

**Transcending Europe's Immigration Security  
Dilemma:  
Security, Trust, and Hospitality**

**Ali Bilgic**

**Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of PhD**

**Department of International Politics  
Aberystwyth University**

**June 2010**

## **Summary**

The thesis aims to develop a theoretical perspective for studying illegal protection-seeking migration, and possible responses to this movement adopted by the receiving communities. Using the security dilemma as the framework of analysis, the discussion will be conducted through the theoretical perspective provided by emancipatory security theory. The thesis has three parts. In Part I, the insecurity experienced by illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers during their journey will be analyzed based on some accounts publicized by various civil society organizations. Part II will develop the theoretical perspective by combining the literatures on refugee and forced migration studies, security dilemma theorizing, normative approaches in IR, and trust-building in world politics. Key concepts such as ‘protection-seeker’ and ‘cosmopolitan trust’ will be developed. In Part III, the logics of immigration security dilemma will be illustrated with special reference to illegal sub-Saharan protection-seeking migration in the EU. The thesis will conclude that Europe’s immigration security dilemma in relation to illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers can be transcended through building cosmopolitan trust, which manifests itself as Kantian hospitality.

## Contents

<b>Contents</b>	I
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	VI
<b>Introduction</b>	
<b>“What Were We Meant to Do? Let Them Drown?”: A Perspective for Common Life in the Age of Migration</b>	1
I.    Why Study Illegal Migration from an Explicitly Normative Perspective and Why Illegal Migration from sub-Sahara to Europe?	2
II.   Approaches and Methods	5
III.  Limitations	8
IV.  Prospective Contribution	10
V.   Overview	12
 <b>PART I</b>	
 <b>Chapter One</b>	
<b>“Real People in Real Places”: Experiences from Illegal sub-Saharan Protection-Seeking Migration</b>	18
I.    Challenges in sub-Saharan Africa: War and Poverty	19
II.   Challenges in the Sahara Desert and the Mediterranean Sea	22
III.  Challenges in North Africa	27
IV.  Conclusion	32

## **PART II**

### **Chapter Two**

#### **Conceptualizing ‘Protection-Seeker’ and Its Criminalization as**

#### **a Source of Insecurity 35**

- I. Why a New Concept? 36
- II. The Three Stages of Global Protection Regime 43
  - a. The Establishment of an International Protection Regime*
  - b. The Euro-centric Institutionalization of the Protection Regime*
  - c. The Globalization of the Protection Regime*
  - d. The Concept of ‘Protection-Seeker’*
- III. Illegal Protection-Seekers as a Source of Insecurity 59
  - a. Criminalization of Protection-Seeking*
  - b. Illegal Immigration as a Source of Insecurity*
- IV. Conclusion 64

### **Chapter Three**

#### **Rethinking the Security Dilemma: A New Way of Studying**

#### **the Relationship between Security and Identity 66**

- I. Two Types of Uncertainty in World Politics 67
- II. Three Logics of the Security Dilemma 70
  - a. Fatalist Logic: ‘Assume the Worst’*
  - b. Mitigator Logic: A Possibility of Security with Building Order?*
  - c. Transcender Logic: Security through Trust-Building*
- III. The Security Dilemma: A New Way of Studying the Security-Identity Relationship 86
- IV. Conclusion 93

<b>Chapter Four</b>	
<b>Cosmopolitan Consciousness for Trust-Building to Transcend Security Dilemmas</b>	95
I. Trust-Building through the Communitarian Way of Thinking?	96
II. Trust-Building through the Post-Modernist Way of Thinking?	98
III. Trust-Building through the Cosmopolitan Way of Thinking?	103
<i>a. Emancipatory Security Theory and Cosmopolitan Consciousness</i>	
<i>b. Cosmopolitan Consciousness for Trust-Building to Transcend Security Dilemmas</i>	
IV. Conclusion	115

<b>Chapter Five</b>	
<b>Conceptualizing Europe’s Immigration Security Dilemma in relation to Illegal sub-Saharan Protection-Seekers</b>	117
I. Uncertainty in Europe’s Immigration Security Dilemma	118
II. Fatalism-Driven Choice: Keep Out Protection-Seekers	120
III. Transcender-Driven Choice: Cosmopolitan Trust as Kantian Hospitality	123
<i>a. Cosmopolitan Trust</i>	
<i>b. Kantian Hospitality and The Properties of Trust</i>	
<i>c. How to Operationalize Cosmopolitan Trust</i>	
IV. Mitigator Logic in Practice: the Euro-Mediterranean Security Regime and the EMP Order	138
V. Conclusion	139

### **PART III**

<b>Chapter Six</b>	
<b>Ameliorating Insecurity in the Mediterranean through the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership Order</b>	143
I. Challenges facing the EU in the Mediterranean Region	144
<i>a. ‘Hard’ Security Challenges: Military Confrontations and WMDs</i>	

<i>b. Economic Instability in North Africa</i>	
<i>c. Religious Fundamentalism and Terrorism</i>	
<i>d. Migration from Africa to Europe</i>	
II. Ameliorating Insecurity through the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership Order	154
<i>a. The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership:         Three Baskets for a Stable Mediterranean</i>	
<i>b. The EMP Order and the Protection of the Status Quo: Three Cases</i>	
<i>c. The Euro-Mediterranean Security Regime for the EMP Order</i>	
III. The EMP and Europe's Immigration Security Dilemma in relation to Illegal sub-Saharan Protection-Seekers	178
IV. Conclusion	179

## **Chapter Seven**

### **Fatalist Logic in Practice: Keep Out Illegal sub-Saharan Protection-Seekers** 182

I. The Fatalist Interpretation of Illegal sub-Saharan Protection-Seekers: From Tampere to the Hague	183
II. Fatalism-driven Responses to Illegal sub-Saharan Protection-Seekers: The Externalization of Illegal Immigration Control	192
<i>a. Externalization of Asylum Procedures</i>	
<i>b. The Establishment of Camps in North Africa and the Libyan Case</i>	
<i>c. The Militarization of the Mediterranean Sea: the Case of Frontex</i>	
III. Conclusion	214

## **Chapter Eight**

### **Transcender Logic in Practice: Offering Kantian Hospitality to Illegal sub-Saharan Protection-Seekers** 217

I. The Global Level: the UNHCR	218
II. The Inter-Governmental Level in the EMP Order	221
III. The EU Level of Hospitality	223
<i>a. The Revival of the Tampere Spirit</i>	
<i>b. A European Regularization Mechanism</i>	

IV.	The Societal Level: Three Principles of Embedding	
	Cosmopolitan Trust	243
	<i>a. City of Sanctuary: Spreading the Culture of Hospitality</i>	
	<i>b. Time Together Program: Hospitality as ‘Just Being There’</i>	
	<i>c. Mentoring and Befriending Foundation: Hospitality as a Long-Term Process</i>	
	<i>d. City of Sanctuary, Time Together, Mentoring and Befriending: Kantian         Hospitality as Trust in Europe’s Immigration Security Dilemma</i>	
V.	Conclusion	258
<b>Conclusion</b>		
<b>“What Exists is Possible”: A Hopeful Thinking for A Common Life in the Age of Migration</b>		
		260
I.	Towards a New Thinking about the Problem of Illegal Protection-Seeking: Cosmopolitan Consciousness	261
II.	Cosmopolitan Consciousness in Security Thinking and Practice: Emancipatory Security Theory	263
III.	Studying Security through Logics: The Security Dilemma	266
IV.	Towards More Emancipatory Security	270
<b>Bibliography</b>		
273		

## **List of Abbreviations**

AFSJ – Area of Freedom Security and Justice  
AI – Amnesty International  
APHDA – La Asociacion Pro Derechos Humanos de Andalucia  
CBMs – Confidence Building Measures  
CEN-SAD – Community of Sahel-Saharan States  
CIMADE – La Comité Inter-Mouvements Auprès Des Evacués  
CSCE – Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe  
DRC – Democratic Republic of Congo  
EC – European Community  
ECHR – European Court of Human Rights  
EMHRN – Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network  
EMP – Euro-Mediterranean Partnership  
ENP – European Neighbourhood Policy  
ENPI – European Neighbourhood Partnership Instrument  
EPAU – Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit of UNHCR  
EU – European Union  
FDI – Foreign Direct Investment  
FRONTEX – European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union  
HRW – Human Rights Watch  
IASFM – International Association for the Study of Forced Migration  
ICMPD – International Centre for Migration Policy Development  
IDPs – Internally Displaced Peoples  
ILO – International Labour Organization  
JHA – Justice and Home Affairs  
MBF – Mentoring and Befriending Foundation  
MEDA – Mediterranean Economic and Development Area  
MsF – Medecins sans Frontiers  
NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization  
OECD – Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development  
OPEC – Organization of Oil Producer Companies  
OSCE – Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe



PBMs – Partnership Building Measures

PICUM – Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Immigrants

RGAs – Regional Protection Areas

SIVE – Spanish Internal Service of External Vigilance

TPS – Temporary Protected Status

TREVI – Terrorisme, Radicalisme, Extrémisme et Violence Internationale

UK – the United Kingdom

UN – United Nations

UNHCR – United Nations High Commission of Refugees

UNODC – United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

WMDs – Weapons of Mass Destruction

## Introduction

### **“What Were We Meant To Do? Let Them Drown?”<sup>1</sup>: A Perspective For Common Life in the Age Of Migration**

This research project is an attempt to answer a politically and intellectually challenging question: how should a political community respond to immigrants who seek protection in that community, when their migration is perceived as a source of insecurity by many in the ‘host’ community? The answer, developed throughout the thesis, provides a new perspective to the study of the relationship between security and identity with reference to illegal protection-seeking migration. The central aim of the thesis is to explore ideas and practices which can contribute to replacing the exclusionary political structures of insecurity with emancipatory structures, where individuals (both illegal protection-seekers and members of the receiving communities) enjoy security together sharing a common identity. The security dilemma framework enables the pursuit of this objective.

Through this framework, the thesis will problematize security understandings and policies which re-produce insecurity for receiving societies and illegal protection-seekers and re-construct the dichotomist identity between the two groups. Alternative ideas and practices which are embedded, albeit marginalized, in the political structures will be discussed and prioritized in order to explore how new emancipatory political structures can be constructed. It will be argued that through transcending the security dilemma caused by illegal immigration, a common we-feeling between citizens and illegal protection-seekers can be created, and thereby emancipatory political structures in which both groups enjoy human rights and freedoms can be constructed. The conceptual framework will be illustrated with special reference to illegal sub-Saharan protection-seeking migration into the European Union (EU).<sup>2</sup> The central research question of the thesis is: *how can*

---

<sup>1</sup> The words of the captain of Francisco y Cataline who saved illegal sub-Saharan immigrants from drowning in the Mediterranean and was sued because of this action, Yasha Maccanico, *EU/Africa: Carnage Continues as EU Border Moves South*, (September, 2006), <[www.statewatch.org](http://www.statewatch.org)> [accessed 22 January 2009].

<sup>2</sup> In this project, the institutional manifestations of the EU are the European Commission, the European Council and the Council of Ministers. Although the European Parliament is included in the decision-making procedure about migration with the Amsterdam Treaty, the body is significant

*Europe's immigration security dilemma in relation to illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers be transcended through trust-building?*

### **I. Why Study Illegal Migration from an Explicitly Normative Perspective and Why Illegal Migration from sub-Sahara to Europe?<sup>3</sup>**

When individuals make choices, they do not only consider what exists in the world, but they also take into account what ought to exist. According to Philip Allott, “the dyad of the actual and the ideal has allowed us to make human reality into a moral order in which the actual can pass judgement upon itself by reference to its better potentiality, which is the ideal”.<sup>4</sup> This thesis, which analyzes the available choices of a political community in relation to illegal protection-seekers, will pass judgement on the actual by reference to the ideal in order to explore the potential of the existing political structures to uphold human rights and freedoms as security for individuals. This perspective takes two groups of individuals as the referent of security analysis: immigrants who seek protection beyond their national communities, although criminalized, and members of the receiving communities.

A study of immigrants who seek protection outside their countries of origin and of conditions under which they are entitled to protection “requires a political choice and ethical judgement”.<sup>5</sup> This is because, as will be discussed in Chapter Two, the content of protection is closely related to human rights and their universal applicability.<sup>6</sup> Some immigrants are criminalized (become illegal) in their search for protection. The criminalization of these immigrants, however, does not mean that they do not need protection or that their human rights can be violated because

---

neither in decision-shaping nor in the implementation of policies. That is why the EP is not included in the analysis. The EU is the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice (AFSJ) since 1999.

<sup>3</sup> ‘Europe’ refers to the AFSJ.

<sup>4</sup> Philip Allott, ‘Globalization from Above: Actualizing the Ideal through Law’ in *How Might We Live: Global Ethics in the New Century*, ed. by Ken Booth, Tim Dunne and Michael Cox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 70.

<sup>5</sup> Aristide R. Zolberg, Astri Suhrke, Sergio Aguayo, *Escape from Violence: Conflict and the Refugee Crisis in the Developing World* (NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 4.

<sup>6</sup> A powerful supporter of this understanding is the UNHCR, see the UNHCR, *The State of the World Refugees: In Search of Solutions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); see also Gil Loescher, ‘Refugees: A Global Human Rights and Security Crisis’ in *Human Rights in Global Politics*, ed. by Tim Dunne and Nicholas Wheeler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 234.

they are illegal. Human beings have the universal right to seek protection beyond their national communities even if they enter the country of asylum illegally.<sup>7</sup> However, as will be illustrated in Chapter Seven, this right can often be undermined by the illegal immigration control policies of the receiving communities. This highlights that the international regime based on the 1951 Convention has not efficiently addressed the contemporary realities of protection-seeking migration, which calls for new ideas and concepts to enhance the conditions of protection for individuals.

The challenging question confronting this thesis is: should the security of the members of the receiving communities always be prioritized over the right to seek protection? Migration itself is a highly politicized issue, especially in the EU, where it is often discussed in conjunction with its security implications.<sup>8</sup> The criminalization of migration adds another dimension to these discussions. The idea that an unknown numbers of immigrants violate the borders and continue their lives without registration, challenging the rule of law, creates a sense of insecurity for the members of the receiving communities. Insecurity also has an economic aspect, although one of the most important reasons for illegal immigration has been a demand for unregistered cheap labour in some receiving states. Illegal immigration feeds the underground economy such as in Italy and Spain. For example, in March 2010, *Time* magazine published the images of a deserted factory in Rosarno, Italy, where illegal sub-Saharan immigrants live and which serves as a labour market for Italian farmers.<sup>9</sup>

Decision-makers are, therefore, expected to address the insecurity caused by illegal immigration. This thesis does not question the right of the EU to deal with illegal immigration as a source of insecurity. However, it problematizes how the issue is generally dealt with in relation to the illegal sub-Saharan migration phenomenon which involves many protection-seekers. Some policies of the EU preventing illegal sub-Saharan immigration have hindered protection-seeking

---

<sup>7</sup> The 1951 Convention and 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, Article 31.

<sup>8</sup> This thesis is not about the security implications of migration in general. Rather it specifically focuses on the criminalization of migration as a source of insecurity. This is because protection-seeking migration has considerably suffered from illegal immigration control policies of states.

<sup>9</sup> Stephan Faris, 'Southern Europe's Immigration Test', *Time*, 01.03.2010, pp. 20-21.

migration. How the illegal protection-seeking can be addressed is the central puzzle of this thesis. The perspective, which will be developed through the analysis, has a potential to solve this puzzle.

Behind the central question, the main objective of the thesis is to develop an explicitly normative response and to operationalize it through an illustration. The latter is illegal sub-Saharan protection-seeking migration to Europe via North Africa, which is increasingly populated by ‘irregular’ immigrants from sub-Saharan Africa.<sup>10</sup> Around 200,000 of them head for Europe annually.<sup>11</sup> Although asylum applicants from sub-Saharan Africa do not constitute the majority, they represent an important proportion in the EU-27.<sup>12</sup> Especially in the UK, asylum-seekers from sub-Saharan Africa are the most populous group who are granted refugee status, subsidiary protection, and protection for humanitarian reasons.<sup>13</sup> This implies that there is a certain level of migration for protection reasons from sub-Saharan Africa to Europe. However, not all immigrants from sub-Saharan Africa who are in search of protection meet the Refugee Convention criteria to be entitled to the status of ‘refugee’. By studying sub-Saharan migration in Europe, this research aims to look at immigrants who remain outside the scope of the 1951 Convention, but need protection nevertheless.

As the legal channels of seeking protection in the EU have significantly decreased and become more expensive, more sub-Saharan immigrants have found illegal immigration as the only way to achieve protection.<sup>14</sup> The EU has adopted policies to stop this type of migration. By studying these policies, it is possible to analyze what types of ideas and policies the EU has tried to use in order to generate security for EU citizens, and how these policies create insecurity for illegal

---

<sup>10</sup> ‘Irregular migration’ is the phrase that the UNHCR uses to define what the EU calls ‘illegal migration’, see the UNHCR Website, < <http://www.unhcr.org/4a1e48f66.html> > [accessed 17 November 2009]. Both illegal migration and irregular migration refer to the same phenomenon. So does ‘undocumented migration’. ‘Illegal migration’ will be used throughout the analysis because the objective of the study is to problematize ‘illegal migration’, rather than accepting it uncritically.

<sup>11</sup> Philippe Fargues, ‘Work, Refuge, Transit: An Emerging Pattern of Irregular Immigration South and East of the Mediterranean’, *International Migration Review*, 43:3 (2009), pp. 544-577.

<sup>12</sup> Eurostat, *Population and Social Conditions*, (2009).

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> John Morrison and Beth Crosland, *The Trafficking and Smuggling of Refugees: the End Game in European Asylum Policy?*, the UNHCR New Issues in Refugee Research Working Paper Series No: 39, (2001), pp. 25-27.

protection-seekers. The study of EU policies is useful to illustrate how the immigration policies of a political community can lead to the situation in which the human rights of immigrants are severely violated. Although the common political practices of the EU are frequently exclusionary and prioritize extensively the security of EU citizens over that of illegal sub-Saharan immigrants, there are also alternative ideas and practices embedded in the margins of the political and social structures. By examining the illegal sub-Saharan protection-seeking migration heading to Europe and possible responses to it, alternative approaches to protection and more broadly to security will be explored.

## **II.Approaches and Methods**

The analysis in this thesis will study the issue of migration in relation to the security-identity nexus. In academic circles in Europe, this subject has increasingly been studied within the theoretical framework of ‘securitization’.<sup>15</sup> The securitization approach is an attempt to enable analysts to understand how an issue is presented as a threat and how it is addressed based on the particular understanding of decision-makers about what security is and how it can be achieved. However, the securitization approach will be shown to be unhelpful with regard to the objectives of this thesis.

The securitization approach analyzes speeches and practices of policy-makers and practitioners by taking their security understanding for granted in studying migration. Although many scholars belonging to this ‘Copenhagen’ school of security criticize the securitization of migration, they largely fail to question the

---

<sup>15</sup> Ole Waever, ‘The Societal Security’ in *Identity, Migration and New Security Agenda in Europe*, ed. by Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, Morten Kelstrup, Pierre Lemaitre (London : Pinter Publishers, 1993), pp. 17-40; Sasse Gwendolyn, ‘Securitization or Securing Rights? Exploring the Conceptual Foundations of Policies towards Minorities and Migrants in Europe’, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 43:4 (2005), pp. 673-693; Ibrahim Maggie, ‘The Securitization of Migration: A Racial Discourse’, *International Migration*, 43:5 (2005), pp. 163-187; Alessandra Buonfino, ‘Between Unity and Plurality: the Politicization and Securitization of the Discourse in Immigration in Europe’, *New Political Science*, 26:1 (2004), pp. 23-49; Jef Huysmans, ‘The European Union and the Securitization of Migration’, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38:5 (2000), pp. 751-777 and *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU* (New York: Routledge, 2006); Christina Boswell, ‘Migration Control in Europe after 9/11: Explaining the Absence of Securitization’, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 45:3 (2007), pp. 589-610; *Security versus Freedom? A Challenge for Europe’s Future*, ed. by Thierry Balzacq and Sergio Carrera (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006); Andrew Neal, ‘Securitization and Risk at the EU Border: the Origins of Frontex’, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 47:2 (2009), pp. 333-356.

rationalities of the decision-makers and practitioners which cause the presentation of migration as an ‘existential threat’. This leads to extensive focus on the existing policies of particular actors, mainly state-level decision-makers, without problematizing their particular understanding of security. In other words, the approach does not sufficiently explore neither the different choices available to decision-makers and citizens, nor alternative agents of security. As put by Ole Waever, securitization is often performed by policy-makers because “the language game of security” is necessarily restricted to the “elites”.<sup>16</sup> However this results in an excessive analytical focus on decision-makers at the expense of alternative agents and their ideas and practices of security.<sup>17</sup>

In this thesis, Ken Booth and Nick Wheeler’s security dilemma framework, which differs significantly from mainstream security dilemma theorizing, enables an analysis which focuses on ideational and practical choices available to decision-makers and citizens of a political community to pursue security.<sup>18</sup> Booth and Wheeler conceptualized the security dilemma through a set of logics. Three logics (fatalism, mitigator, transcender) represent alternative sets of assumptions about what security is, how security can be pursued, and how insecurity can be managed. The security dilemma framework, unlike the securitization approach, enables an analysis of different ‘logics’ of security which produce practices underlined by these understandings. Again, as opposed to the securitization approach, the security dilemma framework widens the analytical scope to alternative ideas and practices of different agents in a political structure.

As the security dilemma provides the framework of analysis in this thesis, the logics will be analyzed through the theoretical perspective provided by emancipatory security theory which has three core principles: individuals should be the ultimate referents of security (a concept related to the idea of emancipation); the security of one group cannot be achieved at the expense of that of others; the perspective on security should be global.

---

<sup>16</sup> Ole Waever, ‘Securitization and Desecuritization’ in *On Security*, ed. by Ronnie D. Lipschutz (New York: Colombia University Press, 1995), p. 56.

<sup>17</sup> Pinar Bilgin, *Regional Security in the Middle East* (London: Routledge, 2005) pp. 27-29.

<sup>18</sup> Ken Booth and Nicholas Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma: Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics*, (Hampshire: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2008).

Within this theoretical framework, in Part I, the main method is to bring the experiences of illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers into the analysis. Through this method, the insecurities of this group of immigrants will be integrated into the discussion by using their own reflections on the challenges of the protection-seeking process in Chapter One. The illustrations are derived from the information gathered by many pro-immigrant civil society actors. In Part II (Chapters Two-Five), a literature review of different academic research areas will be performed in order to conceptualize ideas for analyzing the immigration security dilemma in the thesis. The main areas are refugee and forced migration studies, security dilemma theorizing, the main normative approaches in IR, and literature about trust in politics. In Chapter Five, both Kant's own writings and the works of contemporary Kantian scholars will be used.

In Part III (Chapters Six-Eight), in order to discuss the ideas from which policies are derived, an analysis of political documents of the EU will be conducted. The Commission and the Council are the two key bodies in the EU in the area of migration. The Commission's communications and the Council's Presidency Conclusions and Directives are the main instruments of analysis, especially in Chapters Six and Seven. The Commission's reports will also be analyzed in order to understand the ideas of the Commission about different issues. In order to examine the practices of the EU, a policy analysis will be performed. The method in Part I will be re-introduced in Chapter Eight by analyzing the societal level of Kantian hospitality through the examples from the UK. As mentioned earlier, the UK has the highest number of sub-Saharan asylum applicants who were granted refugee status in 2008 in the EU-27. The movements and programmes in the UK are useful to illustrate how the transcender logic works at societal level.

It is crucial here to emphasize that this thesis is neither primarily about the EU nor about sub-Saharan migration. It does not aim to explore the complex decision-shaping and decision-making character of the EU when dealing with illegal immigration, nor does it answer the question of why sub-Saharan immigrants leave their countries. If these had been the aims, the methods would certainly include interviews with EU officials and fieldwork conducted in North Africa to gather empirical insight by interviewing sub-Saharan immigrants. The methods



discussed above serve the main objective of this project: to construct a new framework of thinking about how to deal with illegal protection-seeking migration.

### **III.Limitations**

Although the analysis aspires to be comprehensive and consistent, this research also has limitations. The first relates to the subject group of this study: illegal protection-seekers. Migration is a complex phenomenon which integrates political, economic and social factors. The analysis is not about a unitary actor that has stable institutions and decision-making structures that can be studied like a state. Instead, immigration is a social phenomenon which is subject to constant change. Generalizations about immigration inevitably involve some level of black-boxing, a fact acknowledged by this study. In order to minimize the effect of this limitation, the generalizations will not be based solely on scholarship of refugee and forced migration studies. Individual protection-seekers' experiences will also be introduced. In relation to the experiences of protection-seekers, the second limitation is the absence of interviews with protection-seekers by the author of this thesis. The main reason, as mentioned earlier, is that sub-Saharan migration is an illustration of a theoretical perspective, not a case *per se*.

Another limitation is the use of the EU as an illustration. The EU is an example of multi-level governance in which sub-state, state, and supra-state level actors interact in decision-shaping and policy-making processes.<sup>19</sup> As a result, it becomes a challenge for analysts to describe a policy as 'an EU policy'. This challenge is also important for this thesis. In order to make a coherent analysis, in this project, the term 'EU' refers to the Commission, the Council of Ministers and the European Council which are the main decision-making bodies in the area of migration. This does not mean that Member State politics are marginal. For example, as will be discussed in Chapter Seven, Member States led the formation of all policies before the issue of migration was moved to the First Pillar with the

---

<sup>19</sup> Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks, 'Multi-level Governance in the European Union' in *The European Union: Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration*, ed. by Brent F. Nelsen and Alexander Stubb (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition), pp.281-311.

Amsterdam Treaty. The policies at the EU level were inter-governmental in character and many of them were not legally binding. With Amsterdam, the Council's decisions have become legally binding and the Commission has achieved a greater role in the area of migration. As a result, it becomes possible to talk about EU ideas and practices. Recent changes were made in this area as a result of the Lisbon Treaty; however, the thesis covers the period until December 1, 2009 – the date when the Lisbon Treaty was put into effect.

The fourth limitation is about how to spread the societal level of hospitality activities to the wider receiving community. It is true that at the societal level, the cases are selective. The individuals selected are those who chose to transcend their fears in relation to protection-seekers. These experiences are selected from the UK, meaning that this fourth limitation has two dimensions. The first one is how to ensure wider societal participation, and, the second is how to make European-wide generalizations based on the cases from the UK. This project discusses alternative choices at societal level in order to reveal the principles of these choices. How to spread these activities to create structural change should be the subject of further research. It is assumed that the principles discussed in Chapter Eight can be generalized in different European societies. Each receiving society can develop its own movements and programs based on these principles. If these individual processes can be generalized in Europe, an emancipatory political structure can be constructed.

One can argue that when even legal migration is highly politicized, it may be considered too utopian or naive to talk about a possibility of trust towards a group of illegal immigrants in a cosmopolitan spirit. In 1939, in the days preceding the outbreak of World War II, E.H. Carr urged his readers “to explore the ruins of our international order and discover on what fresh foundations we may hope to rebuild it”.<sup>20</sup> For Carr, reality without a utopia was as problematic as a utopia without an account of reality.<sup>21</sup> Carr, unlike his followers mistakenly claim, was not against utopias, but against utopias which have “no roots in the present”.<sup>22</sup> *The*

---

<sup>20</sup> Edward Hallett Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939* (London: Macmillan, 1939), p. 290.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 287.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

*Twenty Years' Crisis* is one of the most important classical realist writings which did not hesitate to make realist and explicitly normative analysis when Europe was on the edge of total war. In a political atmosphere where migration is highly politicized, an explicitly normative analysis is necessary more than ever as long as ideals in the analysis can find their roots in the present. The argumentation for a world politics which is reorganized through cosmopolitan principles can still seem too idealistic for some. The answer to this criticism can be found in Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society*. At the end of a book which is largely about an international society between states, Bull stated that “world order, or order within the great society of all mankind, is not only wider than international order or order among states, but also more fundamental and primordial than it, and morally prior to it”.<sup>23</sup>

Inspired by Carr, Bull, and many other major figures contributing to IR theory, this thesis does not chase utopias, but looks for ideas which can contribute to constructing a different world politics that can work for the majority of individuals. In addition, it associates these ideas with practices which already exist in political structures. The thesis does not foresee any type of teleological progress towards more emancipatory political structures, but argues that change does not necessarily require utopias. It can be possible through building upon existing ideas and practices, in other words, today's realities.

#### **IV. Prospective Contribution**

The discipline of IR is significantly affected by external events in the world. Some events such as 9/11, which happen abruptly and unexpectedly for many, change the way the discipline generally understands and explains world politics, sometimes at the expense of alternative voices. Other events, according to Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen, “take the form of steady processes unfolding over time that change the knowledge, understanding and consciousness that support existing practices”.<sup>24</sup> Migration, including its criminalization and politicization, is such an

---

<sup>23</sup> Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society* (London: Macmillan, 1977), p. 308.

<sup>24</sup> Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen, *The Evolution of International Security Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 55.

event that it can affect the organization of modern political communities, the relationships between citizens and non-citizens, and, in essence, the place of the individual and his/her rights in world politics. The politicization of migration deserves intellectual attention in relation to its security implications for both immigrants and the members of the receiving communities. Such an important process urges students of IR to re-think the existing concepts and ways of understanding in the discipline.

This thesis provides a new way of thinking about the migration-security relationship by combining different literatures including normative theory, forced migration, critical security studies, security dilemma and trust. The result will be an argumentation for a consciousness based on cosmopolitan principles and a type of relationship based on trust in world politics.<sup>25</sup> The analysis is an endeavour to provoke scholars towards building a new agenda in the discipline with reference to trust-building, hospitality, emancipation, protection-seeking, and cosmopolitan consciousness.

Following from the aims just outlines, the thesis seeks to make a contribution to IR literature in four areas: to present a new perspective on the issue of illegal protection-seeking and its security implications, to operationalize emancipatory security theory, to operationalize the logics of the security dilemma as a new framework of analysis in the area of migration, and to present an alternative security perspective which goes beyond the (de)securitization discussions. These are the four main threads along with the central argument will be built.

Normative theory in IR primarily and basically discusses the question of how we, as the members of different communities, from local/cultural ones to the potential cosmopolitan community of humankind, should live together. In the age of migration where millions of people have been uprooted for political, economic and social reasons, questions about the conditions of common life have gained a greater importance for students of IR. When migration is performed to achieve

---

<sup>25</sup> For the purposes of the thesis consciousness refers to “mental awareness” which “involves experiencing the world (through the senses), absorbing/transmitting meanings through culture and making judgements (through reason/emotion)”, see Ken Booth, ‘Changing Global Realities: Critical Theory for Critical Times’, *Spectrum*, 1:2 (Summer, 2009), p. 45.

protection at the risk of being criminalized, and thereby becoming a source of insecurity for the receiving communities, these questions become more challenging. This project rethinks the contours of contemporary protection-seeking migration in order to discuss why this type of migration is criminalized and how it becomes a source of insecurity. With the perspective of producing ideas to address this insecurity, it innovatively combines cosmopolitan principles with the concept of trust. The result will be the introduction of ‘cosmopolitan trust’ as an important tool in the construction of a common life between illegal protection-seekers and the members of the receiving communities marked by a common identity.<sup>26</sup> In relation to this, the thesis is also a contribution to the developing literature in IR on trust.

In addition to the contribution to normative theory, this project aims to make three contributions to security studies. One of the objectives is to operationalize the security dilemma framework developed by Booth and Wheeler. The logics of the security dilemma present a novel way of looking at the relationship between security and identity. The operationalization of the logics will be the first of its kind. The second contribution will be to operationalize emancipatory security theory. There is a significant gap in security studies about how the idea of security as emancipation works in practice. In this project, the theory will be operationalized in the area of migration for the first time. These two analytical practices can offer an alternative perspective to the theoretical dominance of the securitization approach in the area of security implications of migration. In this way, the study of the migration-security relationship will move beyond the (de)securitization discussions and towards a security understanding which promotes human rights and freedoms as security.

## **V.Overview**

This thesis is a contribution to normative theory in IR concerning the general question of migration in relation to security. It aims to provide a perspective about

---

<sup>26</sup> Common identity here refers not to an overarching, dominating, and exclusive identity. It implies a wider identity which can be shared by all members of the potential global community of humankind, in addition to multiple local identities.

how security should be thought of and pursued in world politics. The analysis will specifically focus on illegal migration of individuals who seek protection outside their national communities. This is because the issue is useful to analyze how one group's search for security can become a reason for insecurity for the other in the area of migration. The central argument is that Europe's immigration security dilemma in relation to illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers can be transcended through building cosmopolitan trust which manifests itself as Kantian hospitality. The argument will be elaborated in three parts. The first short part will discuss the type of insecurity which motivates this study to develop a new perspective. In the second part, the theoretical framework of the project will be conceptualized. Europe's immigration security dilemma in relation to illegal sub-Saharan immigrants will be illustrated in the third empirical part.

Chapter One aims to give an account of reality to the analysis based on the experiences of illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers. The experiences in this chapter are of contemporary forced migration which will be discussed in detail in Chapter Two. The ideas and concepts developed throughout the analysis aim to offer a new perspective which can address the grave insecurity that illegal immigrants face in their journey towards protection. In other words, the normative analysis which will be conducted in the subsequent chapters will be built upon the experiences of "real people in real places".<sup>27</sup>

Chapter Two provides the background on which Europe's immigration security dilemma will be conceptualized in the subsequent chapters. Two objectives will be pursued. First, the dynamics of contemporary forced migration will be discussed. The concept of 'protection-seeker' will be developed in order to define the subject group of this research; that is, sub-Saharan immigrants who seek protection in Europe. *The concept of 'protection-seeker' refers to an individual who has left the country in which s/he lives due to the weak political, social and economic structures which are supposed to provide the protection in which individuals and groups can enjoy human rights.* Secondly, it will be discussed

---

<sup>27</sup> The objective of the emancipatory security theory is to study security for "real people in real places", Ken Booth, 'Beyond Critical Security Studies' in *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, ed. by Ken Booth (London: Rienner, 2005), p. 272-276.

why protection-seekers are criminalized and how they become a source of insecurity for the receiving societies. Decision-makers face alternative choices to address this insecurity; they are in a security dilemma.

Chapter Three discusses what the security dilemma is and how it should be studied in order to be able to transcend it. It will be argued that the security dilemma is not a mechanistic action-reaction exchange with pre-determined consequences between actors whose identities and interests are fixed. These issues raise the concept of trust. The analysis will especially focus on the normative dimension of trust which is the belief that others will do the right thing by not betraying trust. Then a question arises: on what kind of normative assumptions can actors believe others will do the right thing? Chapter Four will discuss the main normative ways of thinking in IR to explore their potential to develop this type of trust.

In Chapter Four, three ways of normative thinking (communitarianism, post-modernism, and cosmopolitanism) in IR theory will be discussed. It will be argued that the cosmopolitan way of thinking, which will be called ‘cosmopolitan consciousness’, defies both communitarian and post-modernist approaches and provides a stronger ground for trust-building in world politics to transcend security dilemmas. In security studies, emancipatory security theory will operationalize the cosmopolitan way of thinking by problematizing ethnocentric security thinking and promoting ideas and practices which can generate security for individuals regardless of their national or cultural background. Emancipatory security theory will provide a security perspective to study two choices in Europe’s immigration security dilemma.

Chapter Five will conceptualize Europe’s immigration security dilemma in relation to illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers. The security dilemma is characterized by two alternative choices. Under the condition of uncertainty, the fatalist logic regards illegal protection-seekers as a ‘risk’ for the security of EU citizens. Faced with such a risk, ethnocentric security thinking has prioritized the security of EU citizens over that of illegal protection-seekers. The problems of the fatalist logic can be solved by building ‘*cosmopolitan trust*’ which refers to the

*belief that individuals will protect and promote each others' rights and freedoms.* Kantian hospitality as the manifestation of cosmopolitan trust aims to construct a common identity, a 'we-feeling', between the EU citizens and sub-Saharan protection-seekers whose security concerns cannot be thought of independently from each other.

In the third (empirical) part of the thesis the three logics of the security dilemma and Europe's immigration security dilemma will be illustrated with specific reference to illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers into the EU. As a practice of context-setting, in Chapter Six it will be argued that in accordance with the principles of mitigator logic, the EU has chosen to ameliorate insecurity in the Mediterranean region through building an order which is called the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP). The EMP order has been built through the increasing level of cooperation between the EU and North African states in the Euro-Mediterranean security regime. However, the EMP order has resulted in the re-construction of the existing political structures in North Africa which cannot sufficiently provide protection to many individuals to enjoy human rights and freedoms. The EMP order is a political structure for the operationalization of the EU's illegal immigration control policies.

Chapter Seven will analyze and problematize the fatalist interpretation of and responses to illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers by EU decision-makers within the Euro-Mediterranean political structure. In order to understand how decision-makers in the Commission and the Council interpret illegal immigration, two documents, the 1999 *Tampere Presidency Conclusions* and the 2004 *Hague Action Plan* will be analyzed. As a response to illegal sub-Saharan protection-seeking, the externalization of the illegal immigration control process will be discussed with reference to three policies: the externalization of asylum in North Africa, the camps in North Africa, and the militarization of the Mediterranean Sea and western parts of the Atlantic Ocean. The second choice in the security dilemma is the subject of the last chapter.

Chapter Eight will illustrate ideas and practices which can transform the existing exclusionary political structures into emancipatory ones in which both EU citizens



and illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers can enjoy security together at four levels of hospitality. The first focus of the chapter will be on the global dimension of hospitality at the level of the UNHCR. In the second section of the chapter, the focus will be on the inter-governmental level of hospitality. It will be argued that the inter-governmental Euro-Mediterranean relationships should be re-structured based on the values defined in the Barcelona Document. The third level of hospitality is the EU itself. The types of ideational transformation will be discussed together with the political decisions EU decision-makers can take in order to offer hospitality to illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers. At the fourth societal level, the examples of hospitality towards protection-seekers will be examined and presented. In this chapter, societal hospitality activities will be examined with reference to the City of Sanctuary Movement, the Time Together Programme and the Monitor and Befriending System.

In the Conclusion, it will be argued that through embedding cosmopolitan trust, the insecurity caused by illegal migration for both illegal protection-seekers and the receiving societies can be addressed giving rise to a common identity between the two groups. Although the practical implications of hospitality need further research, the ideas and practices discussed in this thesis indicate that there are always choices for those who want to construct a better world.

## Conclusion

### **“What Exists is Possible”<sup>1</sup>: A Hopeful Thinking for Common Life in the Age of Migration**

The normative question driving this thesis is a challenging one, and is of major significance for the 21<sup>st</sup> century: how should a political community respond to immigrants in search of protection when their protection-seeking migration causes insecurity for parts of that community? This question has been approached through the security dilemma theory and illustrations from illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers into Europe. It has been suggested that answers can be found in cosmopolitan trust-building and Kantian hospitality.

In Europe’s immigration security dilemma, the fatalism-driven choice is to build barriers, dispatch warships, and construct camps to stop illegal immigrants. The transcender-driven choice is to understand the insecurities of protection-seekers and why they use illegal methods of entry, create legal channels of migration, and build bonds between protection-seekers and the members of the receiving societies; to build cosmopolitan trust between two groups of individuals. Europe’s immigration security dilemma in relation to illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers is basically between these two choices. Each perspective endeavours to generate security for EU citizens. The former feeds into mistrust, fear, and suspicion towards illegal protection-seekers. The second choice transcends the security dilemma through building a common we-feeling between EU citizens and sub-Saharan protection-seekers. The difference between the two choices lies in the fact that each choice relies on a very different conception of what security means and how it can be achieved. This analysis has made an explicit normative case in favour of transcender logic because the policies of Kantian hospitality as cosmopolitan trust can construct emancipatory political structures in which both EU citizens and illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers enjoy human rights together.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth Boulding’s expression: reflected on by Elisa Boulding, interviewed by Julian Portilla, < [http://www.beyondintractability.org/audio/elise\\_boulding/?nid=2413](http://www.beyondintractability.org/audio/elise_boulding/?nid=2413) > [accessed 15 March 2010]

## **I. Towards a New Thinking about the Problem of Illegal Protection-Seeking: Cosmopolitan Consciousness**

The world today is in the age of migration where hundreds of millions of people are continuously moving across borders. A considerable part of this group is in search for a better life, in “the pursuit of bread, knowledge, and freedom”.<sup>2</sup> As Sita Bali put it, “until the world is free of repression, conflict, political instability and economic inequality, it is certain that population movements will continue”.<sup>3</sup> Given this, we, as the members of a potential global community of humankind and as students of IR, should consider the words of Father Joseph Cassar from the Jesuit Refugee Service which offers hospitality to illegal African immigrants in Malta, when thinking about immigration. He told *The Guardian*:

What is being forgotten here is that these people come from terrible places and are running from the extremes of human behaviour – and deep poverty. It cannot be right to treat them with contempt, detain or house them in horrible conditions, in Europe.<sup>4</sup>

However, many individuals in the receiving societies in the EU have paid little attention to such words. Thousands of sub-Saharan risk their lives every year to achieve protection in the EU. Human catastrophes in and around the Mediterranean Sea are a small, but a serious, representation of world insecurity in the age of migration which victimizes many immigrants and members of the receiving communities by feeling fear, mistrust and insecurity towards immigrants. How has the hope of some immigrants to achieve security become such a source of insecurity for others? This thesis has primarily problematized the ideas which have constructed world insecurity in the age of migration. ‘These world constructing ideas’, according to Booth,

have created an imperfect present and a future tense with danger. Poverty, oppression, war, misery, death and disease are the everyday realities of life swathes of humanity; then add fear, and stir. Debilitating and determining insecurity seem

---

<sup>2</sup> For Booth, the pursuit of bread, knowledge and freedom is the basic meaning of emancipation, see Ken Booth, *Theory of World Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 100.

<sup>3</sup> Sita Bali, ‘Population Movements’ in *Security Studies: An Introduction*, ed. by Paul Williams (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), p. 480.

<sup>4</sup> Aidan Jones, ‘Malta: Where Hysteria is no Answer to the Plight of Refugees’, *The Guardian*, 30.12.2008.

to be in permanent season, and *you and I, him and her, and us and them* will never be what we might become as long as human society, globally, is imprisoned by the regressive ideas that sustain world insecurity.<sup>5</sup>

The regressive ideas can be replaced by others if students of IR open their minds to new possibilities in thinking and in practice. By combining the literatures of security dilemma theorizing, cosmopolitanism, emancipatory security theory, and trust-building, this thesis has sought to construct a perspective through which an illegal sub-Saharan protection-seeker and an EU citizen can share a common identity. It has analyzed a variety of practices with the perspective of finding those which can give a hope for a better world for individuals. And it has found a variety of ideas and practices on which such hope can be built: after all, “what exists is possible”.

This thesis has adopted an explicitly normative position for a type of world politics in which both illegal protection-seekers and members of receiving societies enjoy security together. By adopting an explicitly normative perspective, it may risk opening itself to criticisms of being too idealistic and naïve. Even legal immigrants can be identified by decision-makers and citizens as threats to societal identities and welfare systems. In this political atmosphere, it might be considered wishful thinking, utopian, or naive to talk about the possibility of trust towards illegal immigrants. It is not wishful thinking, but hopeful thinking based on rational ideas and empirical realities. This project hopes for a better world by looking at and being based on existing ideas and practices. It also hopes to provoke the readers to re-think about their choices in relation to what kind of world they want to live in. As stated in the Introduction, the thesis does not chase utopias, but looks to construct a more cosmopolitan world security in the age of migration. The thesis has aimed to provide a perspective for those who choose to think and to act in order to construct a new type of world politics. Is this construction a certainty? No, but, as the thesis has showed, it is a possibility.

The normative perspective developed and promoted in this analysis has been based on the idea that in order to solve the problem of illegal immigration, the choices of decision-makers of the receiving communities should ensure extensive

---

<sup>5</sup> Booth, *Theory of World Security*, pp. 11-12.

freedom of choice for illegal protection-seekers and citizens alike. This perspective is underlined by *cosmopolitan consciousness*. Cosmopolitan consciousness is individual-oriented. Individuals are entitled to enjoy extensive freedom of choice not as members of national communities or cultural groups. They have moral value as members of the global community of humankind. Political communities in the wider community of humankind should consider how their choices affect the individuals outside the communities. By virtue of this principle, cosmopolitan consciousness does not only shape several security ideas and practices in world politics (emancipatory security theory), but also contributes to conceptualizing the type of trust to transcend security dilemmas (cosmopolitan trust).

## **II. Cosmopolitan Consciousness in Security Thinking and Practice: Emancipatory Security Theory**

The analysis of how a political community should respond to illegal protection-seekers concerns a key concept in world politics: security. The analysis in this project is derived from a wider question in world politics: how can decision-makers generate security for the community's members without causing insecurity for the non-members? Emancipatory security theory built upon cosmopolitan consciousness offers an answer to this question by making assertions about how security should be understood and how it should be pursued. As this thesis has argued, emancipatory security theory is not wishful thinking; cosmopolitan consciousness is not to take a moral high ground in such a politically challenging issue. Rather, it offers a security thinking which involves ideas that can potentially construct a different world politics for both illegal protection-seekers and the members of the receiving communities. Emancipation as a process in world politics in the age of migration is possible.

Such an emancipatory perspective on security does not appeal to a type of post-modernist/structuralist thinking which sees any political action to change the existing systems as futile. According to some post-structuralist writers, political struggle for change inevitably gives birth to an exclusionary system similar to the

one that it was meant to replace, hence it is better to do nothing.<sup>6</sup> As Kenan Malik has put it, “unable to transform society, postmodern critics accommodate to, and even celebrate, oppression”.<sup>7</sup> Those who are oppressed by the existing political structures, such as the sub-Saharanans filling smugglers’ boats, hardly agree with this idea. Neither do the students of emancipatory security theory. Pacifism and political inactivism are not the characteristics of emancipatory security theory. As Booth and Wheeler argued, “humans created a world politics of suspicion and division, but a more harmonious way was always an option. Humanity could have done much better in the past, and could do so in the future”.<sup>8</sup> The security-as-emancipation approach investigates how individuals can enjoy security together not as members of particular national communities or cultural groups but as members of the potential cosmopolitan community of humankind. Change is possible because the achievements of humanity today make change possible, although humanity could have done much better in the past.

The intention of the analysis derived from emancipatory security theory is not to prioritize the security of one group over another. The insecurity for the receiving societies starts with the violation of borders by illegal immigrants; continues with the presence of individuals who violate the immigration laws of the country in the society; and gains an economic dimension through the underground economy fed by unregistered workers. Insecurity caused by illegal protection-seeking for the receiving communities is as real, serious, and important as the insecurity of illegal protection-seekers in the camps in North Africa. Far from neglecting the insecurity of the EU, Kantian hospitality practices discussed in Chapter Eight have aimed to provide a perspective which can solve both insecurities. For example, if North African countries can be transformed into political communities where sub-Saharan protection-seekers can obtain protection, further illegal protection-seeking migration towards the EU can be prevented. A regularization mechanism can help to register all immigrants who arrived in the EU borders

---

<sup>6</sup> For example, Jean Francis Lyotard, *The Post-Modern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), p. 66.

<sup>7</sup> Kenan Malik, *The Meaning of Race* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996), p. 264.

<sup>8</sup> Ken Booth and Nicholas Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma: Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics* (Hampshire: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2008), p. 16.

illegally. This potentially not only solves the problem of border violation, but can also prevent unregistered lives within societies.

What is problematized in this thesis is the counterproductive way the issue of illegal protection-seeking has been approached by the EU: by creating more insecurity for illegal protection-seekers, the EU has contributed to the insecurity of EU citizens. Far from taking a moral high ground, policies derived from cosmopolitan consciousness are more realistic and potentially effective than building detention camps in North Africa or sending warships across the Mediterranean. These policies have so far hardly stopped illegal sub-Saharan immigration. As the political, social, and economic structures keep victimizing many individuals in sub-Saharan Africa, and as the legal channels of migration to the EU are extremely limited and expensive, illegal protection-seeking is likely to continue (as the statistical figures suggest). Putting worst-case forecasting and ethnocentrism aside, EU decision-makers and citizens should consider alternative ideas and practices to solve this problem. This is the objective of emancipatory security theory.

One of the fundamental objectives of this project has been to operationalize emancipatory security theory. This objective was pursued in two ways. The first way was to problematize particular security ideas and practices, specifically the fatalist and mitigator logics of the security dilemma. It was showed that neither ethnocentric security thinking nor the security-as-order understanding can generate security because they re-construct oppressive structures for individuals.

The second way of operationalizing emancipatory security thinking was to bring particular practices into the discussion in the form of transcender logic. In Chapter Eight, it was illustrated what emancipatory security theory would look like in practice. The relevant practices do not prioritize the security of one group of individuals over that of another. They specifically target the phenomenon of illegal immigration, rather than the illegal immigrants. Through a set of global and intergovernmental activities, illegal protection-seekers can be increasingly de-criminalized. In addition, the de-criminalization of illegal protection-seekers can be supported by practices at the societal level in order to eradicate the fears and

insecurity of citizens towards protection-seekers. Emancipatory practices connect the two groups, rather than separating them. The emancipatory political structures can eventually be constructed as the connection between illegal protection-seekers and citizens becomes stronger.

### **III. Studying Security through the Logics: The Security Dilemma**

Through the framework of the three logics, the security dilemma can become a new theoretical framework for the students of security studies to analyze different ideas and practices of security in relation to identity. The security dilemma in this project was conceptualized between fatalist and transcender logics. The insecurity imposed on others because of ethnocentric security policies is predictable and acceptable for the fatalist logic. As Chapter Seven illustrated, EU decision-makers adopting fatalist logic interpret illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers as ‘risks’ and assume the worst about their intentions. Fatalist interpretation of illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers has replicated the identity of the EU citizen (the referent of security policies) and the illegal protection-seeker (the target of security policies) dichotomy. As keep-protection-seekers-out policies are implemented in North Africa, the insecurity imposed on protection-seekers has not been a priority.

A second choice in Europe’s immigration security dilemma is underlined by the transcender logic. Although Booth and Wheeler did not associate emancipatory security theory with transcender logic, the analysis attempted to show the role that the former can make in constructing transcending practices. Decision-makers adopting emancipatory security thinking can acknowledge that they are not obliged to act in accordance with fatalist principles. They can realize that there are always choices in world politics beyond ‘assume the worst’. In addition, emancipatory security built upon cosmopolitan consciousness encourages decision-makers to consider the effects of their choices over other individuals. Through operationalizing emancipatory security, individuals are put at the centre of security policies.



One of the contributions of this research is to link emancipatory security theory with transcender logic. This theoretical move does not only strengthen transcender logic, but also operationalizes emancipatory security theory. As illustrated in Chapter Eight, in Europe's immigration security dilemma the transcending practices are individual-oriented across all four levels: global, intergovernmental, EU, and societal. Through transcending the security dilemma, exclusionary and oppressive political structures can evolve into the emancipatory ones through which both sub-Saharan protection-seekers and EU citizens will enjoy human rights together by moving towards a shared or common identity as the members of the potential community of humankind as well as keeping their local identities. Cosmopolitan trust was introduced as a key concept serving this process of emancipation.

Trust itself is a challenging concept for students of security studies. It could be one of the concepts which could replace the regressive ideas that create world insecurity. However, trust involves risks. This thesis acknowledges the possibility of misplaced trust and its consequences. It also acknowledges that trust does not provide "an escape from risk and uncertainty", but it does offer an alternative path to security for those who are troubled by world politics characterized by fear, mistrust, and insecurity.<sup>9</sup> Trust is neither easy nor straightforward. Trust-building relationships can be fragile and need constant attention by both parties. Emancipatory security theory does not impose 'cosmopolitan trust' (or any type of choice) as 'the choice', but reveals choices, and therefore, provides alternative paths for individuals to think about and practice their security. Instead of rejecting it as 'utopian' or 'naive', trust deserves academic analysis. As the thesis has aimed to show, based on the existing practices, cosmopolitan trust can be a choice in world politics where security dilemmas continuously emerge.

Cosmopolitan trust (as part of transcender logic) served as a tool to operationalize emancipatory security theory. Kantian hospitality was conceptualized as the manifestation of cosmopolitan trust in Europe's immigration security dilemma. In *Towards Perpetual Peace*, Kant defined hospitality as a condition of

---

<sup>9</sup> Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 297.

cosmopolitan justice. It was argued that republican societies and political relations between republics are necessary for perpetual peace. Perpetual peace also requires hospitality. Hospitality for Kant is not only morally right, but also practical. It serves as a tool of perpetual peace. As in Kantian political philosophy, this project conceptualized hospitality as a security policy which can create emancipatory structures for individuals.

One of the most important arguments in earlier chapters was that hospitality does not begin at the borders. Hospitality can be offered to illegal protection-seekers at global, inter-state and societal levels. All levels of hospitality should be practiced together. This is crucial for hospitality practices to construct emancipatory political structures. As discussed in Chapter Four, hospitality does not assume positive and constructive relationships between citizens and illegal protection-seekers. Rather, it aims to create the conditions within which both groups can interact. Whether this relationship can construct a common we-feeling depends on the character of the relationship. The societal level activities in Chapter Eight exemplify how hospitality can generate positive results for both protection-seekers and citizens. If global institutions like the UNHCR, the EU, and states support these activities, hospitality can contribute to constructing emancipatory structures.

Kantian hospitality does not mean ‘open the borders and let everybody in’. ‘Let them come’ and ‘let them enter’ are two different arguments based on different rationalities. Who can be allowed to enter is a decision which, under the current political structures, belongs to the states. It is also a matter of immigration law, which is not in the scope of this analysis. The thesis has not argued that EU decision-makers should open the borders and let everybody in. This can increase the insecurity of the receiving societies and fuel extreme-right parties. However, the thesis has argued that the EU should let everybody come and make their case. Hospitality aims to give an opportunity for illegal protection-seekers to explain why they need protection in the EU. Existing ethnocentric security policies of the EU almost destroy this opportunity because they are ‘illegal’. This is not only a violation of Article 31 of the Refugee Convention, but it also makes legal immigration impossible for protection-seekers.

What then does Kantian hospitality look like in practice? At the global level, the concept of ‘protection-seeker’ could be accepted as a third legal category along with asylum-seeker and refugee, through a new convention or a protocol which can be annexed to the 1951 Convention. This move could protect the rights of protection-seekers and help to decrease illegal immigration. At the EU border, protection-seeking offices can be established. These offices, under the supervision of the UNHCR, could act as the offices of regularization mechanism. On a case-by-case basis, illegal protection-seekers would be able to make their case to the protection-seeking officers. Inside the EU, the most urgent practice is to spread the City of Sanctuary movement to all Member States. The EU could play a key role in this process. Information campaigns could be organized through state-civil society cooperation in order to clarify to the public the conceptual confusions about ‘asylum-seeker’, ‘protection-seeker’, ‘refugee’, and ‘illegal immigrant’. These choices might be seen as too naive in such a politicized environment. However, based on what has been achieved so far discussed in Chapter Eight, it can be argued that there is hope for the realization of these practices. Surely the practical implications of hospitality (or the logistics of it) require further research. One question could be whether it will be too costly for the EU to establish, say, protection-seeking offices on the borders. A possible answer could be whether accommodating illegal protection-seekers who want to make their case would be more costly than keeping warships in the Mediterranean during most of the year.

Among those possible practical implications above, the institutionalization of the ‘protection-seeker’ is crucial. The concept of ‘asylum’ is one of the greatest achievements of the global protection regime. It has become a fundamental human right, but also very practical as the concept has been helping millions of individuals escaping from political persecution. However, as discussed in Chapter Two, contemporary human rights understanding involves more than political and civil rights; and, the reasons of contemporary forced migration is not as straightforward as state-induced political persecution. The world needs new concepts like ‘protection-seeker’ to address the realities of contemporary forced migration. Protection-seekers can surely become asylum-seekers by applying for refugee status. However, the likelihood of obtaining refugee status for many of them is considerably low. This does not mean that these immigrants do not need

protection, but they need a type of protection which is different from the one covered by the 1951 Convention. If alternative schemes of protection, like the legal institution of ‘protection-seeking’, could not be formulated in the global protection regime, illegal immigration will likely continue in huge numbers. The legalization of the concept of ‘protection-seeker’ is one of the issues which need further research, as it is one of the essential elements of transcending Europe’s immigration security dilemma.

In addition to fatalist and transcender logics, the research also operationalized the mitigator logic. Although Booth and Wheeler’s operationalization of the mitigator logic was state-centric, which made it difficult to apply to a non-state security dilemma, mitigator logic is important to show how the English School’s order can result in the replication of oppressive structures. As in the fatalist logic, the security understanding of the mitigator logic can fail to create security for individuals. Ironically, the political structures which have been identified as the main reason for instability in North Africa in many EU documents have been reinforced through mitigating practices. As in the fatalist logic, the EU has not achieved the democratic transformation it has desired, while individual rights and freedoms continue to be violated without any serious challenge from the EU. Moreover, it was discovered that the EMP order has made the implementation of the fatalist illegal immigration policies in North Africa possible. In other words, the mitigator logic has produced negative results directly for North African individuals and illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers, and indirectly for EU citizens.

#### **IV. Towards More Emancipatory Security**

The arguments developed in this research highlight problems in the securitization approach to the study of migration. The securitization approach assumes that there is only one understanding of security and decision-makers monolithically adopt the same security perspective, which is more or less similar to the fatalist logic. However, as the research has attempted to show, fatalist and transcending choices co-exist in the politics of migration. Institutions in a political structure can adopt alternative logics. As discussed in Chapter Seven, the Commission and the

Council of the EU have different perspectives about illegal immigration and how to solve this insecurity for the EU. Beyond the decision-making structures, civil society actors can have different ideas about how the insecurity of citizens in relation to protection-seekers can be solved. In other words, the politics of security is more complex than the securitization approach assumes. The security dilemma framework has enabled the analysis of this complexity.

In addition to the problems about the study of security, the identity conceptualization of the securitization approach is also problematic. According to the securitization approach, the relationship between security and identity with reference to migration is one-sided: because immigrants have a different identity than the receiving society, they are presented as a security threat to the societal identity of the receiving society. This is true but incomplete: insecurity can also result in the construction of dichotomist identities between immigrants and the receiving communities. Unlike the securitization approach, this analysis did not accept societal identities as given and fixed and as the reason for insecurity. Instead, they are continuously re-constructed. This project analyzed how an understanding of security and the policies to generate security affect the construction of identities. Some security policies replicate the dichotomist identities; some of them construct common identities. The security dilemma framework enabled this type of analysis that would not be possible through the securitization approach.

Moving beyond the elite decision-making level of analysis explicitly prioritized by the securitization approach of the Copenhagen School, this thesis analyzed civil society actors in the area of migration. The activities of City of Sanctuary, Time Together, and Monitor and Befriending System as exemplars of transcender logic demonstrate that the politics of migration is not restricted to decision-making circles and their ideas and practices. The politics of migration is not solely about fear, exclusion, and mistrust. At the societal level, there is fear and mistrust; there are also activities which connect protection-seekers and citizens under the supervision of civil society actors. Through empowering protection-seekers, they do not only help protection-seekers to integrate into the community in which protection is sought, but also encourage citizens to transcend their stereotypes and

fears about protection-seekers. In other words, the activities of progressive civil society, through building cosmopolitan trust, are crucial to constructing emancipatory political structures. Their activities, however, have been largely neglected by students of security studies analyzing migration. The security dilemma framework, along with emancipatory security theory, has identified progressive civil society activities as potentially emancipatory security policies.

In conclusion, this thesis offers the outline of an approach to answering the question of how we might live together in the age of migration. While offering a new theoretical perspective to the security implications of migration on immigrants and the receiving communities, the analysis has aimed to provoke questions as well. These include: how to ensure wider society participation to the societal level hospitality practices? What are the legal obstacles for the construction of an emancipatory political structure (for example, how to decriminalize rescue at sea)? How might hospitality work in EU Member States other than the UK? In a theoretical sense, although this project is a beginning, the immigration security dilemma framework might be operationalized in relation to different types of migration in order to see if it is useful in other circumstances.

A better world is possible. It depends to what extent individuals can and *want to* explore the possibilities of human potential to live together. It also depends on the ability of IR scholars to problematize the regressive ideas which have replicated world insecurity. In a world where human mobility from developing countries to the more developed regions has increased for a variety of reasons, scholars should work more on the global conditions of common life. The issue has acquired new urgency as insecurity imposed on both immigrants and the receiving communities has increased. The sub-Saharan bodies found in the sea and on the shores of Mediterranean countries are a manifestation of our diminished humanity. This thesis has been an attempt to discuss how the members of global community of humankind can restore our diminished humanity together. It has explored the possibilities of hope to enable us to answer positively the question posed at the very start of the thesis by the captain of the ship *Francisco y Catalina*: No, we as the members of the potential community of humankind should not let them drown.