Social in the Global: Social Theory, Governmentality and Global Politics*, p. 47.

system in the Post-war world order has witnessed the crisis of the US production model based on Fordism. Accordingly, the Neoliberal form of global governmentality was not the consequence of the change of the mode of production, but the result of the historical process of responses to the breakdown of the post-war institutional settings both at national and international level. While at the domestic level, how neoliberal form of governmentality has emerged in particularly at Anglo-Saxon societies can be analyzed by looking at the social and historical conditions of capitalist development of those particular states, in the international realm, neoliberal form of government can only be analyzed through the practice global governance which is promoted by international and regional organizations that have been occupied by advanced liberal societies. Joseph describes this process as the hegemonic project of advanced liberal societies as their macro the macro-level strategy. For the hegemonic projects to be successful to achieve wider consent and to be able to shape state behavior, a group of alliance is necessary. In terms of neoliberalism, Joseph argues that the alliance of advanced liberal states occupying international and regional organizations like the IMF, World Bank, and EU promotes neoliberal form of rule in the name of good governance while the USA is the dominant state in the world system.¹¹⁴

In that context, the fundamental point in global governmentality is that neoliberal form of rule that is based on certain ideas and techniques developed in particular social conditions present in advanced liberal societies may not necessarily work in different regions and societies¹¹⁵. It is due to that there is an obvious difference for the operation of governmentality in a society having necessary social basis than in a society that governmentality is thrust upon by outside. For that reason, application of governmentality in different geopolitical contexts on different scales brings about the unevenness of governmentality and the limits of its effectiveness. Yet, in spite of its different level of effectiveness in different regions, the neoliberal form of governmentality is promoted worldwide through international organizations.

¹¹⁴ Joseph, *The Social in the Global: Social Theory, Governmentality and Global Politics*, p. 48.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 18

2.4. Conclusion

Michel Foucault's original idea of governmentality derives from his investigation on the 'genealogy of the state'. In specific historical and social context of Europe, Foucault traces down the trendy changes on the meaning and the function of the government of oneself, of family and of the state from the 16th century to the late 1970s. Closely related with his conceptualization of power as relational and dynamic, governmentality is aimed at the population as both an individualizing and totalizing power so as to control uncertainty. Accordingly, governmentality having a certain political rationality creates controllable reality by establishing ethical principles, epistemological structures, and certain discourses. This theoretical ground provides a good understanding the link between the technologies of the self and the technologies of domination eminent to the modern state. In Particular, governmentality approach is a useful tool to analyze contemporary neoliberal practices.

Growing attention to governmentality approach in social sciences comes from its relevance and potentials to elaborate domination in the contemporary neoliberal governmental practices. It is important to mention again that the secondary literature is of great importance for the worldwide recognition of Foucault and governmentality. Those Foucauldians not only clarified theoretical aspects of governmentality but also developed a new understanding of the operation of neoliberal governmentality in the contemporary society. Particularly, their interpretation of neoliberal governmentality after the 1980s complements Foucault's original studies.

Proper appropriation of governmentality in IR has a great potential to study international politics. Although there are some arguments that governmentality approach is inappropriate to scale up, there are successful frameworks on global governmentality. Among them, Jonathan Joseph provides a good theoretical framework on the neoliberal form of global governmentality with the help of the theory of hegemony and the concept of uneven and combined development. He argues that Global Governmentality pre-exists and shapes the behavior of states also gets affected by their practices. Therefore, it is both the underlying condition and the consequence of state practices. It works through state strategies and political actions. Accordingly, the neoliberal form of global governmentality basically is a macro-

level hegemonic project of advanced-liberal states to assure the well functioning of the neoliberal system. For Joseph, neoliberal mode of conduct is globally promoted through international and regional organizations via projections and conditions they postulate. Yet, he carefully adds that the success or failure of governmentality in the domestic level depends on social and historical conditions of these societies. Nevertheless, there is a considerable success of this global governmentality in terms of global regulation of state behavior.

From this point of view, this study intends to investigate the recent development of global regime on migration management through the lenses of the neoliberal form of global governmentality. In this study, it is claimed that global migration management is a distinctive part of this global hegemonic project and proper case to see the worldwide promotion of neoliberal values. This is particularly noticeable when looking at the historical development of the term migration management. Herein, the main argument is that global migration management regime is one of the most valid areas of research considering the restriction of free movement of humans while neoliberal-global governmentality necessitates free movement of goods and services. Accordingly, in the following chapter, how global migration management regime developed after the 1990s fits into neoliberal values will be elaborated through the analytics of governmentality.

CHAPTER 3

GLOBAL GOVERNMENTALITY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION

International migration is currently one of the most popular discussion-topics in the global policy agenda. Growing number of states, intergovernmental organizations, and non-governmental organizations highlight the importance of management of global migration flow due to the reason that this phenomenon affects almost all parts of the world. However, what should be remembered is that international migration is not a new phenomenon. In different historical periods, a considerable amount of human flows have deeply affected various regions, societies, and policies. But the key point here is that until recently, international migration had never been regarded a policy issue which would necessitate a global regime to regulate. Indeed, states had been hesitant even to discuss migration issue in the global forums. Hence, the issue had been mostly dealt by domestic, bilateral and in some occasions regional regulations. However, in the last two decades, there is a sudden increase in the interest in the construction of a global migration management regime. Herein, the right question is to ask; ‘why now?’ While there might be various possible explanations for this time consideration depending on one’s own philosophical and theoretical position, this study utilizes Joseph’s historical materialist reading of Foucault and his approach of ‘global governmentality’ in neoliberal form. Accordingly, this study claims that global migration management regime is an indispensable component of the neoliberal form of global governmentality and therefore rightly case to examine world-embracing promotion of neoliberal values.

The reason why the topic of international migration management is chosen to see how neoliberal values are promoted is that the main drive of this policy agenda relies on the worldwide promotion of neoliberal rationality in the interest of global economic structures. First and foremost, elaboration of governmentality in terms of

international migration appears a good avenue since human mobility is the exceptional element in the ‘free movement’ argument of neoliberalism which creates inconsistency¹¹⁶ or contradiction¹¹⁷ in the globalization narrative. In the international sphere, whereas neoliberalism is marked by the global integration of the production process and the free movement of goods and capital between sectors, regions and countries, free movement of people across national boundaries is regarded something that should be restricted. In the context of neoliberal globalization, cross-border human mobility is considered as the tension between neoliberal and territorial rationalities¹¹⁸ and the crucial threat for national sovereignty¹¹⁹. It is due to the reason that global neoliberalization constantly prompts the domination of capital over labor so it brings about restriction on geographical mobility of global labor forces and cross-border immigration¹²⁰. Thus, acceleration of neoliberal globalization particularly since the end of the Cold War stimulates the necessity of comprehensive regulation of international migration. Consequently, international migration management issue stands as the key aspect to analyze the neoliberal form of governmental practices at the global level.

Neoliberal rationality relies on the restriction of human mobility in the sense that restrictive policies target more on the mobility of workers than investors and capital owners. More specifically, global governance of migration attempts to regulate international labor migration by restricting human mobility on the one hand, and by selectively promoting specific forms of labor mobility on the other.¹²¹ Direct

¹¹⁶ Munck, “Globalisation, Governance and Migration: An Introduction.”, p. 1227.

¹¹⁷ León and Overbeek, “Neoliberal Globalisation, Transnational Migration and Global Governance.”, p. 38.

¹¹⁸ Anne McNevin, “Irregular Migrants, Neoliberal Geographies and Spatial Frontiers of ‘the Political,’” *Review of International Studies* 33, no. 2007 (2007): 655–74, doi:10.1017/S0260210507007711.

¹¹⁹ Stephen Castles, “Migration, Crisis, and the Global Labour Market,” *Globalizations* 8, no. 3 (2011): 311–24, doi:10.1080/14747731.2011.576847., p. 312.

¹²⁰ Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism.*, pp. 168–69., David M Kotz, “Capitalism and Forms of Capitalism: Levels of Abstraction in Economic Crisis Theory,” *Review of Radical Political Economics* 47, no. 4 (2015): 541–49, p. 545.

¹²¹ León and Overbeek, “Neoliberal Globalisation, Transnational Migration and Global Governance.”, p. 38.

and indirect exportation of labor¹²² in line with the demand for high-skilled workers in advanced economies, semi-skilled and low-skilled labor in other regions accelerate human mobility¹²³. Therefore, the control of the process of international migration becomes an important point for the stability of global capital accumulation and the well functioning of global economic structures. Based on the global governmentality understanding of Joseph, it can be interpreted as that international migration issue at the global level requires a constant governmental intervention in order to stabilize capital accumulation at the global level by developing a neoliberal mode of regulation.¹²⁴ From this point of view, increasing popularity of the issue of international migration and the placement of the issue in the global governance agenda can be appropriately explained through neoliberal globalization and global economic structures. In spite of the severe criticisms towards institutionalization of international migration management in terms of the absence of a compelling mechanism to directly foster migration governance, it is still possible to talk about the influence of migration management regime at the global level in terms of conditioning neoliberal form of governance that states have to comply with.¹²⁵

In the direction of the theoretical framework of this study, international migration management will be analyzed as a distinctive part of the neoliberal form of governmental practices in the international sphere. As explained in detail in the previous chapter, global governmentality approach relies on the argument that governmentality at international domain operates as the regulation of state behavior on behalf of the hegemonic interests of advanced liberal democracies to assure well functioning of the neoliberal system. Neoliberal mode of rule is globally promoted

¹²² Raul Delgado Wise, "The Migration and Labor Question Today Imperialism, Unequal Development, and Forced Migration," *Monthly Review-An Independent Socialist Magazine* 64, no. 9 (2013): 25–39.

¹²³ For instance, UNDESA explicitly acknowledges that since 1986, there has been an increase in the demand for immigration in developed countries due to labor shortages in certain sectors, an expanding global economy and long-term trends in population aging. This is a shift in the policy from restrictiveness to selectiveness favoring more highly-skilled workers. United Nations, *World Economic and Social Survey 2004: International Migration*, 2004., p. 75.

¹²⁴ Joseph, *The Social in the Global: Social Theory, Governmentality and Global Politics.*, pp. 38-9.

¹²⁵ León and Overbeek, "Neoliberal Globalisation, Transnational Migration and Global Governance.", p. 48.

through international and regional organizations via particular programs, projects and conditions they postulate on non-advanced liberal states. In this regard, global governmentality of international migration means to govern the way migration is managed. The object of conduct is not the migration itself but the traditional policies regulating migration, therefore, the behavior of individual states. By governance of the policies of migration management, therefore, human mobility is controlled and regulated in a way to sustain global economic structures. Accordingly, with the help of governmentality approach, this chapter seeks to show that state behavior regarding international migration is regulated by international and regional organizations in the direction of neoliberal rationality.

This chapter consists of two main sections. In the first section, how international migration management is scaled up and included in the global agenda will be elaborated. Herein, first of all, the term migration management will be conceptualized so as to clarify what is understood by migration management. Later, the emergence of international migration management discourse as a global concern in the early 1990s will be explained. And finally, how this new framework is critically evaluated in literature in a tendency to focus either on a normative-discursive aspect of subordination or on materialist aspect of exploitation will be explained. In the second section, governmentality approach will be applied in international migration issue by following the four major steps that Mitchell Dean formulates as the analytics of government. These steps are;

- 1- Characteristic form of visibility, ways of seeing and perceiving;
- 2- Distinctive ways of thinking and questioning, relying on definite vocabularies and procedures for the production of truth
- 3- Specific ways of acting, intervening and directing, made up of particular types of practical rationality ('expertise' and 'know-how'), and relying upon definite mechanisms, techniques, and technologies.
- 4- Characteristic ways of forming subjects, selves, persons, actors or agents¹²⁶

In the first step, how cross-border human mobility is perceived will be illustrated. To put it briefly, while international migration was visualized in the previous era as an extraordinary situation and a domestic political issue, it is

¹²⁶ Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society.*, p. 38.

conceived now as a ‘normal’ and ‘natural’ affair of humankind. This perceptual change is quite significant for the policy formations on this issue since the apolitical feature attributed to migration by international and regional organizations transforms it to a technical issue of management requiring expertise. In the following step, the technical aspect of global government will be evaluated. Herein, how international and regional organizations regulate state behavior through bilateral, regional and international mechanisms for cooperation will be explained in reference to projects and policies that particularly developed by UN, IOM, ILO, and UNHCR. In the third step, knowledge production regarding migration management will be analyzed. This dimension is significant to see how specific form of migration management is privileged as ‘best practice’ by international organizations within and the outside of the UN system by demonstrating themselves as the formal body of expertise. And in the final step of the analytics of government, initially, which types of capacities and qualifications attributed to individual states will be evaluated. Later, it will be discussed that ‘good’ migrant is identified with the neoliberal subject and is apprised of his entrepreneurial spirit in the global context.

3.1. International Migration at the Global Agenda

3.1.1. What is International Migration Management?

The term, ‘migration management’ was specified in 1993 by Bimal Ghosh through the request of the UN Commission on Global Governance and Swedish government (Commission on Global Governance, 1995). Ghosh indicates that ever growing complexity of in human mobility in the contemporary era makes it necessary to manage the human flow in order to shape the direction of migration for the benefits of all.¹²⁷ Since then, the issue of migration management has become a fresh ground in migration studies. Besides, currently, it is one of the popular discussion topics in the global governance policy agenda that aims at systematizing domestic and international policies regarding the cross-border movement of people. Yet, Geiger and Pecoud rightfully highlight that relevant literature mainly discuss how migration management operates globally before referring to what it really is.

¹²⁷ Ghosh, “Towards a New International Regime for Orderly Movements of People.”, pp. 8-9.

With an attempt to conceptualize the term ‘migration management’, they suggest three different pillars on the way to define what migration management means¹²⁸.

They define migration management firstly as the strategies of different intergovernmental and non-governmental actors as well as regional organizations, think-tanks, and the global migrant networks.¹²⁹ In this definition, international migration management is elaborated through the importance of the agency in the process of mobilization and thereby the regulation of cross-border human mobility. In particular, international organizations such as International Organization for Migration (IOM), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), International Labor Organization (ILO) and so on positions as the most-valid global actors in the field of migration management. Accordingly, the forums and the annual strategy reports of these organizations are in the scope of the first definition of international migration management.

Secondly, international migration management is defined through the association with a range of multi-level practices and activities performed by the institutions in the field of migration¹³⁰. Border control regimes, training of civil servants, counter-trafficking initiatives and other activities in the field of migration in the domestic, regional and international realm can be elaborated within the scope of the second meaning of migration management¹³¹. And lastly, they define migration management as the production of discourses concerning how individual states should manage migration¹³². In the discursive ground of international migration, the depiction of the migration is preserved as a reality specific through the constant articulation of specific conditions and positions.

In the combination of these three pillars (actor, practice, discourse), migration management in the most general manner is the production of normative discourses

¹²⁸ Martin Geiger and Antoine Pecoud, “The Politics of International Migration Management,” in *The Politics of International Migration Management*, ed. Martin Geiger and Antoine Pecoud (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 1–21, doi:10.1080/1369183X.2011.646800., p. 1.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹³² *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

and application of multi-level practices by a range of actors in order to steer and guide the global movements of people. In view of this definition, the next section will elaborate how the issue of international migration management moved on the global level in order to establish a global regime of migration management.

3.1.2. Scaling up; 'Globalization' of the International Migration Management

Noteworthy concern about framing a valid regime of global governance of international migration began in the beginning of 1990s. While there is no single agency concerning international migration management within the UN system, various intergovernmental organizations have been closely engaged in the issue of international migration via complex set of networks¹³³. In particular, new visions regarding how international migration should be managed has been a great concern of international organizations since the end of the cold war. However, international migration issue is not a new trend for IOs, for instance, it has been included in the Constitution of International Labor Organisation (ILO) to protect migrant labors' rights. Besides, the High Commissioner for Refugees first under the League of Nations and later within United Nations (UNHCR) institutionalized the regime specifically for refugee protection since 1921. While it is outside of the UN system, the establishment of an overarching organization regarding migration management dates back to the creation of International Organization for Migration (IOM) whose motto is 'for the benefits of all'. It was founded in 1951 as the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movements of Migrants from Europe (PICMME) to assist displaced people uprooted by the Second World War. Renamed as IOM in 1989, it has been assigned an expanded position for new areas of activity including transnational illegal migration and trafficking, capacity building and so on. All these international organizations have been established to support states on their policies regarding migration. Yet, since the 1990s, their role has been increased in line with the new mode on 'Global Governance' with the objective of improving governance of migration at the global level.¹³⁴

¹³³ Susan F. Martin, "International Cooperation on Migration and the UN System," in *Global Mobility Regimes*, ed. Rey Koslowski (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 29–51., p. 29.

¹³⁴ A. Levatino and A. Pecoud, "Overcoming the Ethical Dilemmas of Skilled Migration? An Analysis of International Narratives on the 'Brain Drain,'" *American Behavioral Scientist* 56, no. 9 (2012): 1258–76, p. 1258.

As an attempt to establish an international policy on the regulation of migration, several actions have taken. First of all, Bimal Ghosh prepared a report called as *Movements of People: The Search for a New International Regime*¹³⁵ through the request of the UN Commission on Global Governance and the Swedish government. In this report, he has discussed how existing domestic policies become inadequate to meet the challenges of the current migratory movement having effects on the global scale. Right after this report, he coordinated the project of New International Regime for Orderly Movements of People (NIROMP). This project can be regarded as the constituent of the narrative of ‘International Migration Management’ regime by outlining the broad objectives of the regime based on the guiding principle of ‘*regulated openness*’¹³⁶. The principle of regulated openness is the compromise of the restrictive migration policies and free movement principle of liberal doctrine by relying on the argument that more orderly movements of people are more manageable and beneficial¹³⁷. Based on this principle, Ghosh develops a three-pillar model; establishment of shared objectives, development of the internationally harmonized normative framework and setting up monitoring mechanisms¹³⁸ for the benefits of sending, receiving and transit countries as well as the migrants themselves. Some other important acts peculiarly on international migration management are;

- 1984, first Regional Consultative Process on Migration (RCP), informal and non-binding inter-state forum on migration
- 1990, United Nations General Assembly adopted *the International Convention on the Protection of all rights of the Migrants and Members of Their Families*¹³⁹, a comprehensive treaty to protect migrant worker’s right by setting moral standards in line with human rights.

¹³⁵ Bimal Ghosh, ed., *Managing Migration: Time for a New International Regime?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). Bimal Ghosh, “Introduction,” in *Managing Migration: Time for a New International Regime?*, ed. Bimal Ghosh (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001391/139149e.pdf>.

¹³⁶ Ghosh, “Towards a New International Regime for Orderly Movements of People.”, p. 25.

¹³⁷ Bimal Ghosh, “New International Regime for Orderly Movements of People: What Will It Look Like?,” in *Managing Migration: Time for a New International Regime?*, ed. Bimal Ghosh (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 220–49., p. 220-21.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 227.

¹³⁹ UN General Assembly, “International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (CMW). Resolution 45/158 of 18 December 1990,” 1990.

- 1993, A report called; *International Migration Challenges in a New Era*¹⁴⁰ issued by the Trilateral Commission indicating the necessity to have a comprehensive migration regime.
- 1993, establishment of the International Center for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)
- 1994, International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) held in Cairo, Egypt, reached up to the consensus of treatment of migration at the global level for the first time.
- 2001, IOM and Swiss government started the Berne Initiative to come up with common understandings about international migration (final report in 2004, titled as *International Agenda for Migration Management*¹⁴¹)
- 2001, International Dialogue on Migration (IDM), the principal forum to discuss overall migration policy organized by the IOM.
- 2002, Hague Process; included government representatives and international and non-governmental organizations in its consultations. The final document known as the Hague Declaration consists of 21 principles for migration management.
- 2004, establishment of an independent Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM) (under Kofi Annan's initiative)
- 2006, organization of the first a High-Level Dialogue (HLD) on International Migration and Development at the United Nations (in 2013, the second dialogue)
- 2006, establishment of Global Migration Group (GMG)
- 2007, Creation of Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD)
- 2009, UNDP drew up the 'Human Development Report' on the issue of human mobility

The main motivation of these initiatives depending on the argument that international migration is a phenomenon that cannot be controlled unilaterally. According to proponents of the regime of international migration management, gradual interdependence as a result of the economic globalization coupled with new communication and transportation technologies resulted in the ever-growing percentage of human mobility. Therefore, it is a necessity to establish an operational framework for migration management to foster the cooperation between states to be able to better deal with the issue. A comprehensive migration management regime

¹⁴⁰ Doris M. Meissner et al., "International Migration Challenges in a New Era," *The Trilateral Commission*, 1993.

¹⁴¹ International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Federal Office for Migration (FOM), "International Agenda for Migration Management: Common Understandings and Effective Practices for a Planned, Balanced, and Comprehensive Approach to the Management of Migration," *The Berne Initiative*, 2005, <http://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/iamm.pdf>.

covering all types of human mobility at the global level is considered as necessary for the achievement of a more ‘orderly’, ‘predictable’ and ‘manageable’ migration process that is also economically beneficial. In this respect, effective and good governance of cross-border human mobility is grounded on the multilateral arrangements. Thus, this position suggests that comprehensive and efficient management of international migration is the requirement of the world we live in. Emphasizing that old regulations no longer work in today’s conditions, these steps were taken to formulate a new regime corresponding to the current situation.

3.1.3. Critical Evaluation of the Global Regime of International Migration Management

Attempts to reconceptualize international migration as a global policy issue mainly neglect the power relations between and within states. Rather than focusing on deeper causes of migration boom in today’s world, updated policies on migration tries to maintain already existing relations through the favorable arrangement of new challenges. Accordingly, the attention is on the regulation of human mobility in the most beneficial way. Considering the economic aspects highlighted in the recent policies on migration, it would not be misleading to argue that neoliberalism encapsulates migration management issue. Herein, the main critical point concerning the role of these organizations is that their primary objective is to ensure the continuity of neoliberal globalization.

In the literature, critical assessment of global migration management regime focuses either on the normative-discursive aspect of subordination or materialist aspect of exploitation. The first group of critiques searches for the inequalities and inconsistencies through the elaboration of migration-related discourses and practices. With regard to the presentation of effective migration management regime as the best practice in the field of migration, they investigate the role of the international and regional organizations in norm promotion. In particular, they argue that the best practice of migration management placed under the name of ‘Good Governance’ maintains current inequalities and unbalanced power relations. One of the most important representatives of this trend, Antonio Pecoud analyzes the shift on the migration discourse on the global level not as an actual shift but as the production of ‘international migration narratives’. He suggests that these narratives have a great potential to spread out new forms and beliefs in migration politics on the core of

economy/development nexus and gradually shapes the perception of states towards the desired policies.¹⁴²

The second group of critics focuses on the effects of global capitalism and the policies of the international political economy to the field of migration management. There is a large literature focusing on the relationship between global dynamics of capital accumulation, transnational managerial class, and the cross-border labor mobility. By looking for the root causes of the migration phenomenon, this group looks for structural causes of changing nature of human mobility and the consequent changes in related policies. From the perspective of international political economy, international migration is considered integral to the global political economy in which the exclusive focus is on 'immigration control' that is assured by specifying the conditions of entry and exists.¹⁴³ Therefore, new agenda of migration management and the gradual replacement of restrictive policies with new control mechanisms are elaborated through the neoliberalization of goods, services, and people. In particular, they argue that international organizations funded mainly by migration receiving-countries are materially dependent on those states so they operate like private enterprises.¹⁴⁴ A good example of this trend is the elaboration of the increasing role of IOM in line with the domination of neoliberal values in IOs. Georgi and Schatral argue that effective migration control systems since the 1980s are consistent with the hegemonic project of industrial societies at the global level based on the rationality of maximum economic growth through neoliberal reforms.

¹⁴² Antoine Pecoud, *Depoliticising Migration: Global Governance and International Migration Narratives* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), p. 4.

¹⁴³ Leila Simona Talani, "Introduction: An IPE Perspective on International Migration," in *Handbook of International Political Economy of Migration*, ed. Leila Simona Talani and Simon McMahon (UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2015), 1–14., p. 1.

¹⁴⁴ In particular, IOM is harshly criticized for acting entrepreneurially in its humanitarian involvement due to its attempts to capitalize its position for efficiency, to provide geographical appraisal and so on. Megan Bradley, "The International Organization for Migration (IOM): Gaining Power in the Forced Migration Regime," *Refugee* 33, no. 1 (2015), pp. 97-8.; Ishan Ashutosh and Alison Mountz, "Migration Management for the Benefit of Whom? Interrogating the Work of the International Organization for Migration" 1025, no. April (2017): 20–38, doi:10.1080/13621025.2011.534914., p. 23.

Therefore, IOM appears as an instrument to stabilize the capitalist system by regulating labor mobility the conditions of exploitation.¹⁴⁵

While these two perspectives bring in accurate criticisms, they both present some deficiencies at the level of analysis. The first group struggles to explain structural inequalities and material basis of the policy shifts by putting over-emphasis on discourses. And the second group overestimates cultural and social mechanisms by dwelling on the economic structures. At this point, global governmentality approach emerges as a good alternative to overcome the shortcomings of these two positions by bringing them together. Through the lenses of global governmentality, this study suggests that the conditions of governmental practices of migration management hinge on the processes of production in the global scale and the requirements of the global labor market. Thereby, international migration should be globally managed in order to stabilize the global capital accumulation so that human mobility would provide ‘benefit’. But at the same time, ‘migration reality’ is constantly re-shaped at the global level in the discursive field so as to construct it as a manageable variation. In that regard, this study argues that international migration management issue is a part of neoliberal globalization in which the neoliberal values are globally promoted and the individual states are exposed to governmental interventions for their attitudes towards migration management. In the following section, these arguments will be broadly evaluated through the analytics of governmentality.

3.2. Analytics of Governmentality; Global Governmentality of International Migration

As already mentioned, the argument of this chapter is that international migration management regime is a part of the hegemonic project of advanced liberal democracies based on the worldwide promotion of neoliberal values. This process is being carried out by international and regional organizations dominated by those industrial societies. From this point of view, global governmentality approach offers a critical assessment of the functioning of these organizations to see how this regime

¹⁴⁵ Fabian Georgi and Susanne Schatral, “Towards a Critical Theory of Migration Control: The Case of the International Organization for Migration (IOM),” in *The New Politics of International Mobility: Migration Management and Its Discontents*, ed. Martin Geiger and Antoine Pecoud, 2012, 193–221.

of migration management is actually beneficial not for all the parties, but for advanced liberal democracies.

In this framework, the term ‘project’ does not have a positive connotation as claimed by those who support this regime. As the pioneer of the formation of international migration management regime, for instance, Ghosh explicitly acknowledges that multilateral approach of migration governance is a ‘global project’ for the establishment of the global regime of human mobility¹⁴⁶ based on the guiding principle of regulated openness. Thus, this position suggests that comprehensive and efficient management of international migration provides economic benefits to migrants, sending countries and receiving countries. Similarly, in the other related documents on migration management, the term ‘benefit’ is often used in an economic sense. The approach of neoliberal global governmentality, on the other hand, demonstrates that the practices labeled as good and beneficial indeed aims worldwide subordination both materially and normatively. Joseph argues that these hegemonic projects have political, economic and social aspect at the international level that requires political order among the states, penetration of neoliberal mode of production and the connection between social classes in different countries.¹⁴⁷ Herein, governmentality operates to create and shape the necessary conditions to ensure that the domination is achieved in all these three angles. In other words, neoliberal hegemonic-domination is achieved only if global governmental practices well-regulates the field of action in the international realm. Accordingly, hegemony is actively reproduced through governmental practices at the global level. In that line, this section will specify governmentalization of the global regime of migration management through the analytics of government.

Analytics of government concerns to expose the particular conditions, under which the regimes of practices emerge, exist and change.¹⁴⁸ It is a way to expose the deep-seated logic of a regime of practices by looking at the distinctive forms of knowledge, characteristic techniques and control mechanisms. By this way, analytics of government problematizes the particular programs through the examination of the

¹⁴⁶ Ghosh, “Introduction.”, p. 3.

¹⁴⁷ Joseph, “Combining Hegemony and Governmentality to Explain Global Governance” p. 3.

¹⁴⁸ Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society.*, p. 30.

effects of the institutional practices based on a set of policies and programs on the targets so as to realize certain goals.¹⁴⁹ Basically, it concerns to uncover the specific rationality for the governmentalization of the certain types of government of a field at any given time and space. Accordingly, analytics of government emerges as a good perspective on the analysis of the operationalization of migration management at the global level for the conduct of migration conduct. In terms of bringing a strong and comprehensive critique, this approach provides a good perspective on how current migration management policies maintain power relations.

3.2.1. Visibility of International Migration

The first step of the analytics of government focuses on the perception and the certain forms of visibility of the object to be governed. It is fundamentally about the production and naturalization of the meaning and the representation of the object to be governed so as to render the field as practicable. In the context of migration management, there are two aspects; perception of migration (the way how migration is understood) and the picture of the domestic policies concerning migration. In that regard, the aim of this stage is to uncover the representation of international migration and policies to deal with it to better evaluate the field of action.

The global vision of international migration has been remarkably changed since 1990s¹⁵⁰. To begin with, migration is perceived as a constant and dynamic phenomenon¹⁵¹, therefore, as ‘normal’ and ‘natural’ feature of human existence¹⁵². In

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 31.

¹⁵⁰ Early perception of international migration was quite different from the contemporary understanding of the issue. First of all, international migration was seen as a serious problem for both sending and receiving. For receiving countries, it was due to that human mobility towards those countries was considered as the consequence of underdevelopment. For the sending countries, it was about the fear of ‘brain-drain’ that would result in the abandonment of the high-skilled workers. In this context, international migration was considered as disadvantageous that should be prevented by state authorities. Related to it, migration issue was considered as a domestic issue of the sovereign states who are enjoyed with being the only legitimate actors in the field of migration. Lack of international regulations, policies and even discussions on international migration issue except for the Geneva Convention on the Status of Refugees shows their unwillingness to make an international policy debate on it. Accordingly, international migration was considered as a political issue that was a matter of national security. For this reason, migration issue has left to the domestic provisions of sovereign governments that basically concentrated on strict border control as the primary responsibility. And finally, international migration was conceived as an extraordinary condition that necessitates political and governmental intervention.

¹⁵¹ IOM - International Organization for Migration, “World Migration Report: The Future of Migration: Building Capacities for Change,” 2010., p. xix.

reference to the history, documents related to this issue particularly emphasize the spontaneity of human mobility. IOM describes human mobility as an integral part of the globalization and global integration which frequently emphasizes that migration is a natural process in today's world¹⁵³. In the Hague Declaration, it is explicitly acknowledged that migration is 'a normal fact of life for individuals, families, communities and states'.¹⁵⁴ Similarly, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the UN mentions in the International Migration Report of 2004 highlights that 'humankind has always been migratory'.

Secondly, international migration is envisioned as a 'neutral' phenomenon that is cleared from moral judgments. Rather than labeling human mobility as naturally positive or negative, the attention has shifted to the process of management. Depending on how the process is managed, it is advocated that migration can be a positive phenomenon. It is particularly due to the reason that the issue of migration has begun to be analyzed in the context of economic development. In the first High-Level Dialogue International Migration and Development in 2006, Participants agreed that 'international migration could be a positive force for development in both countries of origin and countries of destination, provided that it was supported by the right set of policies.'¹⁵⁵ Growing recognition of the interconnection between migration and development on the global agenda has been further stipulated by the formation of the Global Forum on Migration and Development in 2007 along with the works of IOM. In particular, international organizations such as World Bank and UNDP consider remittances as an essential mechanism for the development of

¹⁵² Sara Kalm, "Liberalizing Movements? The Political Rationality of Global Migration Management," in *The Politics of International Migration Management*, ed. Martin Geiger and Antoine Pecoud (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 21–45., p. 35.

¹⁵³ IOM - International Organisation for Migration, "World Migration 2003: Managing Migration: Challenges and Responses for People on the Move," 2003.; IOM - International Organization for Migration, "World Migration 2005: Costs and Benefits of International Migration," 2005.; IOM - International Organization for Migration, "World Migration Report: The Future of Migration: Building Capacities for Change."; IOM - International Organisation for Migration, "World Migration Report: Communicating Effectively About Migration," 2011.

¹⁵⁴ UN General Assembly, "Declaration of The Hague on the Future of Refugee and Migration Policy," 2002., p. 5.

¹⁵⁵ United Nations General Assembly, "Summary of the High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development," 2006, <http://www.un.org/esa/population/migration/hld/>., p. 2.

sending countries. More generally, they envisage migration/development nexus on the ground of the maximum economic gains by maximizing the benefits and minimizing the costs only if enhanced international cooperation and partnership arrangements are ensured. This, however, once again is linked to the well-management of migration¹⁵⁶.

Finally, cross-border human mobility is imaged as a global phenomenon affecting each and every part of the world based on the consideration that the contemporary era is getting more complex and generating new challenges. Therefore, it is possible to argue that the reality of international migration since the 1990s has been predicated on the process of globalization. On the basis of globalization, the phenomenon of international migration appears as an issue which can only be dealt with on multilateral basis. Accordingly, all related actors such as diasporas, corporations, international organizations and non-governmental organizations have been involved in the field. This vision is strongly advocated by international organizations and frequently indicated in policy-recommendation booklets. For instance, Global Migration Group strongly advocates that the involvement of key stakeholders is a key condition for the successful development of migration management process.¹⁵⁷ Again, World Migration Reports of IOM repeatedly urge for the necessity of the participation of the new set of actors at the national and the global level in the policy implementation process for the sake of maximum gains.¹⁵⁸ Accordingly, contemporary understanding of international migration stresses the importance of the engagement of a multi-actor process of migration management, seeing the phenomenon of migration as a whole of complex relations.

While international migration is portrayed as a global phenomenon that can only be dealt with multilateral basis, states remain as the main actors to implement policies. Indeed, the first and foremost condition for international migration to conceptually (and practically) exist, is that the international realm is made up of

¹⁵⁶ United Nations, *World Economic and Social Survey 2004: International Migration*, p. xxii.

¹⁵⁷ Global Migration Group, "Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning: A Handbook for Policy-Makers and Practitioners" (International Organisation for Migration, 2010), p. 22.

¹⁵⁸ IOM - International Organization for Migration, *World Migration Report 2000*, p. 40.; 2003, p. 53.; 2005, p. 365.; 2008, p. 278.; 2010, p. 9.; 2011, p. 100.; 2015, pp. 94-5.

separate sovereign states. Accordingly, the sovereign state system has to be reinserted although unilateral policies are presented as ineffective and undesirable. This image of ‘failure’ in the migration context does not disqualify states but strengthen the position of international and regional organizations to legitimately intervene in the migration management process of individual countries. Indeed, Antonio Pecoud rightfully argues that international organizations while showing the present as unfavorable and adverse, they draw a positive picture of future. IOs spread the understanding that states fail to deal with the global challenges posed by international migration because as OECD indicates that ‘no country can deal with large, unexpected migration flows alone and in isolation’¹⁵⁹. And in return, they present the changing nature of international migration as a different field of activity requiring technical knowledge and expertise that they have.

One important conclusion of this depiction of international migration is that cross-border mobility is portrayed as a ‘management’ issue reliant on expertise and empirical data. As Antonio Pecoud properly interprets this situation as depoliticization of migration in which the political nature of migration is nullified¹⁶⁰. Therefore, international migration management began to be introduced as an apolitical and technocratic affair.¹⁶¹ Secondly, domestic policies of the individual states have been transformed from the political government of migration to the technocratic management of human mobility. By this way, governmental techniques and technologies replace the former practices of political exercise on migration policies. Finally, the new depiction of migration reality based on spontaneity and neutrality on the one hand, and interconnectedness on the other, reproduces globalization narrative and maintains asymmetrical power relations.

3.2.2. Means to Guide: Mechanisms of Cooperation

The second dimension of analytics of government bears on *techne* or technical aspect of government such as means, mechanisms, procedures, and

¹⁵⁹ OECD, *International Migration Outlook 2016*, 2016, http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/international-migration-outlook-2016_migr_outlook-2016-en, p. 8.

¹⁶⁰ Pecoud, *Depoliticising Migration: Global Governance and International Migration Narratives*, p. 95.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

vocabularies¹⁶². In the context of this study, this step concerns to reveal how domestic policies of migration management being shaped and reshaped by international and regional organizations through the mechanisms of cooperation.

The principle of cooperation has begun to be discussed in the 1990s when it was realized that strict border control had not been effective to prevent the migratory waves towards Europe. Later on, instead of unilateral responses of the advanced-liberal societies against immigration, migration policies began to be replaced by a new system of migration management based on the cooperation of the related parties.¹⁶³ Eventually, this principle has been scaled up and multilateral approach of migration management has been conditioned to the practical ‘cooperation’ and ‘consensus’ concerning to effective management of human mobility. It is prescribed as a principle of ‘New Dialogue’ in the Hague Declaration that fosters the idea that cross-border human mobility can be effectively controlled only if all partners and stakeholders agree on practical ‘cooperation’¹⁶⁴. Similarly, cooperation doctrine has been presented by IOM as an essential part of the migration management based on the argument that ‘[e]ffective migration management requires cooperation and dialogue not only among States but also among all interested stakeholders, including international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector.’¹⁶⁵ Antonio Pecoud argues that particularly ‘in the same boat’ and ‘triple-win’ arguments in this new migration management discourse made the cooperation as the core principle of migration management.¹⁶⁶ This principle, in return, has been turned into a mechanism for the international organizations to shape and re-shape the migration policies of the individual states at the bilateral, regional and international level.

¹⁶² Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society.*, p. 42.

¹⁶³ Stephen Castles and Nicholas Van Hear, “Root Causes,” in *Global Migration Governance*, ed. Alexander Betts (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 287–307., p. 292.

¹⁶⁴ UN General Assembly, “Declaration of The Hague on the Future of Refugee and Migration Policy.”, p. 9.

¹⁶⁵ IOM - International Organization for Migration, “International Cooperation,” in *Essentials of Migration Management Volume One: Migration Management Foundations*, n.d., http://www.rcmvs.org/documentos/IOM_EMM/v1/volume1.html., p. 7.

¹⁶⁶ Pecoud, *Depoliticising Migration: Global Governance and International Migration Narratives.*, p. 69.

The most common practice on cooperation is bilateral setups that were also traditionally used as a useful medium to regulate migration. Since 1990s with the introduction of migration management discourse, such arrangements between sending and receiving countries has proliferated with inclusion of a wide range of new issues such as 'temporary labor migration, the control of irregular migration, border management, the return of migrants in an irregular situation and the management of remittances'¹⁶⁷. In particular, new concepts such as 'circular migration' and 'temporary labor migration' have been integrated into the policy documents and labor recruitment agreements became an important part of the current bilateral settings. According to ILO, between 1990 and 2014, ¹⁵¹ bilateral labor recruitment agreements have been initiated in order to meet the changing conditions of the economic and labor market of the sending and receiving countries.¹⁶⁸ However, bilateral cooperation over international migration does not necessarily mean the absence of international organizations in the process of negotiations and implementation. Alexander Betts argues that the new era has given rise to 'facilitative multilateralism' in which intergovernmental organizations play an important role to enable states for developing bilateral forms of cooperation.¹⁶⁹ Besides, inter-state arrangements are closely monitored by international organizations that stand as the formal bodies to determine the terms of the bilateral arrangements by specifying how states should treat international migrants or whether their policies are within the norms set by international conventions. For instance, circular and temporary migration programs have to be operationalized in a space that

¹⁶⁷ United Nations, *World Economic and Social Survey 2004: International Migration.*, p. xvi.

¹⁶⁸ Piyasiri Wickramasekara, *Bilateral Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding on Migration of Low Skilled Workers: A Review* (Geneva: International Labor Organisation, 2015), p. 22.

¹⁶⁹ Alexander Betts, "Introduction," in *Global Migration Governance*, ed. Alexander Betts (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 12.

is bordered by the terms and conditions specified by Mode 4¹⁷⁰ of GATTs and the ILO Convention 97.¹⁷¹

At the regional level, most viable cooperation mechanisms are Regional Consultative Processes (RCPs), and more recently Interregional Forums on Migration (IRF). RCPs are non-binding and informal forums for information exchange on migration issues that bring together the representatives of states and international organizations. First RCP, named as Intergovernmental Consultation on Migration, Asylum and Refugees was established in 1985 in Europe. Since 1990, it has been proliferated in the other regions of the world¹⁷² with the great efforts of IOs, especially UNHCR and IOM. While they are informal and non-binding, in fact, they are quite effective to promote a context for migration management. This is because RCPs are more than forums to discuss migration policies but they create normative agenda for the ‘best practice’ or capacity building. Besides, RCPs tend to grow more on a global scale as they become more informal bureaucratic mechanisms of global intergovernmental organizations such as UNHCR, UNHCHR, UNODC, UNCTAD, ILO and IOM¹⁷³. That is to say, they are important mechanisms to shape migration policies, to spread the new understanding of migration management and to guide individual states to be in the desired direction.

And lastly, at the global level, while there is the absence of formal multilateral governance of international migration, there are certain mechanisms to

¹⁷⁰ Mode 4 is a multilateral legal framework to progressively liberalize the trade in services by presenting rules and frameworks for the movement of labor from one country to another regulated by the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATT) Julia Nielson and Daria Taglioni, “A Quick Guide to the GATS and MODE 4,” no. November (2003), http://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/microsites/IDM/workshops/Trade_2004_04051004/related_docs/quick_guide.pdf, p. 6.

¹⁷¹ This convention has been adopted in 1949 in order to determine the rights of the migrant workers in the countries in which they work.

¹⁷² International Organization for Migration, “About RCPs,” accessed April 27, 2017, <https://www.iom.int/about-rcps>. Some RCP examples; Budapest Process initiated in 1991, Puebla Process established in 1996, Migration Dialogue for South Africa (MIDSA) established in 2000, Migration Dialogue for West Africa (MIDWA) established in 2000, Bali Process initiated in 2002, Arab Regional Consultative Process on Migration (ARCP) established in 2015, International Organisation for Migration (IOM), “RCPs by Region - International Organization for Migration,” 2016, <https://www.iom.int/rcps-region>.

¹⁷³ Frank Düvell, “Irregular Migration,” in *Global Migration Governance*, ed. Alexander Betts (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 78–109., p. 95.

increase global cooperation through international conferences¹⁷⁴, independent initiatives¹⁷⁵ and international conventions and treaties¹⁷⁶ in an attempt to shape the global understanding on migration management. In particular; UN High-Level Dialogue, Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD), projects and programs conducted by IOM, UNHCR, ILO stand as the fundamental mediums to project a global image on human mobility and to determine the direction of migration policies.

To make a general assessment of increasing bilateral, regional and global cooperation in the field of international migration, cooperation arrangements tend to maintain the states' structural position and consequently the structural factors driving labor migration. Under the 'benefit' argument in the discourse of international migration management, there is a continuity of the fundamental power asymmetry between sending and receiving countries as well as within regional and inter-regional settings.¹⁷⁷ Particularly in the context of migration/development, which will be discussed in the next step in more detail, inherent power imbalances between origin and destination countries are reinforced in the current global regime. Moreover, while these terms seem to reflect reverse logics, what is tricky here is that 'cooperation' as a mechanism to guide individual states indeed triggers the sense of 'competition' between states particularly in the context of migration/development nexus. It is due to the reason that the effective migration management framework advocates the understanding that if one state better engages its migration policies with the development policies, it would provide more benefits and its competitive power in the global economic market would increase. In this regard, it is possible to argue that competition as one of the core neoliberal values is subtly promoted through the means of cooperation.

¹⁷⁴ E.g. High-Level Dialogue,

¹⁷⁵ E.g. Berne Initiative

¹⁷⁶ Some examples; *The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families* adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1990 but came into force in 2003, *Cairo Programme of Action* (1994), *United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime* (2000).

¹⁷⁷ Betts, "Introduction.", p. 21.

In terms of states' engagement with international organizations, it would not be wrong to argue that they are getting more willing to cooperate with international organizations for their migration policies. Since the 1990s, new coordination and consultation mechanisms are normatively and materially realized through multilateral and regional programs, joint projects and international agreements and conventions. In the context of this study, tightening relations of the international organizations with individual states is significantly meaningful for elaborating the role of international organizations in shaping of state behaviors. International and regional organizations have an important role in the process of transformation of the migration policies. Indeed, cooperation can be regarded as a pragmatic strategy to increase the efficiency of worldwide migration policies¹⁷⁸ by bringing up all geographies on the most economical way of migration management. In addition to programs and projects they develop, they also prescribe the 'best practice' to cope with the human flow. The scheme of best practice will be analyzed in the following step.

3.2.3. Specific Way of Migration Management

This dimension of the analytics of government deals with the specific forms of knowledge or the *episteme* of government to understand how specific forms of knowledge and expertise render particular issues governable.¹⁷⁹ It is the colonization of knowledge so as to produce the truth of the present. Once again, global governmentality of migration means to conduct the way migration is conducted by individual states. Thus, knowledge here is the knowledge that is produced on the phenomenon of migration should be managed. In this juncture, IOs and IGOs play an important role in gathering information, producing knowledge and providing 'expertise' to states regarding better management.¹⁸⁰ Relying on their expertise, IOs, particularly IOM, promote a series of important recommendations for the effective migration management in the most coherent way.

¹⁷⁸ Pecoud, *Depoliticising Migration: Global Governance and International Migration Narratives.*, p. 69.

¹⁷⁹ Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society.*, p. 42.

¹⁸⁰ Geiger and Pecoud, "The Politics of International Migration Management.", p. 5.

In line with the new perception of migration as a technical issue of management and a field of expertise, International organizations within and outside of the UN system present themselves as the formal body of expertise. Knowledge on the appropriate way to govern migration is generated especially by IOM; dedicated to migration management, UNHCR; devoted to the refugee issue, ILO; regulating labor migration, World Bank; concerned with migration/development nexus, and World Trade Organization; responsible for the international responsibility of service providers. These organizations have comprehensive data collection mechanisms and analysis centers so as to gather data on a range of social, political economic and demographic facets of migration. Collected data is presented through various forms of statistics, charts, graphs and other types of indicators to draw the picture of the present situation and to make estimations about the future trends of human flow. Some important portals are; IOM's Global Migration Data Analysis Centre¹⁸¹, UNHCR Operational Portal of Refugee Situations¹⁸², United Nations Global Migration Database¹⁸³, OECD Migration Databases¹⁸⁴, and World Bank Data Bank¹⁸⁵. They are widely accepted as the reliable sources of timely data concerning migration at the global level, therefore frequently referred to policy documents, research papers, and academic publications.

Based on the data they gather and the information they publish, these organizations form a global vision of migration and shared norms regarding migration management. Starting from the understanding that migration is an

¹⁸¹ International Organisation for Migration (IOM), "IOM's Global Migration Data Analysis Centre | Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC)," 2017, <https://gmdac.iom.int/capacity-building-search>.

¹⁸² UNHCR, "The Refugees Operational Portal," accessed April 29, 2017, <http://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations>.

¹⁸³ United Nations Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), "United Nations Global Migration Database," accessed April 29, 2017, <https://esa.un.org/unmigration/>.

¹⁸⁴ OECD, "OECD Migration Databases - OECD," accessed April 29, 2017, <http://www.oecd.org/els/mig/oecdmigrationdatabases.htm>.

¹⁸⁵ World Bank, "Migration | Data | DataBank," accessed April 29, 2017, <http://databank.worldbank.org/data/databases/migration>.

international process of concern of all¹⁸⁶, the triple-win mindset has been conditioned to the proper management of the process. Subsequently, by devising ‘development-friendly’ policies, these organizations have contributed to the integration of migration into development planning agendas at the national and international level compatible with neoliberal rationality. This migration/development nexus for achieving maximum economic and social the benefits of human mobility via proper migration management particularly comes into play in the field of the global labor market. For instance, the final report of High-Level Dialogue of 2013 explicitly acknowledges that migration is an important factor to improve labor market efficiency ‘both by meeting demand in low skilled sectors, but also by helping to fill gaps in high-skilled sectors such as in information technology’¹⁸⁷. In that line, ideal to achieve maximum economic and social development through migration management is predicated on the principle of flexibility because migration management efforts should be flexible enough to adopt migration policies to changing nature of the global economy. It is due to the fact that international migration management discourse takes global capitalist structure as taken-for-granted¹⁸⁸ and tries to organize human mobility so as to fit the dynamism of the global economy. Accordingly, for the domestic administrative ‘portfolio’ of individual states, IOs foster the principle of flexibility both in institutional structure and migration policies.

On the basis of this developmental logic, different international organizations express the most effective migration policies, legislations and administrative structures with regard to their field of expertise. Among these organizations, IOM demonstrates itself as the leading intergovernmental organization in the field of migration with its dedication to promoting a global understanding of a ‘humane and

¹⁸⁶ Pecoud, *Depoliticising Migration: Global Governance and International Migration Narratives.*, p. 63.,

¹⁸⁷ International Organization for Migration, “Towards the 2013 High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development Final Report of the High-Level Dialogue Series,” 2013., p. 79.

¹⁸⁸ Gerard Boucher, “A Critique of Global Policy Discourses on Managing International Migration,” *Third World Quarterly* 29, no. 7 (2008): 1461–71, doi:10.1080/01436590802386757., p. 1462.

orderly migration for the benefit of all'¹⁸⁹. Accordingly, the objective is set to create an 'effective' and 'development-friendly' management system in between traditional control mechanisms and open-border treatment. What is the most appropriate way is, therefore, has been codified in the conceptual model of migration management. This model provides a comprehensive framework of migration management at state-level by comprising policy-making, legislation and administrative organization. In this model, migration management operates in four main areas; Migration and Development, Facilitating Migration, Regulating Migration and Forced Migration. For each of these areas, IOM defines specific principles, objectives, capacity requirements and professional and institutional role of authoritative agents of expertise¹⁹⁰. This conceptual model is standardized and gradually operationalized in different countries via several services IOM offers to states such as capacity-building, training of civil servants and consultations.

Knowledge on migration management while presented as technical and neutral in nature has certain political implications. Firstly, IOs as the carrier of expertise has legitimized their intervention on domestic policies on migration. Secondly, the conceptual model of migration management is presented as the best practice in the field of migration by international and regional organizations. Therefore, it became a moral obligation for the states to adopt the model since it has been justified with unquestionable expert knowledge. As the model re-orient domestic policies towards the 'Good Governance' of migration in a way that would stipulate the functioning of global capitalist structures, the proliferation of the model means that current inequalities and unbalanced power relations are maintained.

3.2.4. Individual States and Migrants: Necessary Qualifications

The final step of the analytics of government deals with the forms of individual and collective identity that the government's specific practices and programs are sought to be established. With regard to this final step, things to be found are the specific forms of personality and identity, and the types of

¹⁸⁹ International Organisation for Migration (IOM), "About IOM," accessed April 28, 2017, <https://www.iom.int/about-iom>.

¹⁹⁰ For further information; *Essentials of Migration Management: A Guide for Policy Makers and Practitioners Vol.1, Vol.2, Vol.3* (Geneva: International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2004).

qualifications and capacities that the government is predicated¹⁹¹. Similar to the first step, this phase has also two dimensions in the context of international migration management; capacities and qualifications attributed to individual states who have the legitimacy to administer human mobility and individual persons who migrate.

In the previous chapter, it is explained that Joseph does not identify the state as an agent with a collective consciousness¹⁹² but an assemblage of institutions shaping actions through certain projects. Thus states are actors only in the emergent sense. Correspondingly, this step in the analytics of government has a rather different application on global governmentality concerning state behaviors. Global governmentality of international migration attributes certain capacities and qualities but not a 'subjective identity'. States are valued as the basic units having sovereign right to develop their own migration policies. Yet, international norms and mechanisms developed by international organizations somehow constraint¹⁹³ their sovereign authority and 'guide' states to develop most effective migration management policies in a balance between interests of individual states and interests for all states¹⁹⁴. According to IOM, to be able to develop an orderly management system, states should have the standard capacities comprising

'more timely and accurate migration and labor market data, assistance in defining national migration policy goals and priorities, training of migration officials, development of effective and equitable legal framework, coherent administrative structures; consultation mechanisms between government and other national stakeholders, and international cooperation'¹⁹⁵

The capacity-building issue is frequently stipulated by IOs since states are expected to have a full control on entries and exits, and to deal with the new challenges of 'labor mobility, irregular migration, migration and development,

¹⁹¹ Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, p. 43.

¹⁹² He criticizes Wendt's idea of the state as a person and adds that state can be an agent only as the emergent sense like other institutional assemblages.

¹⁹³ by imposing some legal obligations such as the implementation of human rights.

¹⁹⁴ International Organization for Migration (IOM), "Authority and Responsibility of States," in *Essentials of Migration Management: A Guide for Policy Makers and Practitioners Vol.1*, n.d., p. 28.

¹⁹⁵ IOM - International Organization for Migration, "World Migration Report: The Future of Migration: Building Capacities for Change.", p. 7.

integration, environmental change and migration governance'¹⁹⁶. International migration management discourse promotes the understanding that those contemporary challenges require states to apply both restrictive and facilitating migration policies 'flexible' enough to minimize negative effects of migration and to maximize economic benefits. Restrictions on human mobility are notably grounded on global security concerns. States are expected to coordinate 'policies, actions and legal instruments and/or measures to combat terrorism, all forms of extremist violence, illicit arms trafficking, organized crimes and illicit drug problems, money laundering and related crimes, trafficking in women, adolescents, children, migrants and human organs, and other activities'¹⁹⁷. Facilitative policies, on the other hand, are grounded on migration/development nexus in which the policies have been intended to fill the global labor gap. In this context, individual states are expected to develop an effective migration management system which should be designed as both a restrictive and facilitating application of human mobility in line with the demands of the labor market.

In line with the neoliberal form of self-subjectification, migrants are attributed to the characteristic of self-entrepreneurship who are supposed to internalize market values. In several publications that IOs released, migrants are defined through their entrepreneurial characteristic which makes them desirable. In the final report of GCIM, it is clearly recognized that 'Most migrants are characterized by an entrepreneurial spirit and are motivated by a determination to succeed in life'¹⁹⁸. The inflow of entrepreneurial subject is designated as beneficial for destination countries. IOM asserts that 'Migration can bring substantial macroeconomic benefits to destination countries through mitigation of labor shortages, enrichment of human capital and the job opportunities and wealth which

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁹⁷ United Nations Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), *Compendium of Recommendations on International Migration and Development* (New York, 2006), p. 45.

¹⁹⁸ The Global Commission on International Migration, "Migration in an Interconnected World: New Directions for Action," 2005, <http://www.queensu.ca/samp/migrationresources/reports/gcim-complete-report-2005.pdf>, p. 48.

result from migrant entrepreneurial activities.¹⁹⁹ Besides, World Migration Report of 2008 indicated that ‘short-term movements for business and entrepreneurial purposes have greatly increased in all parts of the world in recent years’. Herein, it is their responsibility to discipline and optimize themselves for having sufficient quantity of human capital so as to be accepted as an immigrant. Accordingly, the rationale that global migration management is quite simple; the more human capital migrants have, the more welcomed by states the migrants are. For this reason, according to UN DESA Population Division, ‘highly skilled migrants are usually granted preferential treatment and are subject to fewer restrictions regarding admission, length of stay, change of employment and admission of family members than other immigrants’.²⁰⁰

3.3. Conclusion

Critical evaluation of ‘international migration management’ reveals that new discourse on migration or what Antonio Pecoud calls ‘international migration narratives’ stimulates a broader process of ‘management’ of human mobility on the core of economic development. While the new migration management agenda advocates security oriented restrictive policies based on the strict border control are inefficient, migration management rhetoric and practices display a ‘post-control’ spirit by envisaging proactive policies as the most efficient way of benefitting from the human mobility²⁰¹. This control, therefore, is achieved through steering and governance of state behaviors at a distance that neoliberal rationality postulates because traditional control mechanisms based on law and order has been shifted to the social forms of surveillance²⁰². In this logic, states are not directly dictated to determine their migration policies in the line with new migration management but they have been responsabilized to comply with it by themselves. Similarly, the

¹⁹⁹ International Organization for Migration (IOM), *International Migration and Development: Perspectives and Experiences of the International Organisation for Migration*, 2006., p.

²⁰⁰ Vinod Mishra et al., *World Population Policies 2013*, UN Dept. of Economic & Social Affairs, Population Division, 2013, doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004., p. 111.

²⁰¹ Geiger and Pecoud, “The Politics of International Migration Management.”, p. 15.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 18.

neoliberal form of global governmentality of migration management imposes migrants to voluntarily adopt the 'right behavior' and to be good migrants.²⁰³

As one of the main arguments of this chapter, migration management framework is projected as a vehicle to meet the conditions of economic development. Considering that current international political economy has been designed via the rubric of neoliberalism, this chapter achieves two principal conclusions. Firstly, new migration management framework is quite significant for the global maintenance of neoliberal economic structures. Accordingly, this chapter argues that migration management framework is linked to the neoliberal form of development and therefore, management process has been designed to not to damage global capitalism but to foster global economic growth. And secondly, to be able to maintain the neoliberal global economy, new migration management scheme is inevitably designed to carry and promote core neoliberal values such as flexibility and competition.

How neoliberal values are globally promoted was explained through Joseph's approach of global governmentality. This approach fits well into this study because migration management issue is still up to state policies. States are still the main actors for the implementation of migration policies. However, it is possible to observe that state decisions regarding international migration is shaped by/influenced by the global rationality of this regime. By following up the four steps of the analytics of government, it has been shown that international migration management issue has become a form of global governmentality in which the way migration is managed by individual states is governed by global international organizations. In other words, state behaviors are shaped to develop their own effective migration management regime in line with neoliberal globalization. It has been explained that effective migration management scheme organized in accordance with the neoliberal economic structures is presented by international and regional organizations as the best practice in the field of migration. In particular, the moral and ethical value is attributed to this framework by placing it under the name of 'good governance' and the 'best practice', certainly facilitated to the dissemination

²⁰³ Antoine Pecoud, "Informing Migrants to Manage Migration? An Analysis of IOM's Information Campaigns," in *The Politics of International Migration Management*, ed. Martin Geiger and Antoine Pecoud (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 184–202., p. 197.

of migration management scheme as well as neoliberal values. In parallel with these arguments, how Turkey is guided to develop its own effective migration management regime will be deeply evaluated in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 4

GLOBAL PROMOTION OF MIGRATION MANAGEMENT: CASE OF TURKEY

Global governmentality approach provides good insights to understand contemporary politics on a range of issues. Today's global governmentality has a neoliberal form that is operational at macro-level through activities of international and regional organizations. These organizations assure the well functioning of the global capitalist system by promoting neoliberal values on the governance of social reality via projections and conditions they postulate on individual states. While there is a considerable success of governmentality in global level in terms of regulating state behavior, this approach suggests that the success or failure of governmentality in the domestic level depends on social and historical conditions of these societies. In the previous chapter, how international migration is governmentalized at the global level was detailed by revealing the forms of visibility of migration, cooperation mechanisms as the means of governance, conceptualization of best practice of migration management and the capacities and qualifications that are expected from the individual states. It was argued that international organizations conduct the way of migration is conducted in domestic societies in order to ensure that human mobility is regulated through the demands of the global capitalist structures. In this chapter, how this form of conduct is promoted to individual states will be analyzed in the case of Turkey with the great influence of the European Union. The very purpose of this chapter, therefore, to evaluate the merits of the effective migration management scheme found out in the previous chapter in a more specific context. By this way, governmentalization of international migration will be better explained by moving out from global to EU, and from EU to Turkey.

The chapter consists of three main sections. The first section is devoted to the traditional migration and asylum policy of Turkey. It will be argued that from the

establishment of the Republic in 1923 to the Helsinki Summit of 1999, international migration issue had been considered as a political issue requiring sovereign regulation based on the political identity of ‘Turkishness’. No matter how migratory patterns have been changed in time, it will be shown that Turkey continued to follow its traditional policies. Traditional migration policy of Turkey began to transform in the 2000s in line with deepening relations of the Republic with the European Union. In response to the Unions’ pre-accession requirements, Turkey followed a paradigmatic change in its international migration policy in harmony with the EU’s Common Asylum and Migration Policy. In order to better understand the promotion of the effective migration management framework to Turkey via EU’s conditionality, what is the Union’s international migration policy and how it is compatible with the global discourse should be cleared first. Accordingly, in the second section, the historical development of the Common Asylum and Migration Policy of the EU and its relevance to the global discourse will be explained. Later, within the context of accession partnership, the impact of the EU on Turkey to revise its traditional policies on international migration will be discussed via legal and institutional developments. And in the final section, how this new migration management model of Turkey is in analogy with the global discourse on the effective migration management will be discussed.

4.1. Turkey’s Traditional Policies on International Migration; 1923-1999

Turkey has been chosen as the case to see how neoliberal understanding on international migration management has been promoted. This chapter suggests that Turkey’s policies in the field of international migration have two different periods; traditional migration policy from 1923 to 1999 and effective migration management since the 2000s. To be able to better evaluate the paradigmatic shift in the Republic’s policies towards international migration management, this section aims to overview the three aspects of the traditional policy direction of Turkey. By elaborating these three aspects; depiction of the migration reality, legal basis and institutional framework, it is aimed to make a general evaluation of the traditional migration policy of the Republic. In the final part of this section, it will be argued that while the migration patterns from and through Turkey began to diverge in the 1980s, Turkey continued to pursue its traditional migration policy.

4.1.1. Depiction of the Reality; Political identity of Turkishness and Turkey's Traditional Migration Policy

Traditional migration policy of Turkey was based on the mentality that cross-border human mobility is a fundamental political issue in terms of state's existence and continuity. In line with the common trend of the time, international migration was considered in this period as an important issue for sovereign regulation with a particular emphasis on national identity and territorial integrity. Accordingly, starting from the time when modern Turkey was established as a sovereign nation-state till the 2000s, immigration and emigration patterns have been approached either as a political issue to promote a strong national state with homogeneous population²⁰⁴, or as a security issue that threatens the national well-being.

As a newly established state that has succeeded to gain independence after being occupied in the aftermath of the First World War, nation-building issue was the paramount concern in the early years of the Republic. Prevailing nationalist understanding of time was based on the identity of 'Turkishness'. Kemal Karpat explains Turkishness as a political identity that has been rooted neither in the racial background nor in the group identity. It has been derived from shared historical experience, Islamic faith, and territoriality.²⁰⁵ In line with this definition, the international migration policy of Turkey has been determined as an effective tool in the process of creating a homogeneous Turkish society. The policy framework was designed to 'encourage' the emigration of non-Muslims and the immigration of people sharing the same cultural values with the Turkish society so that they can easily melt into the Turkish identity.²⁰⁶ On the basis of this nationalist understanding, some important immigration and emigration cases can be listed as;

²⁰⁴ İçduygu and Aksel, "Turkish Migration Policies: A Critical Historical Retrospective.", p. 178.

²⁰⁵ Kemal Karpat, "Introduction," in *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays* (Boston: Brill, 2004), 1–33, <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/ebookviewer/ebook/ZTAwMHh3d19fMTMzMDI2X19BTg2?sid=78b45545-0cb0-4185-9361-997139c9ccb0@sessionmgr4006&vid=5&format=EB.>, p. 3.

²⁰⁶ Ahmet İçduygu, Sema Erder, and Ömer Faruk Gençkaya, "Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Göç Politikaları, 1923-2023: Ulus-Devlet Oluşumundan Ulusötesi Dönüşümlere," 2014., p. 54.

- Population exchange with Greece; immigration of 384 thousand people from Greece and emigration of 1.2 million people from Turkey²⁰⁷
- 1924, 1936, 1953; immigration of 77 thousand people from Macedonia and former Yugoslavia
- Till 1989; immigration of 800 thousand people from Bulgaria through several agreements
- Immigration of 79 thousand people from Romania
- Mass Immigration from East Turkistan due to the occupation of country by China
- Mass immigration of Uzbek, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Turkmen, Karakalpakstani, Balkar, Karachay, Azeri, Dagestani, Ingushe, Chechen people after World War II²⁰⁸

4.1.2. Legal Basis and Institutional Structure

The political depiction of international migration and the importance attributed to nationalism and sovereignty has reflected in the legal arrangements as well. The fundamental legal basis of the migration policies has been provided with the Settlement Law which remained in force from 1934 to 2006.²⁰⁹ The law has established the ‘legitimate’ grounds by determining the terms and conditions of the status of migrant and refugee. Article 3 of this law defined immigrant as a person of ‘Turkish origin and/or attached to Turkish Culture’ who wish to come and settle in Turkey²¹⁰. Since the definition of immigrant does not clarify Turkish ethnicity and culture, Article 7 of the same law grants the authority to decide who can be qualified

²⁰⁷ Canan Emek İnan, “Türkiye’de Göç Politikaları: İskân Kanunları Üzerinden Bir İnceleme,” *Göç Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2, no. 3 (2016): 10–33., p. 17.

²⁰⁸ “İçişleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü,” accessed May 5, 2017, http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik3/kitleselel-akinlar_409_558_559.

²⁰⁹ Migration and population policies in the early republican era are considered as the continuation of the late Ottoman policy on population exchange and (re-)settlement. For further evaluation; Canan Emek İnan, “Türkiye’de İskân Siyaseti: İskâna Yönelik Örgütsel Yapı Üzerinden Bir İnceleme,” *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 22 (2014): 82–102.

²¹⁰ “The Turkish Law of Settlement.”

as belonging to Turkish ethnicity and culture to the Council of the Ministers. The absence of clear criteria defining Turkish ethnicity and culture has placed Turkey's immigration policy on a rather subjective ground.²¹¹

This law is also important to show that migration policy of Turkey was in harmony with the social engineering or 'demographic engineering'²¹² of the time. Putting emphasis on Turkish descent and cultural affiliation on the definition of immigrant makes the law an instrument to regulate migration processes to strengthen the national identity. İçduygu argues that this law was used as a "forced migration" institution and a tool for the "forced assimilation" policy when it is evaluated in terms of immigration policies. He adds that, indeed, it has successfully assimilated immigrants by providing an opportunity to set up a new life.²¹³ This is because the law carefully specifies the process of resettlement of immigrants and requires that immigrants are placed in a region where they would remain a minority within the indigenous population. By this way, immigrants would be easily melted into the local population and would not pose a threat to national identity.

Article 3 of the Settlement Law also defined a refugee as 'those persons who take shelter in Turkey in order to reside temporarily on account of compelling reasons without the intention to settle permanently'.²¹⁴ This initial conceptualization of the term refugee was further detailed when Turkey had ratified the UN Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. Turkey signed the Convention in 1951 and its Protocol in 1967, with a geographical reservation by stating that only "those who suffered in Europe" would be accepted as a refugee. In that regard, Turkey expressed any obligation for asylum seekers from outside Europe. Within this

²¹¹ Y. Yeşim Özer, *Uluslararası Göç ve Yabancı Düşmanlığı* (Istanbul: Derin Yayınları, 2015), P. 36.

²¹² Nesim Şeker, "Forced Population Movements in the Ottoman Empire and the Early Turkish Republic: An Attempt at Reassessment through Demographic Forced Population Movements in the Ottoman Empire and the Early Turkish Republic : An Attempt at Reassessment through Demogra," *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, no. 16 (2013).

²¹³ İçduygu, Erder, and Gençkaya, "Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Göç Politikaları, 1923-2023: Ulus-Devlet Oluşumundan Ulusötesi Dönüşümlere.", p. 129-30.

²¹⁴ "The Turkish Law of Settlement."

framework, for instance, the Republic has accepted 800 thousand German-Jewish refugees between 1933 and 1945.²¹⁵

When the terms immigrant and refugee are evaluated together, restrictions on the immigrant status given only to persons of Turkish descent and culture, and refugee status given only to persons coming from Europe brought about distinction between ‘foreigner’ and ‘migrant’²¹⁶. Those remain outside of these definitions within the borders of the country were seen as ‘foreigner’ so that they were neither a part of the migration ‘problem’ nor fall under the international migration policy of the Republic.²¹⁷ Being excluded from the broader migration regulation, the rights and the obligations of the foreigners as well as procedures on their entry and exit have been determined via several legislations such as Passport Law (1950) and the Law related to Residence and Travels of Foreign Subjects (1950).

These legislations while mainly concerned to determine the extensive framework of the status of migrants, refugees, foreigners and the framework policies regarding the migratory patterns, they had also some provisions for the emigration. In particular, some restrictions have been issued on the departure of the Turkish citizens in order to prevent population decline and brain drain. For instance, until 1961, Turkish citizens have not been automatically granted the right to obtain passports in exception for certain legal conditions such as ‘invitation letter’ from the relatives abroad²¹⁸. Starting from the 1960s, however, Turkey’s attitude towards emigration has begun to change. As a result of various labor recruitment agreements with many European countries in the 1960s, Australia and the Middle East and North Africa in 1970s, Turkey began to export labor force and turned into a country of

²¹⁵ *Dünyada ve Türkiye’de Yasadışı Göç* (Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü Yabancılar Hudut İltica Dairesi Başkanlığı, 2001)., p. 8.

²¹⁶ Fulya Memisoglu, “Between the Legacy of Nation-State and Forces of Globalisation: Turkey’s Management of Mixed Migration Flows,” 2014, <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/33862#?>, p. 4.

²¹⁷ Osman Seyhan, “Changing the Status Quo of Migration and Asylum Policies in Turkey: A Narrative Inquiry,” *Journal of Organisational Transformation & Social Change* 11, no. 3 (2014): 185–206, doi:10.1179/1477963314Z.00000000029., p. 188.

²¹⁸ Nermin Abadan-Unat, “Türkiye’nin Son Elli Yıllık Emek Göçü: Yorum, Eleştiri, Öngörü,” in *Türkiye’nin Göç Tarihi: 14. Yüzyıldan 21. Yüzyıla Türkiye’ye Göçler*, ed. M. Murat Erdağın and Ayhan Kaya (Istanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2015), 259–77., p. 264.

emigration.²¹⁹ Labor exportation policy of Turkey is significant due to the fact that, for the first time, Muslim and Turkish population began to emigrate from the country. However, this policy change was neither a product nor a source of a paradigmatic shift in the general understanding. The main drive was the economic crisis of the time and Turkey aimed to narrow the foreign trade deficit through remittances. Besides, it was thought that workers who work in while in European countries would come back as more skilled. Therefore, Turkish citizens going abroad were not regarded as the loss of population. Rather, they were accepted as ‘gurbetçi’ meaning one living away from home.

Coming to the institutional structure and the administrative tasks concerning migration policies, it is seen that the issue of international migration has received a more limited interest in the Turkish Administration system. Accordingly, Özer argues that the issue was basically addressed in two respects; cases where foreign nationals are legally present in Turkey, and the cases that foreign nationals are illegally present in Turkey²²⁰. For both of the cases, therefore, there was no state institution devoted only to migration regulation and public officers specifically charged of the migration-related duties. Hence, depending on the issue and scope of the migration policy, different institutions were undertaking different administrative tasks. Administrative tasks on residence and work permits, health, and education issues for the legal foreigners have been performed through already established central and local public bodies. The main responsibility for carrying out the tasks related to illegal foreigners was yielded to the Foreigners Departments within the General Directorate of Security of Interior (Turkish National Police) and the Coast Guard and Gendarmerie organizations. This administrative structure was maintained until the 2000s when the process of dramatic change on international migration policy of Turkey began.

In brief, the foundation of the legal basis to regulate international migration has been laid for the widespread concerns on the establishment of the homogeneous

²¹⁹ Kemal Kirişçi, “Turkey: A Country of Transition from Emigration to Immigration,” *Mediterranean Politics* 12, no. 1 (2007): 91–97, doi:10.1080/13629390601136871., pp. 91-2.

²²⁰ Y. Yeşim Özer, “Türk Kamu Yönetiminde Yeni Bir Çalışma Alanı Olarak Uluslararası Göç: Yasalaşma ve İdari Yapılanma Sürecinin Değerlendirilmesi,” *İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, no. 45 (2011): 73–88., p. 74.

Turkish society in the early Republican era. Accordingly, within this narrow framework, international human mobility was handled through unsystematic and reactive migration policies by regarding immigration either a threat or an asset depending on ethnic, religious and cultural backgrounds of the immigrants. In the absence of exclusive institutional structure, migration-related regulations have been enforced through central and local administration bodies. This administration style has been maintained since the early 2000s when the new legal arrangements were made to accommodate the mentality of the effective migration management. Although the nature of the international migration has been substantially changed in the 1980s and immigration has become totally a global phenomenon²²¹, Turkey continued to maintain its traditional policy.

4.1.3. Migration policy after 1980s; new challenges same policies

Despite the 1980s are considered as a new era²²² for Turkey because of a radical change in international migration patterns and the transformation of the social, cultural and economic environment in the near geography, Turkey continued to maintain its traditional migration policy. It is true that external incidents like political turmoil in near geography, gradual dissociation of the Soviet Union and the globalization process brought mass immigration flows of non-Turks and non-Muslims for the first time²²³. As a result, migratory waves affecting Turkey have significantly changed and diversified. Yet, the new phase of international migration did not stipulate a process of a policy transformation to cope with the new facets of human mobility. While some additional arrangements and regulations have been brought in, existing legal and institutional regulations grounded in politico-nationalist understanding continued to be implemented. Within the Settlement Law and the Geneva Convention relating the status of refugees, Turkey continued to accept people who only come from Europe as conventional refugees. For example, within the scope of ‘Turkish ethnicity and cultural affiliation’, Turkey continued

²²¹ Douglas S. Massey, *Worlds In Motion: Understanding International Migration At The End Of The Millennium* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 2.

²²² İçduygu and Aksel, “Turkish Migration Policies: A Critical Historical Retrospective.”

²²³ *Ibid.* pp.174-175.

accepting more than 300 thousand people from Bulgaria²²⁴, more than three thousand people from former Yugoslavia and Romania between 1981-1990²²⁵, and almost eighteen thousand people after the events that took place in Kosovo in 1999²²⁶. Similarly, Meskhetian (Ahiska) Turks living in the republics of the former Soviet Union began to migrate to Turkey after the disintegration of the Soviet Union and hundreds of immigrants have been settled in Turkey.²²⁷

Subject to the same legal regulations and under the light of the same nationalist understanding, people from the outside Europe has been given neither the status of asylum seeker nor the refugee status. Whereas the 1980s has brought thousands of asylum seekers from the Middle East, Africa and Asia, Turkey responded this situation by enforcing its legal regulations on foreigners²²⁸. Indeed, the Turkish government was reluctant to accept those even as ‘temporary guests’.²²⁹ In parallel with the underlying desire to have a homogenous Turkish society with a strong national identity, Turkey invoked ‘geographical limitation’ against those people arriving from the neighbor countries particularly after the Iranian Revolution, the Iran/Iraq war, and the first Gulf War. It was due to the reason that the incoming people were mainly Kurdish and they were representing different politico-cultural identity. Therefore, historical tension between Kurdish population and the statist approach based on political Turkishness have kept the traditional concern on homogeneous national identity for national security. Even in some cases, ‘unwanted’ asylum seekers were deported while the refoulment is prohibited in international law.

²²⁴ OECD, *Trends in International Migration: Continuous Reporting System on Migration* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2000), doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2000-en, p. 62.

²²⁵ Kemal Kirişçi, “Post Second World War Immigration from Balkan Countries to Turkey,” *New Perspectives on Turkey* 12, no. 1995 (1995): 61–77, doi:10.1017/S089663460000114X., p. 70.

²²⁶ *İttica ve Göç Mevzuatı* (Ankara: Başkent Matbaası, 2005)., p. 47.

²²⁷ İnan, “Türkiye’de Göç Politikaları: İskân Kanunları Üzerinden Bir İnceleme.”, p. 22.

²²⁸ Ahmet İçduygu, “The Politics of International Migratory Regimes: Transit Migration Flows in Turkey,” *International Social Science Journal* 52, no. 3 (2000): 357–67, doi:10.1111/1468-2451.00265., p. 360.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 360.

This situation attracted serious criticisms from international organizations and human rights advocacy groups²³⁰. For instance, the hesitation of the Republic to accept the large inflow of population during the First Gulf War was regarded by Trilateral Commissions' report as 'for the first time the consequences of refugee crisis were designated a political threat that called for political countermeasures.'²³¹ After Turkey adopted its own regulation on asylum and status determination in 1994, the tension between Turkey and the international organizations, particularly with UNHCR, has further intensified. Nevertheless, the partnership was rebuilt in 1997 and closer cooperation between Turkey and other intergovernmental organizations have been achieved in the following period.

Although the Republic's immigration and refugee policies remained the same, the regulations concerning emigration began to change. In 1981, Turkey has amended the Turkish Citizenship Law and granted the right to hold double or multi citizenship for the first time.²³² This adjustment, however, is neither a cause nor a consequence of a mentality change for migration policy of the country. When a Turkish citizen acquired the citizenship of a foreign state, it was not seen as infidelity towards the Turkish state.²³³ By preferring to apply the blood principle for citizenship, Turkey continued to pursue its nationalist understanding and wished to keep in close contact with the citizens abroad so as to encourage the emigrants to transfer their Turkish citizenship to their children.²³⁴

In the light of these examples, it is seen that traditional migration policy of Turkey continued to be implemented in the 1980s and 90s despite the changing migration patterns. The politico-nationalist understanding which was adopted in the early years of the Republic continued to be the basis of the international migration

²³⁰ Kemal Kirişçi, "Improved Implementation of the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees," *International Journal of Refugee Law* 13, no. 1,2 (2001): 71–79., p. 72.

²³¹ Meissner et al., "International Migration Challenges in a New Era.," p. 76.

²³² Işıl Özkan and Uğur Tütüncübaşı, "Türk ve Alman Hukukunda Çifte Vatandaşlığa İlişkin Gelişmeler," *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* 57, no. 3 (2008): 599–634, <http://auhf.ankara.edu.tr/auhfd/>, p. 600.

²³³ *Ibid.*, p. 619.

²³⁴ Ahmet İçduygu, Yılmaz Çolak, and Nalan Soyarik, "What Is the Matter with Citizenship? A Turkish Debate" 3206, no. May (2017), doi:10.1080/00263209908701291., p. 198.

policy of the Turks until 2000's. To be more precise, the real transformation process has been triggered not by the changing nature of the international migration but by the deepening relations of Turkey and the EU.

4.2. EU Governmentality of International Migration

As the central objective of this chapter is to apply the theoretical findings of the global governmentality of international migration from general to the specific, from global to domestic and from theoretical to practical, how effective migration management framework is promoted to Turkey should be examined via the EU accession process. In the previous chapter, it has been argued that the international migration issue is an important part of the neoliberal form of global governmentality in which the main motive is to maintain the dynamics of the global economic structures. Thus, migration should be managed so as to preserve the current social and economic relations by managing it through the requirements of the global and domestic labor markets. In the theoretical discussion part, it has been explained that effective migration management framework became a moral and ethical way of migration conduct in the name of 'best practice'. It has been also explained that this mode of governance is promoted to individual states via projects and conditions postulated by international and regional organizations. In the case of Turkey, the EU stands as the distinguished organization for the promotion of the effective migration management framework. By virtue of the pre-accession requirements, the Union made Turkey to develop a new regime on international migration management.



Figure 1: Promotion of the Migration Management Framework: Case of Turkey

In order to discuss how relevance is this new regime of Turkey with the global discourse on effective migration management, what is the EU's migration policy and how it is compatible with the global discourse should be elaborated in the first place. Being aware of the role of the EU as the promoter of the new policy agenda on international migration, in the following two parts EU's position towards international migration will be discussed by touching upon the general characteristics of the Common Asylum and Migration Policy. After then, what changes Turkey is required to bring about and how these changes are corresponding with the global discourse would be comes forward more clearly.

4.2.1. Development of the EU Common Migration and Asylum Policy

International migration issue became a contentious topic in the European politics and it began to be discussed within the Community's structures by the Member States in the mid-1980s. Since the early 1990s, immigration and asylum related policies have been considered as supranational issues which were previously linked to the domestic politics of the individual states²³⁵. As a part of the broader European integration, regulation of human mobility within, from and towards Europe attracted a particular interest. Growing number of arguments about the necessity of a common approach regulating international migration has begun to be recognized particularly after the end of the Cold War. While the immigration issue was on the agenda of the European states long before that,²³⁶ formalization of a common migration policy has been realized in the 1990s.

Starting from the Single European Act of 1985, it became an objective to liberalize the free movement of people among member states along with the free movement of goods, capital, money, information, and services. The idea of the removal of all physical, technical and fiscal barriers to the movement of the workers has been confirmed in 1985 with the Schengen Agreement when the five EC countries (France, Germany, Belgium, Luxemburg and the Netherlands) agreed to

²³⁵ Andrew Geddes, *The Politics of Migration and Immigration in Europe* (London: SAGE, 2003), p. 130.

²³⁶ For instance, in the 1950s and 60s, large-scale immigration took place in Europe as the immigration of unskilled and low-skilled workers particularly towards the Western Europe for the purpose to fulfill the labor gap in those booming economies. Rinus Penninx, "International Migration and Related Policies in Europe 1950-2015," *Bulletin of the Serbian Geographical Society* 96, no. 2 (2016): 18-41, doi:10.2298/GSGD1602014P., p. 19.

abolish internal borders and to apply common policies for the Third Country Nationals²³⁷. The idea of the complete internal market, common international border controls and shared asylum policy was firstly implemented in the mid-1990s²³⁸. Since then, free movement system in Europe has evolved through various regulations, directives and action plans.

The Maastricht Treaty of 1992 is the cornerstone not only of the broader European integration but also of the establishment of the EU common migration system. Through the recognition of the migration issue as a ‘common interest’²³⁹ and the establishment of formal cooperation mechanisms for migration management, the treaty paved the way for the further realization of common migration and asylum policy of the Union. With the ratification of the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997, the Schengen area has been formally established and the legal basis of the common migration policy has been provided within the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) of the Union. The Treaty ensured that further administrative and legislative regulations are carried out by five-years working plans. The first five-year program between 1999 and 2004 was called as Tampere agreement that set the agenda²⁴⁰ for the mutual recognition of the common migration and asylum policy. The objectives of the common migration and asylum policy determined in the Tampere program have been achieved in the second five-year term with The Hague Program between 2005 and 2009. Establishment of a systematic monitoring system, the lifting internal border controls in the Schengen area, implementation of the minimum standards for third country nationals and the strengthening of external border controls have been completed at this period.

²³⁷ Christina Boswell and Andrew Geddes, *Migration and Mobility in the European Union* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 58.

²³⁸ Penninx, “International Migration and Related Policies in Europe 1950-2015.”, p. 34.

²³⁹ Geddes, *The Politics of Migration and Immigration in Europe.*, p. 135.

²⁴⁰ Tampere program identified the shared commitment for EU's common migration and asylum policy in four main aspects; partnership with countries of origin, a common European Asylum System, fair treatment of Third Country Nationals and management of migration flow. “Tampere European Council 15-16.10.1999: Conclusions of the Presidency - European Council Tampere 15-16.10.1999: Conclusions of the Presidency,” accessed August 12, 2017, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/tam_en.htm#a.

These two programs have in common that both have emphasized the importance of cooperation among member states in the field of international migration management as a mean to provide prosperity and security. Tampere agreement mentioned the necessity to provide internal security and to create an area of freedom, security and justice (AFSJ) as a condition to abolish internal borders. This ambition was closely tied to stimulation of common visa, migration and asylum policy and integrated management of the external borders for the completion of the Single Market. Security-driven objectives of the EU common migration and asylum policy have been carried out throughout the Hague Programme. Being deeply concerned with the secure borders, these programs enabled to establish a broader legislative framework such as Visa Information System and overarching security institutions under Integrated Border Management System (IBM) such as FRONTEX²⁴¹ and Europol²⁴².

In the following period, common migration and asylum policy continued to stipulate the ideal of AFSJ in which the unregulated human mobility remained as the high level of security concern. Treaty of Lisbon (entered into force in 2009) has extended the EU's competence regarding AFSJ therefore, the measures for common migration and asylum system began to be adopted at supranational level²⁴³. Similarly, the Stockholm Program which was in effect between 2010 and 2014 stipulated further development of IBM through the modernization and technologization of the border management equipment.²⁴⁴ Yet, since the mid-2000s, the economic aspect of human mobility has also gained importance and the Union

²⁴¹ FRONTEX (European Border and Coast Guard Agency) has been established to coordinate and develop European border management. For further information; "Frontex | Mission and Tasks," accessed August 14, 2017, <http://frontex.europa.eu/about-frontex/mission-and-tasks/>.

²⁴² Europol is an EU law-enforcement institution established to prevent and combat all forms of international organized crimes. For further information; "Home | Europol," accessed August 14, 2017, <https://www.europol.europa.eu/>.

²⁴³ Ronald L. Holzacker and Paul Luif, "Introduction: Freedom, Security and Justice After Lisbon," in *Freedom, Security and Justice in the European Union: Internal and External Dimensions of Increased Cooperation after the Lisbon Treaty*, ed. Ronald L. Holzacker and Paul Luif (New York: Springer, 2014), 1–13., p. 6.

²⁴⁴ Raül Hernandez i Sàgrera, "Exporting EU Integrated Border Management beyond EU Borders: Modernization and Institutional Transformation in Exchange for More Mobility?," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 27, no. 1 (2013): 167–83, doi:10.1080/09557571.2012.734784., p. 170.

began to develop new policies to maximize economic benefits from migration by managing migration through the requirements of the EU labor market. At this juncture, the depiction of immigration as a threat to the Union's existence has been softened when legal labor migration was presented as the engine of European development. It is due to the reason the existence of the EU has been conditioned to its ability to compete with other global players and the management of the human mobility through the demands of the European single market was considered as a way to strengthen the Union in the global politics. Consequently, the negative connotation attributed to migration in the context of the management of migration for 'security' disappeared when migration is managed for 'development'.

Ever-increasing integration of the migration issue into the EU's development agenda particularly showed itself with the Union's 'Global Approach' policies. For instance, the 'Global Approach to Migration and Mobility' adopted by the Commission in 2011, explicitly acknowledged that 'Good governance of migration will also bring vast development benefits' and thus, it was suggested that the EU should 'engage more systematically in facilitating and managing migration and mobility'.²⁴⁵ Similarly, the Commission adopted the European Agenda on Migration in 2015 in which the effective management of labor migration to provide positive effects from human mobility was presented as rather crucial for EU's competing with other economies.²⁴⁶ Corresponding to the new commitment to better engagement of migration into the development agenda, the Union began to establish mobility partnerships with the third countries to promote 'legal' circular migration in order to meet the low-skilled labor demands of the EU labor market. Besides, for the purpose to attract highly qualified non-EU citizens, several initiatives have been taken for facilitation of entry of the talented foreigners. For instance, the EU Blue Card Directive has been adopted in 2009 which is an EU level high-skill migration scheme

²⁴⁵ "EUR-Lex - 52011DC0743 - EN - EUR-Lex," accessed August 15, 2017, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52011DC0743>.

²⁴⁶ "European Agenda on Migration," accessed August 15, 2017, https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/background-information/docs/communication_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf.

regulating the entry and residence of the qualified migrants except Denmark, Ireland and the UK²⁴⁷.

The historical development of EU Common Migration and Asylum policy shows that EU's policy on international migration has evolved into two directions; negative depiction of migration concentrated on rising crimes, terrorism, integration and unemployment and so on in the 1990s and attribution of positive meaning to legal labor migration in the 2000s. The initial tendency, and indeed the underlying reason for the establishment of common migration policy at the supranational level were grounded on the purpose to mitigate the negative effects of migration in Europe. As a consequence of the depiction of migration as spreading danger and threats, the new arrangements on common migration policy aimed to maintain the 'law and order' in Europe.²⁴⁸ In this contextualization, migration management was grounded on restrictive policies of immigration and the political and bureaucratic control over migratory processes. While the securitization discourses and practices continued to be powerful, EU common policy towards labor migration began to be changed. With the purpose to provide 'benefit' from human mobility, restrictive policies have been eased up so as to fill the gap in the EU labor market and to attract qualified non-EU citizens. In this juncture, the basic logic of EU's Common Asylum and Migration Policy based on migration management for maximum economic gains and for preventing illegal migration at the same time considerably resembles the effective migration management framework detailed in the previous chapter.

4.2.2. European Union; a Unique Case of Global Governmentality

According to Jonathan Joseph, European Union is a plausible example to investigate how governmentality works at international level by means of regulating state behavior in the certain direction.²⁴⁹ In common with global institutions, he argues that EU sets targets for the member states and for their governments for

²⁴⁷ Anna Triandafyllidou and Irina Isaakyan, "EU Management of High Skill Migration," *RSCAS Policy Brief*, 2014, 1–8, doi:2314-9698., p. 2.

²⁴⁸ Didier Bigo, "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease," *Alternatives* 27, no. 1 (2002): 63–92, doi:10.1177/03043754020270S105., p. 66.

²⁴⁹ Joseph, *The Social in the Global: Social Theory, Governmentality and Global Politics.*, p. 179.

implementing their policies²⁵⁰. By responsabilizing the actors for providing good governance and transparency through the inclusion of all the stakeholders and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, EU, particularly European Commission provides governance from a distance. When he examines the institutional functioning of the EU institutions and the policy documents, he finds out that the form of governance promoted from supranational level carries neoliberal values. In particular, the vision of the world we live in is grounded on globalization in a sense that EU's survival is attributed to the building of social, economic and technological capacity to compete with the others.²⁵¹ Hence, the form of governance that EU advocates require full commitment of the member states to take action for developing the knowledge economy.

Neoliberal rationale on the development policy of the Union is inevitably backed by the renewed understanding on security. In particular, Amsterdam Treaty of 1997 backboneed this new security understanding by setting out the free movement conditions within the union as well as common measures to control entries. By moving the issues of border control, asylum and immigration to the first pillar, the union achieved to create a social imaginary that the EU area is the space of freedom, security and justice.²⁵² This understanding was further stipulated via Hague (2004) and Stockholm (2009) programs and generated a common asylum system and migration management policy. Through freedom/security nexus suggested by the governmentality approach, renewed emphasis on the freedom of the European citizens in terms of freely moving and residing in the territory of the member states has been conditioned on advanced security controls and surveillance mechanisms²⁵³. Tazzioli and Walters interpret this situation as the establishment of a contemporary form of surveillance based on the logic of post-panopticism in which surveillance becomes more and more abstract but tracking the flows of human, money, choices

²⁵⁰ *ibid.*, p. 180.

²⁵¹ *ibid.*, p. 190.

²⁵² *ibid.*, pp. 206-7.

²⁵³ *ibid.*, pp.207-8.

and so on is crucial.²⁵⁴ In this context, migration is constructed as a security issue on the one hand, and as a technical issue of management based on the implementation of standards regulations, procedures and common rules in all member states on the other.

In terms of the neoliberal form of regulation, EU is a good example to see how governmentality fits in domestic regulation of the local population because of the social conditions of these particular societies.²⁵⁵ Since the EU promotes the understanding of global interdependence so that to justify framing social, political and economic problems and setting limits for the actions, it legitimizes the neoliberal assumption of competitiveness in the global context by extending competition into all aspects of social life.²⁵⁶ In this context, policies concerning the regulation of human mobility are getting more and more involved in the competitive demands of the global economy. Latest policies of the Union such as Blue Card Directive and circular migration initiatives to meet the labor market demands and to attract high-skill migrants appear to be a true reflection of this understanding. In consequence of the legitimation of substantial policies on migration management through the competitive demands of the global economy, migration governmentality of the EU tends to expand beyond the Union.

Didier Bigo suggests that the mode of ruling in common migration policy of the Union unifies the internal and external in a sense that the securitization discourse extends towards global level²⁵⁷. Attachment of internal security (whether criminal or economic sense) to the international migration enables the EU to better penetrate into the domestic politics of the third countries. Besides, EU's relative hegemony in the global politics and capacity to transfer the features it's social relations to third countries makes the Union occupy an important position at the global level. Accordingly, the Union promotes the (neoliberal) form of migration management by

²⁵⁴ Martina Tazzioli and William Walters, "The Sight of Migration: Governmentality, Visibility and Europe's Contested Borders," *Global Society* 30, no. 3 (2016): 445–64, doi:10.1080/13600826.2016.1173018., p. 450.

²⁵⁵ Joseph, *The Social in the Global: Social Theory, Governmentality and Global Politics.*, p. 180.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 186-188.

²⁵⁷ Bigo, "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease."

‘forming partnerships with the third countries, cooperating closely with neighbors [and] actively developing and promoting European and international standards’.²⁵⁸

Looking at the case of Turkey, the long-standing membership process that lasts more than 60 years and the attitude of many member states to prefer Turkey as a partner than a member make Turkey's situation both special and complex. In this study, therefore, discussions on Turkey's membership will not be addressed. Rather, regardless of whether or not membership would be granted one day, it will be discussed that through the accession process, Turkey has been promoted the neoliberal mode of migration management.

4.2.3. EU Accession Process and New Migration Management Regime of Turkey

Turkey has a very long history of the EU-membership process. To mention briefly the important turning points in the way of accession, Turkey signed the Ankara Agreement in 1963, the Additional Protocol in 1970, and finally was able to apply for the full membership in 1987. After joining the Customs Union in 1995, the official status of candidacy was eventually granted in 1999 at the Helsinki Summit. In the pre-accession framework, Turkey has been required to bring its domestic law in compliance with the Community law (or the Community *acquis*). In response to the legislative obligations of the member states, Turkey adopted an Accession Partnership document in 2001 and subsequently revised it in 2003. Herein, international migration issue was specified as one of the priority areas that should be harmonized with the EU *acquis*.²⁵⁹ As indicated in the accession partnership document of 2001 (and the final version of 2003), Turkey has been demanded a fundamental change in its international migration policy in line with the following objectives;

- Prevention of illegal migration and illegal smuggling of people and drugs
- Development of effective border management
- Adoption of the EU *acquis* in the field of data protection to join the Schengen Information System and Europol;

²⁵⁸ Joseph, *The Social in the Global: Social Theory, Governmentality and Global Politics.*, p. 208.

²⁵⁹ “Türkiye Katılım Ortaklığı Belgesi,” 2003, http://www.ab.gov.tr/files/AB_Iliskileri/AdaylikSureci/Kob/Turkiye_Kat_Ort_Belg_2007.pdf.

- Gradual adoption of EU negative visa list
- Adoption and implementation of EU legislation and practices on migration (acceptance, re-admission, deportation) to prevent illegal immigration,
- Removal of the geographical reservation for the 1951 Geneva Convention in the field of asylum and the development of residential and social support units for refugees²⁶⁰

Right after, Turkey has entered a new phase of its migration policy in order to give momentum to the EU membership process. Accordingly, a ‘modernization’ process has been accelerated in an attempt to fulfill the objectives determined through accession partnership. More specifically, the Union obliged Turkey to create a grand strategy for migration management in compliance with the EU Acquis on asylum and migration. This process has been supported by the Union through the financial assistance and knowledge transformation via joint projects, such as the project to “Support to Turkish Migration Authorities on Asylum” (2003), and The Asylum-Migration Twinning Project (2004). Within the scope of these projects, a variety of seminars and training programs were organized and a migration strategy for Turkey was finally set up. Although Turkey has already firmly committed to developing a migration management system even before these projects, when National Action Plan on Asylum and Migration was ratified in 2005, Turkey's commitment to this policy change has been officially approved. This formal approval further accelerated the ‘Europeanization’ of international migration management system of Turkey and the Action Plan aimed further ‘capacity building’ including strengthening of administrative and judicial competency in line with the EU acquis.²⁶¹ In this regard, the legal and institutional arrangements of the 2000s can be more meaningful when it is evaluated in reference to the EU-membership process.

4.2.4. Legal and Administrative Developments

Turkey has made substantial changes in the legal framework on its international migration policy throughout the EU accession requirements. In order to

²⁶⁰ “Türkiye Katılım Ortaklığı Belgesi,” 2001, http://www.ab.gov.tr/files/AB_Iliskileri/AdaylikSureci/Kob/Turkiye_Kat_Ort_Belg_2007.pdf., “Türkiye Katılım Ortaklığı Belgesi,” 2003.

²⁶¹ “İltica ve Göç Alanındaki Avrupa Birliği Müktesebatının Üstlenilmesine İlişkin Ulusal Eylem Planı,” 2005, http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik3/iltica-ve-goc-ulusal-eylem-plani_327_344_699.”

satisfy the requirements on migration management that Turkey must adhere before becoming an EU member state, a range of new national laws have been passed in the 2000s. Among them, the most extensive and fundamental legal development in the harmonization process is the adoption of the Law on Foreigners and International Protection in 2013²⁶². This law is, indeed, Turkey's first domestic law regulating international migration as a whole because the former policy of Turkey has been subjected to secondary legislations. By bringing together a number of issues previously regulated through various regulations, the law thereby, comprehensively regulates alien's status in Turkey except for work permits and immovable property²⁶³. That is to say, this law stands as the most important legal instrument for the new migration management system of Turkey and it is an important sign showing the Europeanization of the Turkey's migration policy since 'the law meets practically all the EU's requirements, including establishment of a specialized agency to deal with the reception of asylum-seekers and process their applications as well as the incorporation of the existing EU *acquis* in this area.'²⁶⁴

By introducing a renewed emphasis on the legal and institutional framework, the law forms the backbone of the migration management regime in Turkey. In an attempt to regulate all aspects of the international migration, the new provisions were introduced for the visa obligations, rules of entry and exit, the residence permit and the administrative authorization. In addition to the provisions regulating immigration, the law regulates the legal status of stateless persons and refugees, deportation conditions and the scope of international protection for those who seek asylum in Turkey²⁶⁵. However, even though Turkey has already shown its intention to lift the geographical limitation in the EU negotiation process²⁶⁶, the Law on Foreigners

²⁶² "Yabancılar ve Uluslararası Koruma Kanunu," *Resmî Gazete*, 2013, <http://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.6458.pdf>.

²⁶³ Esra Dardağan Kibar, "An Overview and Discussion of the New Turkish Law on Foreigners and International Protection," *Perceptions* 18, no. 3 (2013): 109–28., p. 109.

²⁶⁴ Umut Aydın and Kemal Kirişçi, "With or Without the EU: Europeanisation of Asylum and Competition Policies in Turkey," *South European Society and Politics* 18, no. 3 (2013): 375–95, doi: 10.1080/13608746.2013.799729., pp. 375-6.

²⁶⁵ Cavidan Soykan, "The New Draft Law on Foreigners and International Protection in Turkey," *Oxford Monitor of Forced Migration* 2, no. 2 (2014): 39–48., p. 40.

²⁶⁶ "İltica ve Göç Alanındaki Avrupa Birliği Müktesebatının Üstlenilmesine İlişkin Ulusal Eylem Planı."

maintains this limitation. Similar to the previous era, the Law prescribes that the refugee status can only be granted to the persons coming from Europe. Yet, it also provides a new protection statuses such as ‘conditional refugee’ and ‘secondary-protection statuses for those remain outside of the definition of the refugee.’²⁶⁷ Formation of an operational framework of asylum governance is again considered as the direct reflection of the EU asylum policy in the Turkish context.²⁶⁸ By this way, Turkey achieves to form an extensive ‘temporary protection’ system by reshaping the previous vision of ‘hospitality’ in a rights-based manner.²⁶⁹

Aside from the new Law on Foreigners, Turkey has enacted several national laws in response to the EU’s requirements which are listed in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Turkey’s new legal regulations on international migration

Legal Regulation	Year	What has brought
Definition of human trafficking as crime requiring heavy penalties	2002	It is the first regulation prohibiting the human trafficking.
Law on the Work Permit for Foreigners	2003	By lifting the previous restriction on several occupations for foreigners to hold, it has enabled foreigners to easily enter the labor market in Turkey.
Regulation for Implementation of Foreign Direct Investment Law	2003	regulating the principles for the promotion of foreign direct investment
Amendment to the Settlement Law	2006	The amendment has lifted the prohibition of the immigration of anarchists, spies and gypsies.
Amendment to the Turkish Citizenship Law	2009	The three-year waiting period has been introduced for foreigners to obtain Turkish citizenship who are married to Turkish citizens.
International Labor Force Law	2016	The law has brought a new vision for developing a grand strategy on international labor force by eliminating the barriers for the qualified workers to access the labor market of Turkey and by preventing unregistered-working of foreigners.

²⁶⁷ “Yabancılar ve Uluslararası Koruma Kanunu.”

²⁶⁸ Kibar, “An Overview and Discussion of the New Turkish Law on Foreigners and International Protection.”, pp. 109-10.

²⁶⁹ Özer, “Türk Kamu Yönetiminde Yeni Bir Çalışma Alanı Olarak Uluslararası Göç: Yasalaşma ve İdari Yapılanma Sürecinin Değerlendirilmesi.”

The EU-led transformation process of Turkey's international migration policy required formation of new administrative structures for migration management. In particular, Turkey was obliged to form civil authority applying standardized practices across the country for the regulation of all migratory trends. In this regard, under the Ministry of Interior, the national Bureau for Asylum and Migration is established in 2008. The Bureau was authorized with the preparation of a new migration legislation and administration in accordance with the EU requirements.²⁷⁰ The process of transition to civilian authority continued in other special areas even in the ones that used to be a hard-core security issue. For instance, in 2008, the Border Management Bureau was formed under the Ministry of Interior as a sole authority responsible for border security²⁷¹.

The new Law on Foreigners is a remarkable turning point not only for providing a legislative framework but also for establishing an institutional structure for migration management. Corresponding to Turkey's obligation to establish a grand civil-authority exclusive to migration and asylum management, the law authorized the Directorate General of Migration Management to 'implement an effective migration management system, to make a contribution to the development of migration policies at international level and the implementation thereof'.²⁷² The institution has been established under the Ministry of Interior and in order to coordinate the overall asylum and migration issues. Tasks of providing the sufficient daily needs of present migrants and informing them of their rights, access to services and responsibilities have been also assigned to the Directorate. Besides, in order to ensure that the policies developed in the Directorate are systematically implemented throughout the country, the Provincial Directorates of Migration Management have taken over the provincial duties in 2015 which were previously assigned to the National Police.

²⁷⁰ Franck Duvell, "International Relations and Migration Management: The Case of Turkey," *Insights Turkey* 16, no. 1 (2014): 35–44., p. 42.

²⁷¹ Ahmet İçduygu and Damla B. Aksel, "Türkiye'de Düzensiz Göç," *Uluslararası Göç Örgütü Türkiye*, 2012., p. 54.

²⁷² "Ministry Of Interior Directorate General Of Migration Management," accessed May 14, 2017, http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik3/vision_912_957_959.

The law also subsequently created the Migration Policy Board and the Migration advisory Board which have been committed to determining migration policies and strategies of Turkey, to coordinate public institutions and organizations working in the field of migration and to cooperate with the related international organizations²⁷³. Other central and local administrative bodies involved in migration management have listed in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Central and Local Administration Units on Migration Management

Central	Local
Commission on International Protection and Assessment	Provincial Disaster and Emergency Directorates
High Commission to Fight Against Irregular Migration	Provincial Directorates of Migration Management
Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD)	Municipalities*
	Governorates*
	Provincial Special Administrations*

*charged with special duties

4.3. Analogy between Effective Migration Management Framework and International Migration Management Regime of Turkey

Thus far, Turkey's traditional policy on international migration, the EU's Common Migration and Asylum policy and how Turkey established its new regime on migration management in response to the pre-accession requirements of the Union have been elaborated. It has been shown that the EU has paved the way for the administrative and legal restructuring for migration management in Turkey as well as developing a new understanding. In this final part of the chapter, now it is necessary to discuss whether this new regime of Migration management is compatible with the global discourse of effective migration management.

²⁷³ Yılmaz Demirhan and Seyfettin Aslan, "Türkiye'nin Sınır Ötesi Göç Politikaları ve Yönetimi," *Birey ve Toplum*, no. 9 (2015): 23–62., pp. 47-8.

4.3.1. Depiction of International Migration

It is already explained in the first section of this chapter that Turkey had perceived international migration as a threat to national integrity when immigrants did not have the Turkic ethnicity or share same cultural values. Accordingly, international migratory movements were considered as extraordinary situations that the country should have been coping with. Looking at the latest policy documents and acknowledged visions of migration-related public bodies, it is easily seen that international migration now is visioned as a normal and natural behavior of mankind.

As the principal agency of migration management in Turkey, Directorate General of Migration Management defines migration as ‘a social reality that has emerged throughout history as a result of the dynamic presence of human beings and driven by and the everlasting demand and necessity’.²⁷⁴ Naturalization and depoliticization of the depiction of international migration with the great role of the EU are obviously compatible with the global discourse explained in the previous chapter. What has been securitized, instead, is informality, which is again promoted by the Union. Correspondingly, Turkey has promised "strengthening the fight against illegal migration"²⁷⁵ which includes both effective border control and recording every movement of foreigners to make sure that no one is gone unnoticed. Presenting its dedication to fighting against illegal migration, Turkey has signed Readmission Agreements with sixteen countries since 2001.²⁷⁶ In line with Antonio Pecoud’s novel evaluation of the ‘post-control’ spirit prevailing in the new discourse on migration management²⁷⁷, what has been demanded by Turkey is to develop this kind of control mechanism.

This new position of Turkey required fundamental changes in legislative and administrative regulations in Turkey. Institutional and administrative changes discussed in the previous section are the products of this shift in the conceptual

²⁷⁴ “İçişleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü,” accessed May 18, 2017, http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik6/genel-bilgi_409_568_908_icerik.

²⁷⁵ “Türkiye Katılım Ortaklığı Belgesi,” 2003., p. 15.

²⁷⁶ Göç Politika ve Projeleri Dairesi Başkanlığı, “2016 Türkiye Göç Raporu” (Ankara: TC İçişleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları, 2017), http://www.goc.gov.tr/files/files/2016_goc_raporu_.pdf, p. 60.

²⁷⁷ Geiger and Pecoud, “The Politics of International Migration Management.”, p. 15.

understanding and the reflection of the new global discourse regarding international migration on Turkey by virtue of the EU accession process. By responsabilizing Turkey to develop its own migration management regime through the directives and progress reports, EU attached certain capacities and qualifications that Turkey required to develop. Lacking ‘expertise’ in this new field, Turkey had to get technical as well as financial assistance from the Union. Twinning projects, for instance, are instrumental tools that EU transfers the expert knowledge in the field of international migration by providing training seminars to state officials. Indeed, the most important reflection of this understanding in Turkey is the establishment of the Directorate General of Migration Management as a transition from polis centered-decision making to civil bureaucracy, or that is to say the transition from the traditional understanding of security to post-control spirit.

4.3.2. Migration Management for Development

With the help of (or under the directive of) the EU, Turkey entered into the process of transformation in its policy on international migration. Corresponding with depoliticization of migration, Turkey’s traditional migration policy began to be replaced with effective or ‘good’ management of human mobility with the purpose to govern the process good enough to get benefit from it. As the sole institution dedicated to this purpose, the Directorate General of Migration Management states that;

‘If it is managed well, migration brings about positive results, otherwise; it may lead to several negative results, particularly to threats against public order and security and also to human rights violations. As a result, development of effective migration management that supports economic development ensures public security and aims protection of the human rights of the migrants has gained vital importance.’²⁷⁸

Using almost the same expressions with the global discourse, the new system of Turkey is embedded in migration/development nexus in which the ‘effective migration management’ is formulated to maximize economic benefits and to minimize negative effects. In that case, it would not be misleading to argue that Turkey adopted the main understanding of the the effective management in which

²⁷⁸ *Turkey and Migration* (Directorate General of Migration Management Publication, 2014), http://www.goc.gov.tr/files/files/_goc_tasarçm_iNGiLiZCE.pdf, p. 6.

the international migration is managed in such a way that human mobility positively contributes to the domestic economy.²⁷⁹

This position has been further stipulated by new legislation on labor management. Initially, with the Law on Work Permit for Foreigners of 2003, the merits of the work permits of foreigners are determined in accordance with the needs and demands of the domestic economy²⁸⁰. Prior to this law, the work permit was given not directly to foreigners but to the workplace or company where the foreigners work. Besides, there was more than one institution in charge which was preventing to develop a comprehensive policy to regulate labor market. With this law, however, the authority to grant the work permit to foreigners has been transferred to the Ministry of Labor and Social Security²⁸¹. The Ministry argues that this legislative change provided new opportunities such as;

- Reduction of bureaucratic procedures by evaluating different needs together
- Convenience in inspection,
- Gathering of statistical information and data about foreigners in one center
- Ensuring coordination and coordination of fulfillment of international obligations
- Facilitation of foreign employment in line with the needs of the country²⁸²

According to the statistical data published by the aforementioned ministry, the total number of work permits given to foreigners in 2004 was 7.302. In 2015, the number reached out 64.547.²⁸³ Provision of work permits from a single institution has made it possible to make general assessments of qualifications as much as the quantities of foreigners entering the labor market in Turkey. In particular, the Ministry of Labor and Social Security of Turkey have assessed that foreigners who

²⁷⁹ Ayselın Gzde Yıldız, "Implications of the External Dimension of European Immigration Policy for Turkey," in *The European Union's Immigration Policy: Managing Migration in Turkey and Morocco* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 97–151., p. 104.

²⁸⁰ İduygu, Erder, and Genkaya, "Trkiye'nin Uluslararası G Politikaları, 1923-2023: Ulus-Devlet Oluşumundan Ulustesi Dnşmlere.," p. 241.

²⁸¹ "T.C. Çalıřma ve Sosyal Gvenlik Bakanlıđı / Uluslararası İşgc Genel Mdrlđ," accessed May 20, 2017, <http://www.calismaizni.gov.tr/baskanlik/hakkimizda/>.

²⁸² Fazıl Aydın, ed., *Yabancıların Çalıřma İzinleri Uygulama Rehberi* (Çalıřma ve Sosyal Gvenlik Bakanlıđı, 2014), https://www.csbg.gov.tr/media/2074/yci_uygulamarehberi.pdf.,

²⁸³ "T.C. Çalıřma ve Sosyal Gvenlik Bakanlıđı / Uluslararası İşgc Genel Mdrlđ," accessed May 22, 2017, <http://www.calismaizni.gov.tr/baskanlik/hakkimizda/>.

entered Turkey legally from the beginning of the 2000s were more likely to work in secondary labor markets or to engage in low-skilled jobs, which led to the problem of informality.²⁸⁴ At this juncture, in order to solve the problem of informality and to attract the high-qualified work force, there have been introduced new regulations in the work permit system.

The International Labor Force Law adopted in 2016 abolished the Law on Work Permit of Foreigners and authorized the Directorate General of International Labor Force within the Ministry of Labor and Social Security to prepare and implement broader objectives in this field. This law largely maintains the principles of the working permits of the foreigners stated in the previous law but also makes some significant changes in the foreign employment policy. Different from the former law, international labor force law determines the merits of exemptions and privileges that would be granted to foreigners. In particular, new law develops a system of ‘turquoise card’ which is designed to provide broader rights including indefinite or permanent work permit to whom are defined as ‘qualified foreigners’. According to the Article 5 of the law, qualified foreigners are defined as whom having the high level of education, investing in large-scale, contributing to scientific and technological advancement, or being internationally successful in cultural, artistic or sportive activities²⁸⁵. Therefore, in line with the global discourse on international migration, the law endeavors to attract foreign direct investment and to facilitate foreigners’ access to the market in order to improve competitive power of Turkey.

4.3.3. Migration Management for Security

The effective management framework also requires the development of policies to mitigate negative effects of human mobility. In contrast to facilitating migration policies to provide economic development, this dimension of effective migration management discourse calls for comprehensive policies to restrict international migration with a particular attention on irregular migration and transnational organized crimes. It is restrictive in a way that the state agency should

²⁸⁴ Ibid.

²⁸⁵ “Uluslararası İşgücü Kanunu,” *Resmi Gazete*, 2016, <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2016/08/20160813-1.htm>.

prevent irregular migration which would damage the dynamics of the labor market, and human mobility that fosters transnational organized crimes such as human and drug trafficking.

On the process of harmonization, Turkey committed to adopting EU policies of integrated border management and Schengen visa regime. Besides, within the scope of irregular migration, EU-Turkey Readmission agreement concerning the extradition of illegal migrants between the two parties signed in 2013 and enacted in 2016. However, with regards to expected transformation on these issues, there has not been much progress achieved so far.²⁸⁶ Similarly, Turkey did not completely adopted Schengen Policy regime and continued to implement more liberal visa policy instead of implementing visa requirement to the country in the EU negative list.

When it comes to fighting against organized crime, some steps are taken in this field. As already mentioned Turkey defined human smuggling as a crime in 2005 and provisioned some penalties on it. In 2013, a special service unit charged with the works on the victims of human trafficking within the Directorate General of Migration Management was set up. Yet, the enthusiasm in the development dimension of effective migration management is not seen in this area and Turkey prefers more to follow its own traditional policies on it. In the global context of international migration management, restrictive policies on human mobility are attributed either to transnational organized crimes and global mobility of terrorist organizations or ‘undesirable’ labor mobility. In the EU context, therefore, Turkey is expected to adopt integrated border management or new policies focused on solving problems specific to EU. Since Turkey becomes more and more popular transit country on the way of Europe, EU’s demand on transformation of restrictive migration policies of Turkey can be elaborated more as the Union’s case-specific concern than to enhance the capacity of a candidate state so as to grant membership. Because Turkey’s liberal visa system is crucially important for Turkish economy,

²⁸⁶ Yıldız, “Implications of the External Dimension of European Immigration Policy for Turkey.”, p. 116.

strict application of Schengen visa regime would generate negative consequences for Turkey's economic and trans-social relations²⁸⁷.

4.3.4. Cooperation on Migration Management

And as the final reflection of global discourse on migration management, Turkey has developed cooperation mechanisms both in domestic and international politics. In terms of internal management of international migration, New Migration management system was designed to include all related actors and domestic and international governmental and non-governmental organizations operating in the field of migration and they have been deeply encouraged to take a more active role in the process management. In the process of transformation towards effective migration management, International and domestic NGOs have started to increase their activities in Turkey. Being already present as the formal body of expertise in the field of international migration, IOM and UNHCR gradually expanded their field of activity. While IOM has been operating in Turkey since the first Gulf War in 1991, Turkey became an official member of IOM in 2004 and their partnership has been formalized. Turkey's relation with the UNHCR has also deepened in 2000s when the agency helped to harmonize Turkey's asylum policy with the EU²⁸⁸. They have been supported by local establishments as well. For instance, the Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants (ASAM) established in 1995 began to work closely with UNHCR on the process of refugee status determination since 2013.

Turkey also began to take part in global, regional and bilateral cooperations. In this regard, Turkey chairs the Budapest Process which is a regional consultative forum involving more than 50 states and 10 international organizations. The Process has been created to share information and the best practices on the issue like regular and irregular migration, asylum, visa and human trafficking. Turkey also led the process of the Silk Road Working Group. This project aims to support the

²⁸⁷ Kemal Kirişçi, "A Friendlier Schengen Visa System as a Tool of Soft Power: The Experience of Turkey," *European Journal of Migration and Law* 7, no. 4 (2005): 343–67, doi:10.1163/157181605776293219., p. 346.

²⁸⁸ Umut Aydın and Kemal Kirişçi, "With or Without the EU: Europeanisation of Asylum and Competition Policies in Turkey," *South European Society and Politics* 18, no. July 2014 (2013): 375–95, doi:10.1080/13608746.2013.799729., p. 382.

development of a sustainable migration management system in Iraq, Pakistan, and Afghanistan which are historically sending countries. Moreover, Prague Process, Almaty Process, Bali Process, Hague Process and Rabat Process are other dialogue forums regarding effective migration management Turkey has joined. Finally, in 2014-2015, Turkey assumed the rotating presidency of the Global Migration and Development Forum from Switzerland²⁸⁹.

As elaborately discussed in the previous chapter, these cooperation mechanisms are effective tools for global promotion and consolidation of ‘effective migration management’ understanding. Being as active as international organizations expected, it can be evaluated that Turkey became a part of global governmentality of international migration since as a country being shaped and reshaped in the field of migration, Turkey began to shape third countries in the same direction.

As the final remark on the discussion, the process of the conduct of the Turkey’s behavior on international migration is a successful example since it reflects new mentality on migration management. To show it in a nutshell, the Table 4 below has been generated to demonstrate the fundamental characteristics of the effective migration management framework and their reflection in the EU’s Common Migration and Asylum Policy and the new migration management framework of Turkey.

²⁸⁹ “İçişleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü,” accessed August 16, 2017, http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik3/turkiyenin-duzensiz-gocle-mucadelesi_409_422_424.

Table 4: Merits of the Migration Management in the Global Discourse, the European Union and Turkey

Global Discourse on Effective Migration Management	Common Asylum and Migration Policy of the European Union	New Migration Management of the Regime of Turkey
International Migration as a Management issue based on technical expertise	✓	✓
Depiction of international Migration as normal and natural behavior of human kind	Normalization of the legal migration	Normalization of the legal migration
The basis of management; The Principle of 'Regulated Openness' (Restrictive policies + Facilitative Policies)	✓	✓
Restrictive Policies; Migration Management for (traditional) Security	-Integrated Border management; Strict Border Control, Systematic monitoring system -Schengen Visa Regime -Implementation of Minimum Standards for the Third Country nationals	-Integrated Border Management (not fully functional) -New Legal and Institutional arrangements fighting against human trafficking, transnational organized crimes and illegal migration
Facilitative Policies; Migration Management for Economic Development;	-Softened policies on legal migration -Initiatives on Circular and Temporary Labor Migration -Mobility Partnerships -Blue Card Initiative	-Law on Work Permit for Foreigners -International Labor Force Law -Turquoise Card System -Liberal Visa Policy
Global Approach; Cooperation	-Membership Process -Partnership Agreements -Readmission Agreements -Active involvement in the regional and global cooperation processes	-Partnership Agreements -Readmission Agreements -Active involvement in the regional and global cooperation processes -Improved relations with the regional and international organizations
'Neoliberalization' of Migration Management re-formulation of Migration/development nexus and promotion of neoliberal values; competition, flexibility,	-Managing migration to increase EU's capacity to compete with other global powers -Development of a grand migration management strategy flexible enough to deal with the global changes	-Managing migration to fill the labor gap in the Labor Market of Turkey so as to boost economic development and to increase Turkey's capacity to compete in the global economy -Development of a grand migration management strategy flexible enough to deal with the global changes

4.4. Conclusion

In this chapter, Turkey's policies on international migration have been elaborated in two periods; traditional migration policy of Turkey starting from the establishment of the country till the Helsinki summit of 1999, and the new migration management understanding ever since the summit. It has been argued that irrespective of the changing nature of international migration patterns affecting Turkey, the country continued to implement its traditional policies towards migrants. These traditional policies were established on the nationalist concerns; hence immigration and emigration patterns beyond the scope of Turkish national identity have been highly politicized and greatly responded. It is true that dynamics and conditions of human mobility affecting Turkey historically changed. However, paradigmatic change concerning how to deal with migration is something that is part of more structural and deep-seated transformation at the global level. Accordingly, this chapter attempted to see how paradigmatic shift to migration management was realized in Turkey in response to the EU's requirements.

After the candidate status was granted in the Helsinki Summit of 1999, Turkey initiated a process of a drastic change in its migration policy in line with effective migration management framework. It has been explained that in response to the EU's requirements, Turkey has made several arrangements on its legislative and administrative regulations and developed a migration management system. It is not asserted here that the traditional migration policy of Turkey was comprehensive enough to cope with the new challenges. Rather, it is argued that the emergence of new patterns of migration goes back to 1980s, but the migration policy of Turkey began to change in the 2000s. In this direction, beyond a domestic necessity, development of a new international migration management system should be examined through Turkey's relations with the regional and international organization within the broader understanding of global governmentality of international migration. In particular, EU/ Turkey relations give further insight into Turkey's attempt to reconceptualize its migration policy not as conditionality that the EU externally imposes on Turkey but as a good example of global governmentality in which the EU along with other intergovernmental organizations governs the Turkey's behavior in the field of international migration.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The main concern of this study was to examine how neoliberal globalization shapes the policies concerning international migration. Through the theoretical lenses of the global governmentality approach, this thesis particularly focused on governmentalization of international migration at the global level so as to reveal how domestic management of international migration is conducted globally. It has been claimed that international migration is globally governmentalized in which domestic policies of the individual states to conduct cross-border human mobility are conducted at the global level. It was also shown that the delineation of ‘good’ governance of international migration has been frequently ascribed to neoliberal globalization. By this way, the contemporary migration management policies have been fixed to the regulation of human mobility through the demands of the global capitalist structures. This has particularly shown itself when the issue of international migration has been linked to the field of development and when the good governance of migration has been attributed to providing (economic) benefits from the human mobility.

In general, this study offers some important insights into the field of international migration and the approach of global governmentality. It has been shown that international migration management existentially hinges on the neoliberal form of global governmentality. Since the effective migration management discourse has been obtained on the basis of migration/development nexus, it is obvious that it would make no sense in a scenario in which neoliberal globalization or global integration of the capitalist production process does not exist. Thus, in the direction of the global governmentality approach, the new framework on effective migration management has been evaluated as a part of the hegemonic project of the advanced liberal societies at the global level. In this framework, globalization narrative has

been constantly reproduced since the international migration is depicted as a global phenomenon and the good governance of it is conditioned to the bilateral, regional, interregional and global cooperation. This, in return, strengthened the position of international and regional organizations to intervene the domestic policies of the individual states on the one hand, and maintained state's structural positions by preserving power asymmetries between sending and receiving countries on the other. It is particularly came into view on the 'benefit' argument which suggests if a state better engages its migration policies in its development policies, the state can achieve economic benefits so its competitive power in the global economy increases. Yet, the 'uneven' feature of the international sphere does not give equal opportunities to the every single country and the same logic of management may not bring the expected consequences to the each actor.

Accordingly, this study reaches a conclusion that effective migration management discourse plays an important role in sustaining the dynamics of global capitalism by enabling human mobility to meet the demands of the global labor market. In fact, this study argues that conditions of governmental practices in the field of international migration are determined by the requirements of the global capital accumulation, thus migration management would be 'effective', 'beneficiary' or 'legitimate' only if human mobility is regulated through the demands of global structures of capitalism. Yet, the illusion of the 'benefit' discourse hides the more critical considerations on state's asymmetrical power relations and the disadvantageous states in the current social and economic production process. Throughout the thesis, it has been argued that international migration management framework is an important tool to sustain the dynamics of neoliberal globalization and the capitalist system. Therefore, it serves better to the greatest beneficiaries of this system.

In the final part of the thesis, Turkey was chosen to see how 'effective migration management' is promoted. It has been concluded that new migration management regime of Turkey has been established in response to the pre-accession requirements of the EU rather than being a domestic necessity to reform the existing policies towards international human mobility. In other words, the Union has conditioned Turkey to develop a comprehensive 'international migration management' system compatible with EU's common asylum system and migration

management policy. To be more precise, the effective migration management framework has been promoted to Turkey through the EU. When Turkey's new system of migration management was compared with the global discourse, it was assessed that this new system is compatible with the global discourse on effective migration management. By redefining the meaning of 'international migration' as a social reality, human mobility was depoliticized. This shift in the conceptual understanding has enabled to develop a new system based more on managerial and technical governance of international migration. Hence, Turkey realized a 'development-friendly' system of migration management in which the human mobility was intended to be managed to fill the gap in the labor market and to contribute to the economic growth. Thereby, this study attempted to approach the recent transformation of international migration policy of Turkey from a different perspective in which establishment of migration management system was not considered exclusive to EU-Turkey relations but as the reflection of the global discourse of effective migration management within a particular society.

In terms of the case of Turkey, this study provides an opportunity to evaluate the recent changes in migration policy from a different angle. Broadly speaking, the general tendency in examining international migration policy of Turkey is to determine the change in the migration flows affecting Turkey by determining the new variables and to examine the state policies in response to this. In other words, the migration policies of Turkey are frequently examined by making temporal distinctions on categorical shifts in which the main focus is on human mobility as the principal object of government²⁹⁰. While admitting their importance, this study attempted to bring a new perspective by considering state policies to conduct human

²⁹⁰, For instance, Ahmet İduydu, one of the most respected researchers in this field, portrays four principal periods in terms of Turkey's responses to the changes on the migration reality; 1923-1950s; two way immigration and emigration circulation, 1960s; migration boom, 1980s; the emergence of new migration patterns, 2000s; new mode on migration transition and its governance; İduygu, Erder, and Genkaya, "Trkiye'nin Uluslararası G Politikaları, 1923-2023: Ulus-Devlet Oluşumundan Ulusötesi Dönüşümlere."; İduygu and Aksel, "Turkish Migration Policies: A Critical Historical Retrospective."; Ahmet İduygu, "Demographic Mobility over Turkey: Migration Experiences and Government Responses," *Mediterranean Quarterly* 15, no. 4 (2004). Some other examples are; Yıldız, "Implications of the External Dimension of European Immigration Policy for Turkey."; Kirişçi, "Turkey: A Country of Transition from Emigration to Immigration."; Özge Bilgili, "Turkey's Multifarious Attitude towards Migration and Its Migrants," *Migration Policy Center, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies*, 2012.

mobility as also an object of government. Accordingly, by looking at how Turkey actively pursued migration management policy via the lenses of global governmentality approach, this study neither privileged nor denounced state sovereignty to determine how international migration should be managed. Rather, it has been argued that field of action on international migration has been shaped globally in a way that Turkey had to adopt ‘effective migration management’ scheme not because it has been forcefully dictated, but because it has appeared as the best option to deal with human mobility in a world shaped through neoliberal globalization.

Turkey is not an advanced liberal society so the new framework does not provide the same benefits that the framework suggested. When, for instance, Turkey generated a grand strategy on migration management on the migration/development nexus, the country aimed to attract high-skilled non-Turkish nationals so as to increase scientific and technological advancements within the country and to increase Turkey’s competitive power in the global politics. In that line, the Law on Work Permit for Foreigners was adopted in 2003 and the merits of the work permit were determined to fulfill the needs and the demands of the domestic economy and to draw the attention on the qualified labor force.²⁹¹ Yet, the Ministry of Labor and Social Security of Turkey has explicitly acknowledged that the legal migrants in Turkey are more likely tend to work in secondary labor markets and in low skilled jobs²⁹². This is why the state had to prepare a new law (namely the International Labor Force Law) and to bring new principles and regulations to attract highly skilled labor force. This very specific example is significant to show that when Turkey (or an equivalent state) adopts the same governmental mentality, the structural position of the state in the international realm tends to disadvantage the state compared to the advanced liberal societies. In this context, the Turquoise Card system of Turkey (not operational yet) is likely to attract less foreigners than its equivalent practices such as the Blue Card initiative of the European Union or the Green Card System of the United States.

²⁹¹ İçduygu, Erder, and Gençkaya, “Türkiye’nin Uluslararası Göç Politikaları, 1923-2023: Ulus-Devlet Oluşumundan Ulusötesi Dönüşümlere.”, p. 241.

²⁹² “T.C. Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı / Uluslararası İşgücü Genel Müdürlüğü.”

And finally, although the great influence of the European Union on Turkey's policies towards international migration is stated in almost every study, this interaction is mostly sought to be put on a political ground of EU-Turkey relations²⁹³. The issue of international migration, typically seen as a bargaining chip, is regarded as an area where the two sides display of power. However, this point of view is insufficient to explain why Turkey continues to work towards strengthening effective migration management, even when its relations with the EU worsened steadily. In fact, the year 2016 has been a highly turbulent and complicated in terms of the EU-Turkey relations, so the overall situation has been regarded increasingly negative in many aspects. However, Turkey continued to favor effective migration management scheme for regulating human mobility through the demands of the labor market. For instance, Turkey took an important step by adopting the International Labor force law in 2016, which is considered as an important legal tool to attract high-quality labor force. Accordingly, it shows that while the process of transformation has been triggered by the EU, now it became part of the neoliberal transformation of Turkey, thereby it continues to progress independently of the conditions of the EU. At this point, this study suggests that international migration policy of the EU is not unique, but it is intertwined with the global hegemonic discourse.

In addition to some good insights this thesis provides, a number of important limitations need to be considered too. To begin with, the scope of this study was limited in terms of governmentalization of international migration at the global scale to shape the behaviors of individual states in this field. Thus far, global governmentality approach has been quite successful in explaining how effective migration management regime was imposed on Turkey. Yet, the approach also suggests that the success or failure of governmentality in the domestic level depends on social and historical conditions available in this particular society. This means that while global governmentality of international migration has been successful to regulate Turkey's attitude towards international migration since Turkey established a

²⁹³ Some examples are; Yıldız, "Implications of the External Dimension of European Immigration Policy for Turkey."; Ali Tekin and Aylin Güney, eds., *The Europeanization of Turkey: Polity and Politics* (Routledge, 2015).; Aydın and Kirişçi, "With or Without the EU: Europeanisation of Asylum and Competition Policies in Turkey."; Ahmet İçduygu and Damla B. Aksel, "Two-to-Tango in Migration Diplomacy: Negotiating Readmission Agreement between the EU and Turkey," *European Journal of Migration and Law* 16 (2014): 337–63, doi:10.1163/15718166-12342060.

migration management regime in line with the hegemonic discourse, assessment of whether this new system is fully operational in the local context necessitates further evaluation.

This study preferred not to point out how effective this new system is in Turkey due to several reasons. First of all, the main objective of this study is to examine the spread of neoliberal values in the field of international migration, and in this consideration, to analyze the compatibility of the new conceptualization of migration management with neoliberal globalization. Accordingly, the domestic operation of the system is beyond the scope of this thesis. Moreover, ‘social and historical conditions’ are rather a broad premise to get hold of. Thereby, it requires further study in order to gain any further conclusion and to get some concrete signs. To be more precise, even if Turkey's new regime of migration management reflects neoliberal values and it is consistent with global discourse, the process of neoliberal transformation of the country needs to be examined in detail to see whether this system is operational at domestic level. This transformation, which also encompasses other policy fields such as education and health, may only be meaningful when historical and social examination of the neoliberal transformation that the Turkey has been carrying out since the 1980s. Finally, despite the fact that the new approach on international migration began to be realized through administrative and legislative changes at the beginning of the 2000s, the most important steps have been taken quite recently. Therefore, it would be misleading to discuss whether the new system is operational at domestic level before at this moment.

All things considered, this study has shown that international realm has been shaped in the field of international migration so as to responsabilize individual states to regulate human mobility through the demands of the international labor market. It has been also shown that new understanding of effective migration management is realized in Turkey through legal and administrative changes. Yet, several questions remain unanswered and reserved for the future researches on this issue. One important issue that requires further study is the domestic functioning of this system. What kind of changes this new system leads to in practice requires further study. For example, the fact that foreigners now have easier access to the labor market of Turkey, but this does not necessarily mean that the demand for foreigners has increased in return.

As already explained, the conceptual model of migration management has been established on the promise that if migration is managed effectively, it would be beneficial for sending and receiving countries and the migrants themselves, since it would fill the gap in the global labor market and contribute to economic growth. Placing effective management system on the migration/development nexus and encouragement of development-friendly policies on migration has certain implications on the characteristics of migrants as well. A further study may be conducted on the compatibility of self-realization of migrants with neoliberal subjectivity.

REFERENCES

- (DESA), United Nations Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. *Compendium of Recommendations on International Migration and Development*. New York, 2006.
- . “United Nations Global Migration Database.” Accessed April 29, 2017. <https://esa.un.org/unmigration/>.
- (IOM), International Organisation for Migration. “About IOM.” Accessed April 28, 2017. <https://www.iom.int/about-iom>.
- . “IOM’s Global Migration Data Analysis Centre | Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC),” 2017. <https://gmdac.iom.int/capacity-building-search>.
- Abadan-Unat, Nermin. “Türkiye’nin Son Elli Yıllık Emek Göçü: Yorum, Eleştiri, Öngörü.” In *Türkiye’nin Göç Tarihi: 14. Yüzyıldan 21. Yüzyıla Türkiye’ye Göçler*, edited by M. Murat Erdağ and Ayhan Kaya, 259–77. Istanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2015.
- Ashley, Richard K. “Untying the Sovereign State: A Double Reading of the Anarchy Problematique.” *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 17, no. 2 (1988): 227–62. doi:10.1177/03058298880170020901.
- Ashley, Richard K., and Rob B. J. Walker. “Speaking the Language of Exile: Dissident Thought in International Studies.” *International Studies Quarterly* 34, no. 3 (1990): 259–68. doi:10.2307/2600569.
- Ashutosh, Ishan, and Alison Mountz. “Migration Management for the Benefit of Whom? Interrogating the Work of the International Organization for Migration” 1025, no. April (2017): 20–38. doi:10.1080/13621025.2011.534914.
- Assembly, United Nations General. “Summary of the High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development,” 2006. <http://www.un.org/esa/population/migration/hld/>.

Aydın, Fazıl, ed. *Yabancıların Çalışma İzinleri Uygulama Rehberi*. Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı, 2014.
https://www.csgb.gov.tr/media/2074/yci_uygulamarehberi.pdf.

Aydın, Umut, and Kemal Kirişçi. “With or Without the EU: Europeanisation of Asylum and Competition Policies in Turkey.” *South European Society and Politics* 18, no. July 2014 (2013): 375–95. doi:10.1080/13608746.2013.799729.

Aydın, Umut, and Kemal Kirişçi. “With or Without the EU: Europeanisation of Asylum and Competition Policies in Turkey.” *South European Society and Politics* 18, no. 3 (2013): 375–95. doi:10.1080/13608746.2013.799729.

Bank, World. “Migration | Data | DataBank.” Accessed April 29, 2017.
<http://databank.worldbank.org/data/databases/migration>.

Barry, Andrew, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas S. Rose. *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Betts, Alexander. “Introduction.” In *Global Migration Governance*, edited by Alexander Betts. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Bigo, Didier. “Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease.” *Alternatives* 27, no. 1 (2002): 63–92.
doi:10.1177/03043754020270S105.

Bilgili, Özge. “Turkey’s Multifarious Attitude towards Migration and Its Migrants.” *Migration Policy Center, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies*, 2012.

Boswell, Christina, and Andrew Geddes. *Migration and Mobility in the European Union*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Boucher, Gerard. “A Critique of Global Policy Discourses on Managing International Migration.” *Third World Quarterly* 29, no. 7 (2008): 1461–71.
doi:10.1080/01436590802386757.

Bradley, Megan. “The International Organization for Migration (IOM): Gaining Power in the Forced Migration Regime.” *Refugee* 33, no. 1 (2015).

- Burchell, Graham. "Liberal Government and Techniques of the Self." In *Foucault and Political Reason Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government*, edited by Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas Rose, 19–37. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Burchell, Graham, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Castles, Stephen. "Migration, Crisis, and the Global Labour Market." *Globalizations* 8, no. 3 (2011): 311–24. doi:10.1080/14747731.2011.576847.
- Castles, Stephen, and Nicholas Van Hear. "Root Causes." In *Global Migration Governance*, edited by Alexander Betts, 287–307. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Dean, Mitchell. *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE Publications, 2010.
- Defert, Daniel. "'Popular Life' and Insurance Technology." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 211–35. The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Deleuze, Gilles. "What Is Dispositif?" In *Michel Foucault, Philosopher: Essays*, edited by Timothy J. Armstrong, 159–68. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.
- Demirhan, Yılmaz, and Seyfettin Aslan. "Türkiye'nin Sınır Ötesi Göç Politikaları ve Yönetimi." *Birey ve Toplum*, no. 9 (2015): 23–62.
- Dillon, Michael. "Governing through Contingency: The Security of Biopolitical Governance." *Political Geography* 26, no. 1 (2007): 41–47. doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2006.08.003.
- Donzelot, Jacques. "The Mobilization of Society." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Duvell, Franck. "International Relations and Migration Management: The Case of Turkey." *Insights Turkey* 16, no. 1 (2014): 35–44.

Dünyada ve Türkiye’de Yasadışı Göç. Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü Yabancılar Hudut İltica Dairesi Başkanlığı, 2001.

Düvell, Frank. “Irregular Migration.” In *Global Migration Governance*, edited by Alexander Betts, 78–109. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Emek İnan, Canan. “Türkiye’de İskân Siyaseti: İskâna Yönelik Örgütsel Yapı Üzerinden Bir İnceleme.” *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 22 (2014): 82–102.

Essentials of Migration Management: A Guide for Policy Makers and Practitioners Vol.1, Vol.2, Vol.3. Geneva: International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2004.

“EUR-Lex - 52011DC0743 - EN - EUR-Lex.” Accessed August 15, 2017. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52011DC0743>.

“European Agenda on Migration.” Accessed August 15, 2017. https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/background-information/docs/communication_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf.

Ewald, François. “Insurance and Risk.” In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 197–211. The University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Foucault, Michel, Mauro Bertani, and Alessandro Fontana. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*. New York: Picador, 2003.

Foucault, Michel, Hubert L. Dreyfus, and Paul Rabinow. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Foucault, Michel, and Colin Gordon. “Power, Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972 - 1977.” edited by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

- Foucault, Michel, and Michel Senellart. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Foucault, Michel, Michel Senellart, François Ewald, and Alessandro Fontana. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*. New York: Picador/Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- “Frontex | Mission and Tasks.” Accessed August 14, 2017.
<http://frontex.europa.eu/about-frontex/mission-and-tasks/>.
- Geddes, Andrew. *The Politics of Migration and Immigration in Europe*. London: SAGE, 2003.
- Geiger, Martin, and Antoine Pecoud. “The Politics of International Migration Management.” In *The Politics of International Migration Management*, edited by Martin Geiger and Antoine Pecoud, 1–21. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2011.646800.
- George, Jim. “Realist ‘Ethics’, International Relations, and Post-Modernism: Thinking Beyond the Egoism-Anarchy Thematic.” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 24, no. 2 (1995): 195–233.
- Georgi, Fabian, and Susanne Schatral. “Towards a Critical Theory of Migration Control: The Case of the International Organization for Migration (IOM).” In *The New Politics of International Mobility: Migration Management and Its Discontents*, edited by Martin Geiger and Antoine Pecoud, 193–221, 2012.
- Ghosh, Bimal. “Introduction.” In *Managing Migration: Time for a New International Regime?*, edited by Bimal Ghosh. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001391/139149e.pdf>.
- . , ed. *Managing Migration: Time for a New International Regime?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “New International Regime for Orderly Movements of People: What Will It Look Like?” In *Managing Migration: Time for a New International Regime?*, edited by Bimal Ghosh, 220–49. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- . “Towards a New International Regime for Orderly Movements of People.” In *Managing Migration: Time for a New International Regime?*, edited by Bimal Ghosh, 6–27. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Gordon, Colin. “Governmental Rationality: An Introduction.” In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Göç Politika ve Projeleri Dairesi Başkanlığı. “2016 Türkiye Göç Raporu.” Ankara: TC İçişleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları, 2017. http://www.goc.gov.tr/files/files/2016_goc_raporu_.pdf.
- Group, Global Migration. “Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning: A Handbook for Policy-Makers and Practitioners.” International Organisation for Migration, 2010.
- Guy, Jean-Sébastien. “Beyond Global Modernity, Global Consciousness and Global Governmentality: The Symmetrical Anthropology of Globalization.” *European Journal of Social Theory* 19, no. 4 (2016): 451–67. doi:10.1177/1368431016655066.
- Hacking, Ian. *Hacking the Human: Social Engineering Techniques and Security Countermeasures*. Hampshire: Gower Publishing Limited, 2008.
- Hamann, Trent H. “Neoliberalism, Governmentality, and Ethics.” *Foucault Studies*, no. 6 (2009): 37–59. doi:papers2://publication/uuid/FA40A384-B2D2-4839-860E-EA85F61AE023.
- Harvey, David. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. 1st ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Holzhacker, Ronald L., and Paul Luif. “Introduction: Freedom, Security and Justice After Lisbon.” In *Freedom, Security and Justice in the European Union: Internal and External Dimensions of Increased Cooperation after the Lisbon Treaty*, edited by Ronald L. Holzhacker and Paul Luif, 1–13. New York: Springer, 2014.
- “Home | Europol.” Accessed August 14, 2017. <https://www.europol.europa.eu/>.

İçduygu, Ahmet, Yılmaz Çolak, and Nalan Soyarik. "What Is the Matter with Citizenship? A Turkish Debate" 3206, no. May (2017). doi:10.1080/00263209908701291.

International Organisation for Migration (IOM). "RCPs by Region - International Organization for Migration," 2016. <https://www.iom.int/rcps-region>.

International Organization for Migration. "About RCPs." Accessed April 27, 2017. <https://www.iom.int/about-rcps>.

International Organization for Migration (IOM). "Authority and Responsibility of States." In *Essentials of Migration Management: A Guide for Policy Makers and Practitioners Vol.1*, n.d.

———. *International Migration and Development: Perspectives and Experiences of the International Organisation for Migration*, 2006.

International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Federal Office for Migration (FOM). "International Agenda for Migration Management: Common Understandings and Effective Practices for a Planned, Balanced, and Comprehensive Approach to the Management of Migration." *The Berne Initiative*, 2005. <http://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/iamm.pdf>.

IOM - International Organisation for Migration. "World Migration 2003: Managing Migration: Challenges and Responses for People on the Move," 2003.

———. "World Migration Report: Communicating Effectively About Migration," 2011.

IOM - International Organization for Migration. "International Cooperation." In *Essentials of Migration Management Volume One: Migration Management Foundations*, n.d. http://www.rcmvs.org/documentos/IOM_EMM/v1/volume1.html.

———. "World Migration 2005: Costs and Benefits of International Migration," 2005.

———. "World Migration Report: The Future of Migration: Building Capacities for Change," 2010.

İçduygu, Ahmet. "Demographic Mobility over Turkey: Migration Experiences and Government Responses." *Mediterranean Quarterly* 15, no. 4 (2004).

———. "The Politics of International Migratory Regimes: Transit Migration Flows in Turkey." *International Social Science Journal* 52, no. 3 (2000): 357–67. doi:10.1111/1468-2451.00265.

İçduygu, Ahmet, and Damla B. Aksel. "Turkish Migration Policies: A Critical Historical Retrospective" XVIII, no. 3 (2013): 167–90. <http://sam.gov.tr/turkish-migration-policies-a-critical-historical-retrospective-ahmet-icduygu-and-damla-b-aksel/>.

———. "Türkiye’de Düzensiz Göç." *Uluslararası Göç Örgütü Türkiye*, 2012.

———. "Two-to-Tango in Migration Diplomacy: Negotiating Readmission Agreement between the EU and Turkey." *European Journal of Migration and Law* 16 (2014): 337–63. doi:10.1163/15718166-12342060.

İçduygu, Ahmet, Sema Erder, and Ömer Faruk Gençkaya. "Türkiye’nin Uluslararası Göç Politikaları, 1923-2023: Ulus-Devlet Oluşumundan Ulusötesi Dönüşümlere," 2014.

"İçişleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü." Accessed May 5, 2017. http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik3/kitlesele-akinlar_409_558_559.

"İçişleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü." Accessed May 18, 2017. http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik6/genel-bilgi_409_568_908_icerik.

"İçişleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü." Accessed August 16, 2017. http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik3/turkiyenin-duzensiz-gocle-mucadelesi_409_422_424.

"İltica ve Göç Alanındaki Avrupa Birliği Müktesebatının Üstlenilmesine İlişkin Ulusal Eylem Planı," 2005. http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik3/iltica-ve-goc-ulusal-eylem-planı_327_344_699.

İltica ve Göç Mevzuatı. Ankara: Başkent Matbaası, 2005.

İnan, Canan Emek. "Türkiye’de Göç Politikaları: İskân Kanunları Üzerinden Bir İnceleme." *Göç Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2, no. 3 (2016): 10–33.

- Joseph, Jonathan. "Combining Hegemony and Governmentality to Explain Global Governance." *Spectrum: Journal of Global Studies* 6, no. 1 (2012): 1–15.
- . "Poverty Reduction and the New Global Governmentality." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 35, no. 1 (2010): 29–51. doi:10.2307/40645277.
- . *The Social in the Global: Social Theory, Governmentality and Global Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Joseph, Jonathan, and Olaf Corry. "Jonathan Joseph and Olaf Corry Review Each Other's Books on Governmentality and Global Politics and Then Respond to Each Other's Reviews." *European Political Science* 13, no. 1 (2014): 124–30.
- Kalm, Sara. "Liberalizing Movements? The Political Rationality of Global Migration Management." In *The Politics of International Migration Management*, edited by Martin Geiger and Antoine Pecoud, 21–45. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Karpat, Kemal. "Introduction." In *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays*, 1–33. Boston: Brill, 2004.
<http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/ebookviewer/ebook/ZTAwMHh3d19fMTMzMDI2X19BTg2?sid=78b45545-0cb0-4185-9361-997139c9ccb0@sessionmgr4006&vid=5&format=EB>.
- Kibar, Esra Dardağan. "An Overview and Discussion of the New Turkish Law on Foreigners and International Protection." *Perceptions* 18, no. 3 (2013): 109–28.
- Kirişçi, Kemal. "A Friendlier Schengen Visa System as a Tool of Soft Power: The Experience of Turkey." *European Journal of Migration and Law* 7, no. 4 (2005): 343–67. doi:10.1163/157181605776293219.
- . "Improved Implementation of the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees." *International Journal of Refugee Law* 13, no. 1,2 (2001): 71–79.
- . "Post Second World War Immigration from Balkan Countries to Turkey." *New Perspectives on Turkey* 12, no. 1995 (1995): 61–77. doi:10.1017/S089663460000114X.
- . "Turkey: A Country of Transition from Emigration to Immigration." *Mediterranean Politics* 12, no. 1 (2007): 91–97. doi:10.1080/13629390601136871.

- Kooiman, Jan. "Governance and Governability: Using Complexity, Dynamics and Diversity." In *Modern Government: New Government-Society Interactions*, edited by Jan Kooiman. London: SAGE Publications, 1993.
- Kotz, David M. "Capitalism and Forms of Capitalism: Levels of Abstraction in Economic Crisis Theory." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 47, no. 4 (2015): 541–49. doi:10.1177/0486613415584573.
- Larner, Wendy. "Globalization, Governmentality and Expertise: Creating a Call Centre Labour Force." *Review of International Political Economy* 9, no. 4 (2002): 650–74. doi:10.1080/0969229022000021844.
- Larner, Wendy, and William Walters. "Globalization as Governmentality." *Alternatives* 29, no. 5 (2004): 495–514.
doi:papers2://publication/uuid/E4530498-A026-4793-92A4-46448A46BDA9.
- Lemke, Thomas. "Foucault, Governmentality and Critique." *Rethinking Marxism* 14, no. 3 (2002): 49–64. doi:10.1080/089356902101242288.
- León, Alba I., and Henk Overbeek. "Neoliberal Globalisation, Transnational Migration and Global Governance." In *Handbook of International Political Economy of Migration*, edited by Leila Simona Talani and Simon McMahon, 37–54. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2015.
- Levatino, A., and A. Pecoud. "Overcoming the Ethical Dilemmas of Skilled Migration? An Analysis of International Narratives on the 'Brain Drain.'" *American Behavioral Scientist* 56, no. 9 (2012): 1258–76.
doi:10.1177/0002764212443817.
- Lindsey, Linda L. "Sharp Right Turn: Globalization and Gender Equity." *Sociological Quarterly* 55, no. 1 (2014): 1–22. doi:10.1111/tsq.12051.
- Martin, Susan F. "International Cooperation on Migration and the UN System." In *Global Mobility Regimes*, edited by Rey Koslowski, 29–51. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Massey, Douglas S. *Worlds In Motion: Understanding International Migration At The End Of The Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

- McNevin, Anne. "Irregular Migrants, Neoliberal Geographies and Spatial Frontiers of 'the Political.'" *Review of International Studies* 33, no. 2007 (2007): 655–74. doi:10.1017/S0260210507007711.
- Meissner, Doris M., Robert D. Hormats, Antonio Garrigues Walker, and Shijuro Ogata. "International Migration Challenges in a New Era." *The Trilateral Commission*, 1993.
- Memisoglu, Fulya. "Between the Legacy of Nation-State and Forces of Globalisation: Turkey's Management of Mixed Migration Flows," 2014. <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/33862#?>
- Migration, International Organization for. "Towards the 2013 High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development Final Report of the High-Level Dialogue Series," 2013.
- "Ministry Of Interior Directorate General Of Migration Management." Accessed May 14, 2017. http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik3/vision_912_957_959.
- Mishra, Vinod, Victor Togbe, Yumiko Kamiya, and Julia Ferre. *World Population Policies 2013*. UN Dept. of Economic & Social Affairs, Population Division, 2013. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.
- Morton, Adam David. "Unravelling Gramsci: Hegemony and Passive Revolution in the Global Political Economy." *Pluto Press*, 2007. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.
- Munck, Ronaldo. "Globalisation, Governance and Migration: An Introduction." *Third World Quarterly* 29, no. 7 (2008): 1227–46. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01436590802386252>.
- Nielson, Julia, and Daria Taglioni. "A Quick Guide to the GATS and MODE 4," no. November (2003). http://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/microsites/IDM/workshops/Trade_2004_04051004/related_docs/quick_guide.pdf.
- OECD. *International Migration Outlook 2016*, 2016. http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/international-migration-outlook-2016_migr_outlook-2016-en.

- . “OECD Migration Databases - OECD.” Accessed April 29, 2017.
<http://www.oecd.org/els/mig/oecdmigrationdatabases.htm>.
- . *Trends in International Migration: Continuous Reporting System on Migration*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2000.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2000-en.
- Özer, Y. Yeşim. “Türk Kamu Yönetiminde Yeni Bir Çalışma Alanı Olarak Uluslararası Göç: Yasalaşma ve İdari Yapılanma Sürecinin Değerlendirilmesi.” *İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, no. 45 (2011): 73–88.
- . *Uluslararası Göç ve Yabancı Düşmanlığı*. Istanbul: Derin Yayınları, 2015.
- Özkan, Işıl, and Uğur Tütüncübaşı. “Türk ve Alman Hukukunda Çifte Vatandaşlığa İlişkin Gelişmeler.” *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* 57, no. 3 (2008): 599–634. <http://auh.f.ankara.edu.tr/auhfd/>.
- Pecoud, Antoine. *Depoliticising Migration: Global Governance and International Migration Narratives*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- . “Informing Migrants to Manage Migration? An Analysis of IOM’s Information Campaigns.” In *The Politics of International Migration Management*, edited by Martin Geiger and Antoine Pecoud, 184–202. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Penninx, Rinus. “International Migration and Related Policies in Europe 1950-2015.” *Bulletin of the Serbian Geographical Society* 96, no. 2 (2016): 18–41.
doi:10.2298/GSGD1602014P.
- Rose, Nikolas. “Governing ‘Advanced’ Liberal Democracies.” In *Foucault and Political Reason Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government*, edited by Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas Rose, 37–65. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- . “Government, Authority and Expertise in Advanced Liberalism.” *Economy & Society* 22, no. 3 (1993): 283–99.
- . *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- Rose, Nikolas, and Peter Miller. "Political Power Beyond the State: Problematics of Government." *British Journal of Sociology* 61, no. SUPPL. 1 (2010): 271–303. doi:10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01247.x.
- Rosenberg, Justin. "Kenneth Waltz and Leon Trotsky: Anarchy in the Mirror of Uneven and Combined Development." *International Politics* 50, no. 2 (2013): 183–230. doi:10.1057/ip.2013.6.
- . "Why Is There No International Historical Sociology?" *European Journal of International Relations* 12, no. 3 (2006): 307–40. doi:10.1177/1354066106067345.
- Rosenow, Doerthe. "Decentring Global Power: The Merits of a Foucauldian Approach to International Relations." *Global Society* 23, no. 4 (2009): 497–517.
- Sagrera, Raül Hernandez i. "Exporting EU Integrated Border Management beyond EU Borders: Modernization and Institutional Transformation in Exchange for More Mobility?" *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 27, no. 1 (2013): 167–83. doi:10.1080/09557571.2012.734784.
- Selby, Jan. "Engaging Foucault: Discourse, Liberal Governance and the Limits of Foucauldian IR." *International Relations* 21, no. 3 (2007): 324–45. doi:10.1177/0047117807080199.
- Seyhan, Osman. "Changing the Status Quo of Migration and Asylum Policies in Turkey: A Narrative Inquiry." *Journal of Organisational Transformation & Social Change* 11, no. 3 (2014): 185–206. doi:10.1179/1477963314Z.00000000029.
- Soykan, Cavidan. "The New Draft Law on Foreigners and International Protection in Turkey." *Oxford Monitor of Forced Migration* 2, no. 2 (2014): 39–48.
- Şeker, Nesim. "Forced Population Movements in the Ottoman Empire and the Early Turkish Republic: An Attempt at Reassessment through Demographic Forced Population Movements in the Ottoman Empire and the Early Turkish Republic : An Attempt at Reassessment through Demogra." *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, no. 16 (2013).
- "T.C. Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı / Uluslararası İşgücü Genel Müdürlüğü." Accessed May 20, 2017. <http://www.calismaizni.gov.tr/baskanlik/hakkimizda/>.

“T.C. Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı / Uluslararası İşgücü Genel Müdürlüğü.” Accessed May 22, 2017.
<http://www.calismaizni.gov.tr/baskanlik/hakkimizda/>.

Talani, Leila Simona. “Introduction: An IPE Perspective on International Migration.” In *Handbook of International Political Economy of Migration*, edited by Leila Simona Talani and Simon McMahon, 1–14. UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2015.

“Tampere European Council 15-16.10.1999: Conclusions of the Presidency - European Council Tampere 15-16.10.1999: Conclusions of the Presidency.” Accessed August 12, 2017.
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/tam_en.htm#a.

Tazzioli, Martina, and William Walters. “The Sight of Migration: Governmentality, Visibility and Europe’s Contested Borders.” *Global Society* 30, no. 3 (2016): 445–64. doi:10.1080/13600826.2016.1173018.

Tekin, Ali, and Aylin Güney, eds. *The Europeanization of Turkey: Polity and Politics*. Routledge, 2015.

The Global Commission on International Migration. “Migration in an Interconnected World: New Directions for Action,” 2005.
<http://www.queensu.ca/samp/migrationresources/reports/gcim-complete-report-2005.pdf>.

“The Turkish Law of Settlement.” *Official Gazette*, 1934.
http://gocdergisi.com/kaynak/1934_2510_settlement_law.pdf.

Triandafyllidou, Anna, and Irina Isaakyan. “EU Management of High Skill Migration.” *RSCAS Policy Brief*, 2014, 1–8. doi:2314-9698.

Turkey and Migration. Directorate General of Migration Management Publication, 2014. http://www.goc.gov.tr/files/files/_goc_tasarçm_İNGİLİZCE.pdf.

“Türkiye Katılım Ortaklığı Belgesi,” 2001.
http://www.ab.gov.tr/files/AB_Iliskileri/AdaylikSureci/Kob/Turkiye_Kat_Ort_Belg_2007.pdf.

- “Türkiye Katılım Ortaklığı Belgesi,” 2003.
http://www.ab.gov.tr/files/AB_Iliskileri/AdaylikSureci/Kob/Turkiye_Kat_Ort_Belg_2007.pdf.
- “Uluslararası İşgücü Kanunu.” *Resmi Gazete*, 2016.
<http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2016/08/20160813-1.htm>.
- UN General Assembly. “Declaration of The Hague on the Future of Refugee and Migration Policy,” 2002.
- . “International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (CMW). Resolution 45/158 of 18 December 1990,” 1990.
- UNHCR. “The Refugees Operational Portal.” Accessed April 29, 2017.
<http://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations>.
- United Nations. *World Economic and Social Survey 2004: International Migration*, 2004.
- Walker, Rob. B. J. *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. “2008: The Demise of Neoliberal Globalization | MR Online.” Accessed August 23, 2017. <https://mronline.org/2008/02/01/2008-the-demise-of-neoliberal-globalization/>.
- Wichum, Ricky. “Security as Dispositif: Michel Foucault in the Field of Security.” *Foucault Studies* 1, no. 15 (2013): 164–71.
- Wickramasekara, Piyasiri. *Bilateral Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding on Migration of Low Skilled Workers: A Review*. Geneva: International Labor Organisation, 2015.
- Wise, Raul Delgado. “The Migration and Labor Question Today Imperialism, Unequal Development, and Forced Migration.” *Monthly Review-An Independent Socialist Magazine* 64, no. 9 (2013): 25–39.
- Wodak, Ruth. “Introduction: Discourse Studies - Important Concepts and Terms.” In *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michal Krzyzanowski, 1–30. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

“Yabancılar ve Uluslararası Koruma Kanunu.” *Resmi Gazete*, 2013.
<http://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.6458.pdf>.

Yıldız, Ayselin Gözde. “Implications of the External Dimension of European Immigration Policy for Turkey.” In *The European Union’s Immigration Policy: Managing Migration in Turkey and Morocco*, 97–151. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

ULUSLARARASI GÖÇ'ÜN KÜRESEL YÖNETİMSELLİĞİ: TÜRKİYE ÖRNEĞİ

Bu çalışmada, neoliberal küreselleşmenin uluslararası göç politikalarını nasıl şekillendirdiği incelenmektedir. Neoliberal küreselleşme, sermayenin, malların, hizmetlerin, bilgi ve teknolojinin serbest dolaşımına dayanan ve 1980'lerden itibaren giderek yaygınlaşan toplumsal ve ekonomik bir süreçtir²⁹⁴. Neoliberal küreselleşmeye yönelik dönüşümler, piyasa ilişkilerinden toplumsal ilişkilere kadar, her türlü insan eyleminin yönlendirildiği çok yönlü bir süreçte gerçekleşmektedir. Bu dönüşümün ölçeği ve derinliği göz önüne alındığında, uluslararası göç konusu da bu büyük dönüşümün bir parçası olarak değerlendirilmekte ve sürecin etkilerini incelemek için uygun bir çalışma alanı olarak öne çıkmaktadır. Özellikle, uluslararası göç konusunun 1990'lı yıllardan itibaren küresel bir politika konusu olarak sıklıkla tartışılmaya başlanması, göç yönetimine yönelik eleştirel analizlerin önemini artırmıştır. Bu doğrultuda, küresel yönetimsellik yaklaşımının kuramsal görüşleri ışığında, bu tez uluslararası göç yönetiminin uluslararası düzeyde yönetilmesine odaklanarak, egemen devletlerin göç politikalarının uluslararası ve bölgesel örgütler vasıtasıyla nasıl şekillendirildiği incelemektedir. Bu örgütler tarafından geliştirilen Etkili göç yönetimi modeli üzerinden, uluslararası göç politikalarının neoliberal küreselleşmeye uyumlu bir biçimde yeniden düzenlenmesi tartışıldıktan sonra, bulgular Türkiye örneği üzerinden test edilmiştir.

²⁹⁴ Linda L. Lindsey, "Sharp Right Turn: Globalization and Gender Equity," *Sociological Quarterly* 55, no. 1 (2014): 1–22, doi:10.1111/tsq.12051., pp. 2-4.

Çalışmanın temel sorunsalı neoliberal küreselleşmenin uluslararası göç politikalarını nasıl şekillendirdiğidir. Tezin başlangıç noktasını oluşturan bu soru, küresel yönetimsellik yaklaşımının teorik temellerinden yola çıkarak cevaplanmıştır. Bu yaklaşımın temel prensiplerini anlamak için öncelikle Michael Foucault'un 'yönetimsellik' kavramı açıklanmış, sonrasında ise liberal ve neoliberal yönetimsellik modellerinin temelleri incelenmiştir. 'Yönetim sanatı' anlamına gelen yönetimsellik kavramı, bireysel ve kolektif insan hareketlerinin belirli amaçlara ulaşmak için siyasi bir akıl doğrultusunda ve belirli taktikler ve araçlarla yönetilmesidir.²⁹⁵ Foucault'a göre, liberalizm ve neoliberalizm politik birer ideoloji değil, ortaya çıktığı dönemin yönetimsellik sorunlarına cevap veren birer yönetim aklıdır. 19. Yüzyılda Avrupa'da ortaya çıkan Liberal devlet aklı, dönemin sosyal, siyasi ve ekonomik sorunlarına cevap olarak laissez faire prensibinin etkin olduğu sınırlı ve etkili yönetim anlayışına dayanır. Bu yönetim tarzı, bir yandan piyasanın doğal işleyişinin yönetsel müdahalelerle bozulmaması gerektiğini ve bireylerin ekonomik çıkarlarını takip etmesinin kamu yararına olduğunu savunurken, öte yandan piyasanın sınırlarının ve bireylerin etkinlik alanlarının politik müdahalelerle sınırlandırıldığı bir yönetim sanatıdır. 20. Yüzyılda ortaya çıkan neoliberal yönetim aklı ise, yönetim pratiğinin toplumsal ve ekonomik alanların rekabet olgusu üzerinde yeniden şekillendirilmesi gerektiğini savunur. 2. Dünya savaşından sonra Alman ve Avusturyalı ekonomistler tarafından geliştirilen bu yönetim aklı Amerika birleşik devletlerinde ise Chicago ekolü olarak kendine yer bulmuştur. Etkili ve sınırlı yönetimin temel prensip olarak gösterildiği bu modelde de, yönetim aklı sürekli ve yoğun yönetsel müdahalelerin yolunu açar.

Neoliberal-küresel yönetimsellik yaklaşımı, ileri liberal toplumlarda ortaya çıkan bu yönetim sanatının uluslararası arenaya aktarıldığı savından yola çıkarak, bu yönetimsellik modelinin tüm dünyaya yayıldığını savunur. Özellikle neoliberal yönetimselliğin hâkim olduğu bu devletler, uluslararası ve bölgesel örgütler üzerindeki etkinleri vasıtasıyla, bu örgütlerin egemen devletlere bir takım projeler ve koşullar sunarak neoliberalleşmelerini sağlamaktadırlar. Böylece, ekonomik ve toplumsal yaşamın küresel ölçekte neoliberalleşmesi sağlanarak, sosyal ve ekonomik

²⁹⁵ Michel Foucault and Michel Senellart, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 4.

retim iliřkilerinin dengede tutulması ve devamlılıęı saęlanmaktadır. Jonathan Joseph tarafından geliřtirilen bu yaklařıma gre, kresel ynetimsellięin iki boyutu vardır; egemen devletlerin politikalarının uluslararası rgler vasıtasıyla neoliberal ynetim sanatına doęru řekillendirilmesi bu ynetim sanatının ilkelerin kendini zg sosyal ve toplumsal zelliklerine baęlı olarak iřlevselleřmesi. Joseph'e gre, gnmz dnya politikasında hkim olan neoliberal ynetim sanatı, devletin hareket alanlarını sınırlandırmakta ve ynlendirmekte olduka bařarılıdır. Fakat benimsenen neoliberal ynetimsellięin, devletlerin yerel politikalarında bařarılı olup olmayacaęı, ancak o toplumlarda mevcut olan sosyal ve toplumsal řartlar incelendięinde ortaya ıkar.

alıřmanın sonraki blmnde, neoliberal kreselleřmenin uluslararası g politikalarını nasıl řekillendirdięi, kresel ynetimsellik yaklařımıyla incelenmektedir. zellikle, 'etkili g ynetimi' sylemi zerinden, egemen devletlerin uluslararası g politikalarının kresel ynetimsel mdahalelerle nasıl řekillendirildięi incelenmektedir. Michael Dean tarafından geliřtirilen ynetimin analizi, bu blmde uluslararası g konusuna uygulanmıřtır. Ynetim pratiklerinin hangi zel kořullarda ortaya ıktıęını, sregeldięi ve deęiřtięini gstermeyi amalayan ynetimin analizi, drt ana ařamadan oluřmaktadır²⁹⁶. Bu ařamalar, grme ve algılama biimi, Hakikatin retimi iin belirli szckler ve usullere dayanarak, ayırt edici dřnme ve sorgulama yolları, belirli bir ynetim aklının zgl mekanizmalar, teknikler ve teknolojilere dayanarak mdahale etmek iin belirledięi yollar ve son olarak kiřilerden ya da aktrlerden beklenen karakteristik zellikleri ortaya ıkarmaya yneliktir²⁹⁷. zellikle 1990larda orta ıkan 'g ynetimi' kavramı zerinden, bu ařamalar Uluslararası G rgt, Dnya Ticaret rgt ve Birleřmiř Milletler Mlteçiler Yksek Komiserlięi gibi uluslararası rgtlerin ortaya koydukları vizyon ve misyonlar doęrultusunda yayınladıkları yıllık raporlar, projeler, faaliyet raporları ve benzeri dokmanlar incelenerek deęerlendirilmiřtir.

'G ynetimi' kavramı ilk kez 1993 yılında Birleřmiř Milletler Kresel Ynetiřim Komisyonu ve İsve Hkmetinin talebi zerine oluřturulan NIROMP

²⁹⁶ Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, p. 30.

²⁹⁷ Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, p. 38.

projesi içinde Bimal Ghosh tarafından kullanılmıştır.²⁹⁸ Ghosh, insan hareketliliğini yönetilmesinin elzem olduğu günümüz dünyasında, göç yönetiminin göç veren ülkeler, göç alan ülkeler ve göçmenler için fayda sağlaması adına ‘düzenlenen açıklık’ (regulated openness) prensibini temel alması gerektiğini savunur.²⁹⁹ Bu prensibe göre, devletlerin göç politikaları ne fazla kısıtlayıcı ne de fazla liberal olmamalıdır. Göç yönetimi öyle bir biçimde gerçekleştirilmedi ki, insan hareketliliğinin doğurduğu olumsuz sonuçlar bertaraf edilirken, olumlu etkilerinden azami ölçüde fayda sağlanmalıdır. Dolayısıyla, uluslararası göç yönetimi sınır ötesi insan hareketliliğini aynı anda hem kısıtlayıcı hem de kolaylaştırıcı değildir.³⁰⁰ Göç olgusunu olumsuz sonuçları olarak, uluslararası organize suçlar, uluslararası terörizm ve yasadışı göç gösterilirken, olumlu etkiler çoğunlukla göç/kalkınma ekseninde değerlendirilmiştir. Özellikle, kalkınma olgusu üzerinden ele alınan göç yönetimi, insan hareketliliğinin yerel ve küresel emek piyasasının ihtiyaçları doğrultusunda yönetilmesi gerektiği anlayışına dayanmaktadır. Böylece, uluslararası göç, ülkelerin emek piyasalarının taleplerine cevap vererek, ekonomik kalkınmaya katkı sağlar ve ülkenin küresel piyasadaki rekabet gücünün artmasına katkı sağlar. Bu noktada, göç yönetimi kavramının kalkınma temelli ana prensibi, küresel kapitalizmin dinamik yapısının emek piyasaları üzerinden korunması ve devamlılığının sağlanması olarak öne çıkmaktadır. Göç yönetimine yönelik bu yaklaşım, ilgili uluslararası örgütlerin hareket noktasını oluşturmaktadır.

Küresel bir politika konusu olarak 1990lı yıllarda yeniden tanımlanan uluslararası göç olgusunun ilgili uluslararası kuruluşlar tarafından nasıl tasvir edildiği incelendiğinde, sınır ötesi insan hareketliliğinin ‘doğal’ ve ‘normal’ bir süreç olarak yeniden kavramsallaştırıldığı görülmektedir.³⁰¹ Küreselleşmenin ve küresel entegrasyonun doğal bir parçası olarak resmedilen uluslararası göç, negatif ya da

²⁹⁸ Ghosh, “Towards a New International Regime for Orderly Movements of People.”, pp. 8-9.

²⁹⁹ Ghosh, “Towards a New International Regime for Orderly Movements of People.”, p. 25.

³⁰⁰ Bimal Ghosh, “New International Regime for Orderly Movements of People: What Will It Look Like?,” in *Managing Migration: Time for a New International Regime?*, ed. Bimal Ghosh (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 220–49., p. 220-21.

³⁰¹ Sara Kalm, “Liberalizing Movements? The Political Rationality of Global Migration Management,” in *The Politics of International Migration Management*, ed. Martin Geiger and Antoine Pecoud (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 21–45., p. 35.

pozitif anlamlardan arındırılarak doğallaştırılmıştır, böylece siyasi bir yönetim konusu olmaktan ziyade teknik bir yönetim konusu olarak resmedilmiştir. Yönetim analitiğinin teknik boyutuna bakıldığında ise, bu uluslararası örgütlerin, iş birliği mekanizmaları vasıtasıyla, egemen devletlerin uluslararası göç konusundaki yerel politikalarına müdahale ettiği ve yönlendirdiği görülmektedir. 1990lı yıllardan itibaren giderek yaygınlaşan bölgesel ve küresel iş birliği mekanizmaları, hem uluslararası örgütlerin, egemen devletlerin göç politikalarına yönelik müdahalelerine meşru birer zemin oluşturulurken, hem de etkili göç yönetimi çerçevesinin en iyi uygulama biçimi olarak sunulmasını sağlamaktadır. Uluslararası göç yönetimi modelinin nasıl oluşturulduğu incelendiğinde ise, göç yönetimi bilgisinin kendilerini alanlarında uzman olarak sunan uluslararası örgütler tarafından üretildiği açıkça görülmektedir. Bu örgütler, topladıkları ve yayınladıkları bilgiler aracılığıyla, göç olgusunun küresel vizyonu ve normları oluşturmaktadır. Özellikle Uluslararası Göç Örgütü, göç yönetimi alanında uluslararası arenada en etkili kurum olarak göze çarpmaktadır. Bu örgütün sunduğu etkili göç yönetimi anlayışı, Göçün Kolaylaştırılması, Göç ve Kalkınma, Göçün Düzenlenmesi ve Zorunlu Göç konularında yönetim prensiplerini ve standartlarını belirler. Oluşturulan yönetim prensipleri ise en iyi uygulama biçimi olarak devletlere sunulmaktadır. Son olarak, egemen devletlerin, sunulan bilgiler ışığında, göç yönetiminin sağladığı kazanımları elde etmek için kapasite oluşturmaları beklenmektedir. Uluslararası Göç Örgütü devletlerden beklediği temel standartlar şunlardır;

‘Güncel ve doğru göç ve emek piyasası verileri, ulusal göç politikası hedef ve önceliklerini tanımlanması, göç alanında çalışan kişilerin eğitimi, etkili ve adil yasal çerçevenin geliştirilmesi, hükümet ve diğer ulusal paydaşlar arasındaki istişare mekanizmaları ve uluslararası işbirliğini mekanizmalarını içeren tutarlı idari yapılar’.³⁰²

Çalışmanın son bölümünde ise, Türkiye’nin 2000li yıllarda oluşturmaya başladığı uluslararası göç yönetimi modeli, uluslararası göçün küresel yönetimselliğinin başarılı bir örneği olarak incelenmiştir. Bu bölümde öncelikle Türkiye’nin geleneksel göç politikası incelenmiştir. Cumhuriyetin kurulduğu günden, 1999 yılında Helsinki Zirvesinde Avrupa Birliği üyeliğine aday ülke olarak kabul

³⁰² IOM - International Organization for Migration, “World Migration Report: The Future of Migration: Building Capacities for Change.”, p. 7.

edildiği döneme kadar, uluslararası göç konusu, politik bir konu olarak değerlendirilmiş, dolayısıyla devletin egemenlik alanına dâhil olan bir düzenleme meselesi olarak görülmüştür. Özellikle ‘Türklük’ politik kimliğine yönelik geliştirilen geleneksel göç politikası, devletin temel hedeflerinden biri olan homojen bir toplum oluşturma amacına uygun olarak oluşturulmuştur. Türkiye'nin geleneksel göç politikası, Avrupa Birliği ile olan ilişkilerinin derinleşmesine paralel olarak 2000'li yıllarda değişmeye başlamıştır. AB'nin katılım öncesi şartlarına cevap olarak Türkiye, uluslararası göç politikasında AB'nin Ortak Göç ve Mülteci Politikasıyla uyumlu bir değişik izlemiştir. Göç politikasındaki bu değişiklik ne ölçüde küresel söylemle uyumlu olduğunu görebilmek için, Avrupa Birliği'nin Ortak Göç ve Mülteci Politikasının tarihsel süreci, temel özellikleri ve Türkiye'den beklenen değişiklik noktaları açıklanmıştır. Bu bölümde son olarak, AB'nin başlattığı bu değişim sürecinin küresel söyleme olan uyumu incelenmiştir.

Türkiye'nin geleneksel göç politikası konuyu sınırlı bir çerçevede ele alan, sistematik olmayan ve ülkenin kurulduğu dönemdeki siyasi kaygılara paralel olarak homojen toplum inşası için bir araç olarak kurgulanmıştır. Özellikle ‘Türklük’ kimliği üzerine dayalı bu politika zemini, zamanla değişen göç patternlerinden etkilenmeyerek 2000li yıllara kadar sürdürülmeye devam etmiştir. Helsinki zirvesine kadar, uluslararası göç konusu, devletin egemenliğini etkileyen önemli bir politika konusu olarak kabul edilmiş ve göç hareketliliği dar bir hukuki çerçevede ele alınmıştır. Bu dönemde Türkiye'nin göç politikası milli kimlik ve toprak bütünlüğüne vurgu yapılarak, devletin önemli bir egemenlik alanı olarak görüldü. Dolayısıyla, uluslararası göç güçlü bir ulus devlet ve homojen bir toplum sağlamak için bir araç olarak görülmüştür. Uluslararası göç olgusunun, devletin varlığı ve sürekliliği açısından temel bir siyasi mesele olduğu zihniyetine dayanan bu dönemde, ulusal kimlik ve toprak bütünlüğünün önemine özellikle vurgu yapılmıştır.

Bu milliyetçi duruş ve egemenliğe atfedilen önem, hukuki düzenlemelerle meşru bir zemin kazanmıştır. 1934 yılında düzenlenen ve 2004 yılına kadar yürürlükte kalan İskân Kanunu, göçmen ve mülteci statülerini belirleyen ilk ve en önemli hukuki düzenlemedir. Bu kanunun 3. Maddesi, yalnızca ‘Türk soyundan ve Türk kültürüne bağlı olan’ kişilere göçmen statüsü tanımıştır. Aynı madde, mülteciyi ise zorlayıcı sebeplerden ötürü Türkiye’de bulunan ve yerleşme niyeti olmaksızın

geçici olarak barınan kimseler olarak tanımlamıştır.³⁰³ Mülteci statüsünün bu ilk kavramsallaştırması, Türkiye, Birleşmiş Milletler Mülteci Sözleşmesini onayladığında daha detaylı bir şekilde anlatılmıştır. Türkiye, 1951'de Sözleşmeyi, 1967'de ise Ek Protokolü 'coğrafi çekince' koyarak, yalnızca "Avrupa'da yaşayanların" mülteci olarak kabul edileceğini belirterek imzalamıştır. Göçmen statüsünün yalnızca Türk soyundan ve Türk kültürüne bağlı olan kişilere verilmesi, mülteci olarak ise yalnızca Avrupa'dan gelen kişilerin kabul edilmesi, ülkenin uluslararası göç politikasının oldukça sınırlı olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu durum, teoride ve pratikte 'yabancı' ve 'göçmen' ayrımına neden olmuştur.³⁰⁴ Ülke sınırları dâhilinde bulunan bu tanımların dışında kalanlar, yabancı olarak değerlendirilmişler dolayısıyla 'göç' sorunun bir parçası olarak görülmemişlerdir.³⁰⁵ Yabancıların hak ve yükümlülükleri ile bunların giriş ve çıkış usulleri ise Pasaport Kanunu (1950) ve Yabancıların İkamet ve Seyahatleri Hakkında Kanun (1950) gibi çeşitli mevzuatlarla belirlenmiştir. Uluslararası göç politikasının Türk İdari Yapılanmasında ise özel bir ilgilere haiz olmadığı, bu sınırlı göç politikasının mevcut yapılanma sahilinde yürütüldüğü gözlemlenmiştir.

1980'ler, yakın coğrafyadaki sosyal, kültürel ve ekonomik çevrenin dönüşümü nedeniyle Türkiye için yeni bir dönem olarak kabul edilmesine rağmen,³⁰⁶ geleneksel göç politikası sürdürülmeye devam edilmiştir. Yakın coğrafyadaki siyasi kargaşa, Sovyetler Birliği'nin kademeli olarak dağılması ve küreselleşme süreci gibi olaylar neticesinde, ilk kez Türk ve Müslüman olmayan kitlesel göç akımının Türkiye'yi etkilemeye başladığı doğrudur³⁰⁷. Fakat bu yeni göç dalgaları bir politika dönüşüm sürecine neden olmamıştır. Bazı ilave düzenlemeler ve yönetmelikler

³⁰³ "The Turkish Law of Settlement."

³⁰⁴ Fulya Memisoglu, "Between the Legacy of Nation-State and Forces of Globalisation: Turkey's Management of Mixed Migration Flows," 2014, <http://cadmus.eui.eu//handle/1814/33862#?>, p. 4.

³⁰⁵ Osman Seyhan, "Changing the Status Quo of Migration and Asylum Policies in Turkey: A Narrative Inquiry," *Journal of Organisational Transformation & Social Change* 11, no. 3 (2014): 185–206, doi:10.1179/1477963314Z.00000000029., p. 188.

³⁰⁶ Ahmet İçduygu and Damla B. Aksel, "Turkish Migration Policies: A Critical Historical Retrospective" XVIII, no. 3 (2013): 167–90, <http://sam.gov.tr/turkish-migration-policies-a-critical-historical-retrospective-ahmet-icduygu-and-damla-b-aksel/>, p. 178.

³⁰⁷ Ibid. pp.174-175.

getirilirken, siyasi-milliyetçi anlayışa dayanan mevcut hukuki ve kurumsal düzenlemeler uygulanmaya devam edilmiştir. Asıl köklü değişiklikler daha önce de belirtildiği gibi Türkiye'ye 1999 yılında düzenlenen Helsinki Zirvesi'nde Avrupa Birliği'ne aday ülke statüsü verildikten sonra başlamıştır.

Avrupa Birliği'nin Ortak Göç ve Mülteci Politikası, 1990larda oluşturulmaya başlanmıştır. Daha önce her ülkenin kendi egemenlik alanında değerlendirilen uluslararası göç konusu, 90lı yıllardan itibaren birliğin tamamını ilgilendiren, Avrupa entegrasyonunun bir parçası olarak ulus-üstü bir konumda ele alınmaya başlanmıştır. Bu doğrultuda, 1992 yılındaki Maastrich Anlaşması, 1997'deki Amsterdam Anlaşması, bu anlaşma kapsamında oluşturulan Tampere ve Hague Planları ve 2009'daki Lizbon Anlaşması AB Ortak Göç ve Mülteci Politikasının temellerini oluşturmuştur. Bu politikanın tarihsel gelişimi ve temel özelliklerine bakıldığı zaman, AB'nin uluslararası göç politikasının iki yönde evrildiği görülmektedir; terörizm, bütünleşme ve işsizlik gibi konulara vurgu yapılan ve 1990lı yıllarda öne çıkan güvenlik merkezli anlayış ve iş gücü merkezli değerlendirilen ve 2000'li yıllarda önem kazanan kalkınma merkezli anlayış. İlk eğilim ve aslında ulus-üstü düzeyde ortak göç politikasının oluşturulmasının temel nedeni, Avrupa'ya yönelik göç hareketlerinin olumsuz etkilerini azaltma amacına dayanıyordu. 2000li yıllardan itibaren ise, güvenlik temelli göç yönetimi anlayışının devam ettirilmesinin yanında, göç dalgalarının birliğin ekonomik kalkınmasına katkı sağlayacak biçimde yönetilmesi gerektiği anlayışı önem kazanmaya başladı. İnsan hareketliliğinden 'fayda sağlamak' amacıyla, AB emek piyasasındaki boşluğu doldurmak ve AB üyesi olmayan nitelikli vatandaşları cezbetmek için kısıtlayıcı politikalar hafifletmeye başladı. Bu bağlamda, AB'nin Ortak Göç ve Mülteci Politikasının temel mantığı, küresel söylemdeki etkili göç yönetimi çerçevesine uyumlu bir biçimde, hem kolaylaştırıcı hem de önleyici politikaların aynı anda yürütüldüğü bir yönetim modelini yansıtmaktadır. Sonuç olarak, AB'nin göç yönetimi pratikleri, aynı anda hem maksimum ekonomik kazanımlar sağlamak hem de göç hareketlerinin neden olduğu olumsuz etkileri minimuma indirmek amacına dayanarak, etkili göç yönetimi çerçevesinin örnek bir uygulama biçimi olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır.

Türkiye AB'ye üyelik yolunda çok uzun bir geçmişe sahiptir. Kısaca belirtmek gerekirse, Türkiye 1963'te Ankara Anlaşması'nı ve 1970'de Ek Protokol'ü imzaladı. 1987 yılında nihayet tam üyelik başvurusunda bulunabildi. 1995'te Gümrük

Birliđi'ne girdikten sonra 1999'daki Helsinki Zirvesi'nde adaylık statüsü kazandı. Katılım öncesi çerçevede, Türkiye'den iç hukukunu Topluluk müktesebatına uygun hale getirmesi beklendi. Uluslararası göç konusu da Türkiye'nin deđişiklik yapması gereken alanlardan biriydi. Bu dođrultu Türkiye'den beklenen deđişiklikler şunlardır;

- Yasadışı göçün ve yasadışı insan ve uyuşturucu kaçakçılığının önlenmesi
- Etkili sınır yönetiminin geliştirilmesi
- Schengen Bilgi Sistemine ve Europol'e katılmak için veri koruması alanında

AB müktesebatının kabul edilmesi;

- AB olumsuz vize listesinin kademeli olarak kabul edilmesi
- Yasadışı göçe engel olmak için AB mevzuatının ve göçle ilgili

uygulamaların (kabul, geri kabul, sınır dışı etme) uygulanmalarının benimsenmesi

- Sığınma alanında 1951 Cenevre Sözleşmesi için cođrafi çekincenin kaldırılması ve mülteciler için konut ve sosyal destek birimlerinin geliştirilmesi³⁰⁸

Bu hedefleri gerçekleştirmek için Türkiye, uluslararası göç konusunu ilgilendiren yasal düzenlemelerinde ve idari yapılanmasında önemli deđişiklikler gerçekleştirdi. Bu deđişim süreci ise AB'nin sağladığı teknik ve mali yardımlarla desteklendi.

AB müktesebatına uyum sağlamak adına Türkiye'nin göç mevzuatında yaptığı deđişiklikler bakıldığı zaman öne çıkan en önemli hukuki düzenleme 2013 yılında yürürlüğe giren Yabancılar ve Uluslararası Koruma Kanunu'dur. Türkiye'nin geleneksel göç politikasının yönetmeliklerle ve ikincil düzenlemelerle yürütüldüğü göz önüne alınırsa, bu kanun Türkiye'nin uluslararası göçü bir bütün olarak düzenleyen ilk ulusal yasadır. Daha önce çeşitli yönetmeliklerle düzenlenen bir dizi konuyu bir araya getiren Yabancılar Kanunu, çalışma izni ve taşınmaz mülkiyetlerin durumu haricinde, yabancıların Türkiye'deki statüsünü kapsamlı bir şekilde düzenlemektedir.³⁰⁹ Kanun, uluslararası göçün tüm yönlerini düzenlemek amacıyla, vize yükümlülükleri, giriş ve çıkış kuralları, oturma izni ve idari izinler hakkında kapsamlar hükümler barındırır. Göçü düzenleyen hükümlere ek olarak kanun ayrıca

³⁰⁸ "Türkiye Katılım Ortaklığı Belgesi," 2001, http://www.ab.gov.tr/files/AB_Iliskileri/AdaylikSureci/Kob/Turkiye_Kat_Ort_Belg_2007.pdf., "Türkiye Katılım Ortaklığı Belgesi," 2003.

³⁰⁹ Esra Dardağın Kibar, "An Overview and Discussion of the New Turkish Law on Foreigners and International Protection," *Perceptions* 18, no. 3 (2013): 109–28., p. 109.

vatansızların ve mültecilerin hukuki statüsünü, tehcir koşullarını ve Türkiye'de sığınma talebinde bulunanlara yönelik uluslararası korumanın kapsamını düzenlemektedir. Neredeyse tüm AB koşullarını yerine getirmesi nedeniyle yabancılar kanunu, Türkiye'nin Uluslararası göç politikasının Avrupalılaşmasının en önemli kanıtı olarak gösterilmektedir.³¹⁰ Yabancılar kanununa ek olarak Türkiye ayrıca Yabancıların Çalışma İzinlerine Yönelik Kanun (2003) ve Uluslararası İş Gücü Kanunu 'nu (2016) çıkartmış, Türk Vatandaşlığı Kanunu'nda önemli düzenlemeler yapmış (2009) ve tarihinde ilk kez insan ticaretini ağır ceza gerektiren suç olarak tanımlamıştır (2002).

Türkiye'nin uluslararası göç politikasındaki dönüşüm süreci, idari yapılanmanın da değişimine neden olmuştur. Kapsamlı bir uluslararası göç yönetimi rejiminin oluşturulabilmesi için standartlaştırılmış uygulamaları ülke çapında yürüten bir sivil otorite kurma ihtiyacı doğmuştur. Bu doğrultuda, 'etkili bir göç yönetim sistemini uygulamak, göç politikalarının uluslararası düzeyde geliştirilmesine ve uygulanmasına katkıda bulunmak' amacıyla 2013 yılında İç İşleri Bakanlığı'na bağlı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü kurulmuştur.³¹¹ 2015 yılında ise, standart uygulamaların ülke çapında uygulanması amacıyla Göç İdaresi İl Müdürlükleri göreve başlamıştır.

Çalışmanın son bölümünde, AB güdümünde oluşturulan Türkiye'nin yeni göç yönetimi rejiminin küresel söylemde yer alan etkili göç yönetimi çerçevesiyle olan uyumu tartışılmıştır. Bu yeni göç yönetimi politikasında Türkiye, uluslararası göç olgusunu göçmenlerin politik kimlikleri üzerinden değerlendirmeyi bırakmış ve uluslararası göçü, insanlığın normal ve doğal bir davranışı olarak nitelendirmeye başlamıştır. Dolayısıyla, küresel söylemdeki vurguyu benimseyerek, sınır ötesi insan hareketliliğini teknik bir yönetim konusu olarak ele almaya başlamıştır. Yine etkili göç yönetimi söyleminin önerdiği 'düzenlenen açıklık' (regulated openness) prensibinin, Türkiye'nin yeni göç yönetimi rejiminin temelini oluşturduğu görülmektedir. Bu doğrultuda Türkiye'nin yeni göç politikası uluslararası göç hem

³¹⁰ Umut Aydın and Kemal Kirişçi, "With or Without the EU: Europeanisation of Asylum and Competition Policies in Turkey," *South European Society and Politics* 18, no. 3 (2013): 375–95, doi: 10.1080/13608746.2013.799729., pp. 375-6.

³¹¹ "Ministry Of Interior Directorate General Of Migration Management," accessed May 14, 2017, http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik3/vision_912_957_959.

kısıtlayan hem de destekleyen politikaların bir arada uygulandığı bir düzende kurulmuştur. Uluslararası terörizm, insan ve uyuşturucu kaçakçılığı gibi güvenlik tehdidi oluşturan konularda kısıtlayıcı hatta engelleyici politikalar izlenirken, insan hareketliliğinden ekonomik fayda sağlamak adına kolaylaştırıcı politikalar uygulanmaktadır.

Sonuç olarak bu çalışma, neoliberal küreselleşmenin uluslararası göç politikalarını nasıl etkilediğini araştırmış ve bu sorunsalı neoliberal küresel yönetimsellik yaklaşımıyla incelemiştir. Bu teorik yaklaşımın temel savları doğrultusunda, uluslararası göç konusunun küresel bir yönetimsellik örneği olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Özellikle kalkınma bağlamında incelendiğinde, en iyi uygulama biçimi olarak gösterilen etkili göç yönetimi çerçevesinin, uluslararası göç hareketlerinin küresel ve yerel emek piyasasının ihtiyaçları doğrultusunda yönetilmesi gerektiğini vurgulamaktadır. Bu anlayış biçiminin, Avrupa Birliği'nin Ortak Göç ve Sığınma politikasında yer aldığı, üyelik öncesi şartlar vasıtasıyla da Türkiye empoze edildiği görülmektedir. Fakat başarılı bir yönetimsellik örneği olarak, Türkiye'nin yeni göç politikası AB ile ilişkilerinden bağımsız olarak küresel söylemle uyumlu bir biçimde gelişmeye devam etmektedir.

APPENDIX B

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı : ZEYTİN

Adı : Elif

Bölümü: ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER

TEZİN ADI: Global Governmentality of International Migration: Case of Turkey

TEZİN TÜRÜ: Yüksek Lisans

Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.

2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.

3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: