

The Road to the EU-Turkey Refugee Deal

Investigating the desecuritization of Turkey



Kayleigh Rijnbeek (4334000)

kayleigh.rijnbeek@student.ru.nl

Master Political Science – International Relations

Radboud University Nijmegen

Supervisor: Jutta Joachim

13/08/2018

Abstract

On March 18, 2015, an agreement between the European Union and Turkey was implemented aimed at the reduction of irregular migrant crossing to the EU. Though the EU-Turkey readmission agreement presented a solution to the European refugee crisis, which had been at its height in 2015, the details of the agreement were almost immediately criticized. The agreement stated that Turkey would be a safe third country for refugees, under which terms the EU could return migrants -who had crossed into Greece through Turkey- back to Turkey. Amongst the opponents to the deal were several humanitarian agencies and the United Nations who problematized the designation of Turkey as a safe third country due to the nations troubled record with human rights. These concerns had in the past also been voiced by the EU and individual EU member states. The apparent change in the framing of Turkey suggests the desecuritization of Turkey. This thesis uses a frame analysis to investigate the frames that were used to describe Turkey in Dutch discourse and uses theory-testing process-tracing to test whether a process of desecuritization can be observed in the Turkish case. Drawing on securitization theory, the research identifies the presence of desecuritization frames and provides evidence that shows that part of the desecuritization mechanism that was deductively gathered from the securitization literature is present.

Key words: Turkey, Securitization, Desecuritization, Readmission Agreement

List of Contents

List of Abbreviations	4
Chapter 1: Introduction	5
1.1 <i>Background</i>	5
1.1.1 <i>The EU-Turkey Readmission Agreement</i>	6
1.2 <i>Research Question</i>	7
1.3 <i>Theory</i>	8
1.4 <i>Methodology</i>	10
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework	11
2.1 <i>Securitization</i>	11
2.1.1 <i>Securitization and the Copenhagen School</i>	12
2.1.2 <i>Beyond the Copenhagen School</i>	16
2.2 <i>Framing</i>	18
2.3 <i>Securitization Framing</i>	22
Chapter 3 : Methods	24
3.1 <i>Frame analysis</i>	24
3.2 <i>Process Tracing</i>	27
3.3 <i>Case Selection</i>	29
3.4 <i>Data</i>	30
Chapter 4: Empirical Analysis	32
4.1 <i>Towards the EU-Turkey readmission agreement</i>	33
4.2 <i>Desecuritization and securitization frames</i>	36
4.2.1 <i>Governmental level</i>	36
4.2.2 <i>Civil Society level</i>	40
4.2.3 <i>The media</i>	43
4.3 <i>Tracing desecuritization</i>	46
4.3.1 <i>The audience and facilitating conditions</i>	46
4.3.2 <i>Audience acceptance</i>	48
4.3.3 <i>The realm of normal politics</i>	49
Chapter 5: Conclusion	51
5.1 <i>Empirical evidence</i>	51
5.2 <i>Reflection and limitations</i>	53
5.3 <i>Future research</i>	55
Bibliography	56

List of Abbreviations

APD: Asylum Procedures Directive

CBS: Centraal Bureau Statistiek

CS: Copenhagen School

EC: European Commission

EEC: European Economic Community

EU: European Union

HRW: Human Rights Watch

UN: United Nations

UNHCR: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background

On March 18, 2016, the European Union and Turkey agreed on the implementation of the EU-Turkey agreement (Collet, 2016). Described by European Council President Donald Tusk as a “clear message that the days of irregular migration to Europe are over” (BBC, 2016), the deal, or agreement as it is often referred to, is actually a joint ‘statement’ between the EU and Turkey (Batalla Adam, 2017: 45). With this joint statement the parties made a combined promise to address the European refugee crisis. In its most general description, the agreement allows the EU to return any irregular migrants who have entered Greece to Turkey, which has been deemed a safe third nation for refugees. The process leading up to the agreement is this thesis will investigate. It will be a process of uncovering what, at least superficially, appears to be a complete frame-shift in the description of the nation, namely from Turkey as a -securitized- nation guilty of breaking humanitarian rights (MP Harry van Bommel in Besselink, 2015), to Turkey as a -desecuritized- nation deemed safe for refugees. Usage of the safe third country principle in relation to Turkey has been scrutinized by organizations such as Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk, Amnesty International and the United Nations (UN), allowing for a critical look into the discursive practices used in the period leading up to the agreement’s implementation. The terms readmission agreement EU-Turkey deal and joint action plan will be used interchangeably throughout this thesis.

It is precisely the idea of Turkey functioning as a safe destination for refugees that has been met with both disappointment and strong criticism from various actors such as action groups, humanitarian agencies and even the United Nations. These humanitarian agencies have perhaps been most vocal in their criticism of the readmission agreement responding with concern to the deal. Amnesty International for one has described the readmission agreement as a “blue print for despair” (Amnesty International, 2017) in their briefing published in February 2017, questioning the status of Turkey as a safe third nation and addressing the risk of refoulement from Turkey. Dutch refugee organization Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk has called the situation for refugees in Turkey “dire [schrijnend]” (18 March 2018). Additionally, the United Nations refugee agency has expressed concerns regarding the deal from its very conception stating that they believe:

“an asylum-seeker should only be returned to a third state if responsibility for assessing the particular asylum application in substance is assumed by the third

country; the asylum-seeker will be protected from refoulement; the individual will be able to seek and, if recognized, enjoy asylum in accordance with accepted international standards, with full and effective access to education, work, health care and, as necessary, social assistance” (Achilleas, 2016)

The response from Amnesty International, Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk and the UN is evidence of the problematic nature of the agreement and calls for close investigation of its creation. If anything, the opposition makes for a crucial study into the legitimization of the agreement, especially how the framing used in this process legitimized Turkey as a safe third country for refugees despite previously being described as a nation not meeting the moral values as upheld by the EU. The research will thus provide a necessary insight into the way framing is involved in the shaping and reshaping of policy.

Additionally, the deal is striking due to the tumultuous relationship between the EU and Turkey in which the EU has repeatedly pushed back Turkey’s accession to the EU for various reasons amongst which concerns for Turkey’s Human Rights record (Wright, 2016). In light of this surprising change in the relationship with Turkey, it is crucial to investigate *how* Turkey was framed in the lead up to the agreement and whether we can observe if the framing of Turkey changed in the lead-up to the implementation of the action-plan. Central elements to this discussion are thus the safe third country concept, securitization and framing.

1.1.1 The EU-Turkey Readmission Agreement

The readmission agreement between Turkey and the European Union is one of many examples of the measures undertaken by the EU to deal with migration issues. Its creation resulted from the European Union’s aim of curbing the massive influx of refugees that the different nation states saw as part of the European refugee crisis. The Netherlands, for one, faced an influx of 58.880 refugees in 2015, compared to 29.890 in 2014 and 16.725 in 2013 (CBS, 2018). For Europe as a whole, the number of refugees rose to 1322.800 in 2015 as opposed to 627.000 in 2014 and 431.100 in 2013 (Vluchtelingenwerk, 2018). Though incentives for agreeing to the deal are likely to have stemmed from different motivations for Turkey, Turkish Prime Minister Ahmet Davutoglu said “EU and Turkey we have the same goal, the same objective to help Syrian refugees especially” (Almasy, 2016). Originally agreed upon in 2015, the implementation of the deal was realized in March of 2016 after Turkey agreed to the proposals made as part of the action plan. One of the most significant aspects of the deal is Turkey’s promise to readmit any irregular migrant who has entered into

one of the Greek islands from Turkey (JRS Europe, 2016). In return, the EU promised to reignite negotiations into Turkey's accession to the EU, speed up the removal of visa requirements of Turkish citizens in the Schengen zone, and provide financial support to Turkey to improve the situation of Syrians in the country (Batalla Adam, 2017: 45).

Additionally, a commitment was made for the EU to resettle one Syrian refugee from Turkey for every irregular migrant that was readmitted to Turkey as part of the agreement (Batalla Adam, 2017: 45). Now, two years after the deal was implemented, it is time to evaluate the deal, especially its creation.

1.2 Research Question

In light of the controversy surrounding the implementation of the readmission agreement this thesis aims to answer the following research question:

How was Turkey framed as a safe third nation in the process of creating the EU-Turkey agreement despite the strained relationship between Turkey and the European Union?

The puzzle will thus be to figure out *how* the EU moved from a problematic relationship with Turkey to the EU propping up Turkey as a safe third nation. The EU-Turkey deal will serve as an illustrative case of how an issue, in this research a nation, is framed to make it an acceptable concept, for this research the acceptable concept will be the safe third country concept. This thesis will be focused on the interplay between framing and securitization as such applying a securitization framing framework to the case at hand. The research will explore how, in the creation of the agreement, the frame changed from framing Turkey as a nation with a troubled record with human rights, thus a securitized nation, to Turkey as a nation that is a safe third nation for refugees, in other terms, desecuritizing the nation.

From a scientific perspective, this case is striking as it looks at the process of desecuritizing an individual nation, namely Turkey, to present it as a safe nation for refugees through the creation of the agreement. The scientific relevance lies in precisely this process of desecuritization, a process that, despite significant theorizing into securitization, remains under theorized. Additionally, this research aims to add to the theoretical debate as while the issue of migration has been widely securitized, especially in the EU, there has not yet been any research into the *desecuritization of individual nations* for migration. The aim of this research will thus be to uncover what frames were present in the lead-up to the

implementation of the action-plan. Though we can observe that an agreement was made between Turkey and the EU member states, this thesis will show *how* Turkey was framed to achieve this result. Can the presentation or indeed framing of Turkey in the lead-up to this agreement account for the acceptance of its implementation? The investigation of the frames that are present in the period prior to the agreement's implementation can then be used to trace the process of desecuritization. The tracing of this process in turn can be used to determine whether the understanding of desecuritization that has been developed thus far is extensive enough for practical use.

Additionally, this thesis serves a societal purpose. Turkey has often been described as a nation guilty of breaching human rights, yet the readmission agreement was adopted. This is intriguing as, according to the UNHCR, a country can only be a safe third country if it upholds the stipulations of the 1951 Refugee Convention, which states that a refugee's human rights must be respected. This research will thus present an insight into the expected frame-shift regarding Turkey. To look into the framing of international agreements such as this one will provide an insight into the way in which issues are legitimized in the wider public. An understanding of this process of legitimization provides us with a critical eye with which to evaluate international agreements. As more deals resembling the readmission agreement may be made with other gateway countries into the EU we should be able to distinguish framing differentiations that are used by actors who are part of the agreement making process. This research can thus serve as a guide to understanding how an individual nation becomes desecuritized and thus provide a critical evaluation of this process.

1.3 Theory

This thesis draws on both framing and securitization theory to answer the research question set out above. Framing is a process of selecting certain aspects of an event or an issue so these aspects become more prominent in the discussion of the event or issue. It is undertaken to promote certain definitions, interpretations or solutions (Entman, 1993: 52). Framing involves the organization of information in such a way that an issue or event is represented to highlight those aspects which are most important to the actor engaged in framing.

The logic behind framing comes from framing theory. The idea that framing effects occur when "(often small) changes in the presentation of an issue or an event produce

(sometimes large) changes of opinion” (Chong, Druckman, pg.103). The framing of an issue, such as the readmission agreement, consists of presenting one particular viewpoint where many other interpretations are possible. This thesis pays particular attention to the framing used in the lead-up to the agreement. Frames are a form of communication and part of culture, they are therefore often invisible, making them “a power mechanism in their own right” (Van Gorp, 2007: 63). Framing may seem like a monotonous part of daily life, however, they are the starting point for “interest formation and determine[s] which institutions will take up [these] issues and which actors will pay attention to them” (Joachim, pg. 249). We may therefore speak of framing as an integral part of the agreement making process.

Securitization, like framing, is a process of describing an event or an issue in a particular manner. Within this framework though, the event is placed within the realm of security. Securitization involves a securitizing actor, a constructed threat, a referent object and an audience (Wæver, 1993; Buzan et al, 1998; Balzacq, 2005; Stritzel, 2007). By placing an issue or event as an existential threat to a referent object, the issue is moved out of a sphere of normal politics into a space of exceptionality (Stritzel 2007: 360). The premise of the approach is that issues and events may be socially constructed as threats by a securitizing actor (Buzan, et al, 1998; Vultee, 2012). This thesis will focus mainly on the reversal of this process known as desecuritization. In this process a previously securitized issue or event is placed back into the realm of normal politics, back into a space of democratic discussion (Wæver, 1993; Buzan et al, 1998; Freire et al, 2008; Roe, 2004; Roe, 2012). The research will thus focus on the framing undertaken by a desecuritizing actor as part of a desecuritizing move.

The aim of this research is thus to uncover how the this process of framing aided in the desecuritization of Turkey. In adhering to securitization logic, we may view the deal as “constructing security through collaborative projects and common initiatives and actions” (Mihaila, pg. 427). It shows how security as a concept has been reshaped since the end of the Cold War when the nature of threats changed. Security is not just military any more, it is also found in soft power (Mihaila, 2015). Security is a concept that can now be related to the designation of a country as a safe third nation. This designation is not related to hard power in the least but is part of respecting a person’s rights. If Turkey is framed as a safe-third country it is desecuritized, framing it as a secure destination/country to be visited (Mihaila, pg. 427), or in terms of the readmission agreement, a safe country for the return of refugees, allowing for the legitimization of the deal amongst the general population.

1.4 Methodology

A content analysis, particularly an analysis of frames, in combination with process tracing will be used to investigate *how* the discussion was *framed* by different actors in the lead-up to the implementation of the agreement. In studying the frames present in the lead up to the agreement, this thesis is expected to find both positive and negative frames, some frames desecuritizing Turkey and others used to securitize the nation. The uncovered frames will be grouped according to the level -governmental, civil society, media- at which they appear, to both identify which frames each level adopted and whether a frame-shift can indeed be observed. The arguments and statements made by relevant actors are all part of the framing process and I set out to uncover why a statement is framed in a particular way and how the frame is created. The basis of this particular methodology is that a frame is used as a tool for justification, as a way of legitimizing strategic interests. The empirical analysis chapter will include the inferences we can make from the framing used at the different levels researched. Turkey will thus be used as a case study to illustrate how a nation may be desecuritized or securitized in the lead-up to an agreement such as the EU-Turkey readmission agreement.

The frame analysis will consist of an analysis of various types of written content. The data for the content analysis will be gathered on three levels. Firstly, and most importantly, the governmental level will be addressed. As the implementation of the readmission agreement was a policy decision on EU level, this research looks at Dutch parliamentary documents to provide an insight into the framing present in the lead-up to the agreement. Dutch parliamentary documents were chosen as the Netherlands played a significant role in the creation of the agreement. The civil society level will serve to provide an insight into counter-frames that may be present, additionally giving an insight into acceptance of the expected desecuritization frame. Finally, the media level will consist of articles gathered from two Dutch newspapers, namely *De Telegraaf* and *De Volkskrant*. The use of framing in the media level will be used to determine whether frames used on the governmental or civil society level were adopted by the media, again providing insight into frame acceptance.

Following the content analysis I will engage in process tracing. This second aspect of the research will be undertaken to test the process of desecuritization. Merely showing the presence of desecuritization frames does not provide evidence of successful desecuritization. In order to fulfil this aim the different steps of desecuritization must be empirically analyzed. This thesis will thus make use of theory-testing process tracing to investigate whether the theorized causal mechanism is present. Chapter 3 will discuss the methods more extensively.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

This chapter deals with the theories that are most relevant to this research, namely securitization theory and framing theory. Though the two tend to be treated separately in the literature, framing and securitization theory complement each other greatly as both have a basis in structuring the opinion of an audience through discursive practices. By combining the two, we can understand the framing of the readmission agreement more comprehensively. This combination can be achieved by incorporating framing theory in the broader securitization framework. In doing so framing is placed as central to the discursive practices of securitization. Framing will thus be used as a theoretical tool to study the discursive practices of securitization. Section 2.1 will deal with the specifics of the securitization approach, section 2.2 will set out the details of framing theory and. Finally, in section 2.3, following the explanation of what each of these theories show and how they aid in the research aim of this thesis, the integration of framing theory into the securitization framework is explained. This final framework represents the integrated securitization framing framework that will serve as the basis of this research.

2.1 Securitization

Securitization theory, with its roots in the International Relations discipline (Stritzel, 2007: 357), allows us to understand that an issue can be framed as a security issue. It provides an insight into how an event may be placed within the sphere of security by presenting it to form a threat to a referent object (Wæver, 1993; Buzan et al, 1998; Balzacq, 2005; Stritzel, 2007). Stemming from the period following the end of the Cold War, when the face of security began to change, securitization illustrates how threats are constructed so they may be removed from ‘normal politics’ into a field of exceptionality (Stritzel, 2007). As such, securitization does not occur naturally. Securitization theory includes the presence of a securitizing actor, a securitizing move or act and a referent object (Buzan et al, 1998; Balzacq, 2005). Within the understandings of securitization theory, security is no longer viewed as consisting of only hard, military power, but is also considered to be found in soft power (Mihaila, 2015). In other words, there has been a shift from security as solely concerned with military power, to security as related to culture and identity. Securitization approaches security not as an objective measurable concept of military risk but as an act of socially constructing issues as threats (Wæver 1993: 61).

2.1.1 *Securitization and the Copenhagen School*

The adoption of securitization theory originated in the 1980's but grew immensely in the following decade. The then new approach to security was a response to the realist approach to security in the world (Stritzel 2007: 357). The subsequent rise of securitization theory is generally attributed to the Copenhagen School (CS), at its center Ole Wæver and Barry Buzan (Hysmans 1998: 479), who provided a European approach to security studies (Hysmans 1998: 480). Members of the Copenhagen School defined security as a speech act (Wæver 1993: 53), in which “the *word* “security” is the act: the utterance is the primary reality” (Wæver 1993: 54). Invoking the term security as a speech act constitutes a securitizing move (Stritzel 2007: 358). By referring to an issue with the terminology of security, the issue is presented as a threat to “a valued referent object that is so existential that it is legitimate to move the issue beyond the established games of ‘normal’ politics to deal with it by exceptional, i.e. security methods” (Stritzel 2007: 360). It is a means of presenting an issue in a way that allows for normally unaccepted measures.

Of course, more is involved than the simple use of the term security, with it comes a particular rhetorical structure (Huysmans 1998: 492). The rhetorical structure and therefore successful securitization consists of three steps, namely; the identification of an existential threat; emergency action, and; the effect on the relation between the units due to the breaking free of rules (Taureck 2006: 55). In other words, only when a situation is successfully referred to as a threat and this description is accepted to the extent where exceptional actions can be undertaken without backlash, is securitization successful. Undeniably, the focus of the speech act lies almost solely on the linguistic aspect of securitization (Stritzel, 2007: 358). However, significant power is also awarded to the audience who determine the success of the speech act. Presenting something as a threat does not in itself cause securitization, “this is a securitizing move, but the issue is securitized only if and when the audience accepts it as such” (Buzan et al. 1998: 25). This suggests that if the audience does not accept the securitizing move then an issue will never be able to enter into the security sphere. As desecuritization, which will be discussed in more detail below, is the reversal of securitization, we would expect that for desecuritization to be successful the audience must also accept a desecuritizing move. Desecuritization forms the main area of interest for this thesis, related to the expectation that Turkey has been desecuritized in the lead-up to the EU-Turkey agreement.

The Copenhagen School's interpretation of securitization grew from the conception of security as related to national survival and thus still has strong realist features (Stritzel 2007: 360). This tension between the response the theory tries to offer to the realist approach of security and the adherence to realist features is logical. After all, the Copenhagen School tried to evolve security studies to surpass the focus on military relations between states whilst avoiding the creation of a concept that was all-encompassing to any type of threat to "the existence, well-being or development of individuals, social groups, nations and mankind" (Huysmans 1998: 482; Buzan et al, 1998). The mainstream understandings of security relate to the "state's monopoly over the legitimate use of violence by armed forces in the domestic and international environment of the state" (Huysmans 1998: 486). However, the securitization approach of the Copenhagen School incorporates many more actors into the debate whilst also introducing non-military threats and challenging the state-centric approach of mainstream understanding of securitization (Huysmans 1998: 487). Securitization is thus concerned with the security of people, or groups of people. This security can be affected by factors in the "military, the economic, the political, the societal and the environmental" (Huysmans 1998: 488) sectors, though the sectors are not mutually exclusive. This thesis is expected to show a dissociation from military threats and, instead, highlight the desecuritization of an individual nation in relation to migration, combining the political and societal levels.

The shift towards a less state-centric approach of security has been subject to scrutiny. Covering the security spectrum from traditional realist to critical securitization scholars highlights the difficulty of limiting the field of security. While traditional realists criticize securitization theory for straying too far outside the realm of threats to the state, critical scholars call for a more encompassing approach to security (Vultee, 2012: 35). The aim of the Copenhagen School was to create a new approach to securitization that was more inclusive than the security of traditional realists, including issues of politics, society and the environment (Vultee, 2012: 35), whilst refraining from the creation of a grand theory indiscriminate in its application of security. Within the scholarly discussion, the distinction between the approaches is described as the wide versus narrow debate about security issues (Buzan, et al, 1998: 2). The Copenhagen School consists distinctly of 'wideners' of the debate. While the proponents of the wider approach to security have been criticized with the claim that they are including so much into the security debate that its meaning is becoming void (Buzan, et al, 1998: 2), their discussion of security incorporates the necessary limitations

to uphold the scholarly merits of the theory. As the wideners of the CS set out the criteria that to be securitized something must be constructed as an existential threat to a referent object where the construction must be realized by a securitizing agent (Buzan, et al, 1998: 5), they have taken the first steps towards a comprehensive theory that is relevant to the academic field.

The process of securitization includes both securitizing agents and functional agents (Huysmans 1998: 490), who are involved in the securitization of the referent object as mentioned above. The securitizing agent is simply the actor performing a securitizing move (Buzan et al, 1998: 36). The functional actors however, do not engage in securitization, rather they are the parties that influence decisions in the process (Buzan et al, 1998: 36; Freire et al, 2008). In this research, a functional actor may be found in the civil society actors who are critical of the readmission agreement. Their critical response to the designation of Turkey as a safe third country could be used to affect the policy. The performance of such a securitizing move is not limited to those in office or the elite; rather they can be performed by a large variety of actors or agents, with the success of the move depending on the credibility of the actor and the power and capability with which they are able to construct the threat (Vultee, 2012: 34). The same is to be expected in relation to desecuritization. For an issue to be moved back into normal politics the desecuritizing actor must be credible. In this research, Dutch parliament will be presented as the desecuritizing actor, studying their discursive acts to determine if and how they adopt desecuritizing frames. However, this research will also attempt to highlight securitizing moves enacted by non-state and non-elite actors, expectedly in the form of humanitarian actors securitizing Turkey.

The process of securitization is not merely dependent on the use of security discourse by a securitizing agent rather; according to the Copenhagen School (Buzan et al 1998:3; Stritzel 2007: 358; McDonald 2008: 567), success is dependent on three facilitating conditions, namely;

1. The demand internal to the speech act of following the grammar of security,
2. The social conditions regarding the position of authority for the securitizing actor- that is, the relationship between speaker and audience and thereby the likelihood of the audience accepting the claim made in a securitizing attempt, and
3. Features of the alleged threats that either facilitate or impede securitization (Buzan et al, 1998: 33)

Important for the understanding of this research is the awareness that securitization is not a matter of present or absent, but instead we find it in different degrees. An issue is not securitized overnight, instead, the securitizing actor will introduce parts of the securitization process gradually, thus steadily increasing the level of securitization. The same can be expected for desecuritization. In this thesis, it is expected that the desecuritization of Turkey occurred over time. The facilitating conditions can be present to a greater or lesser extent. They are never necessary conditions for a successful speech act; their presence merely improves the likelihood of its success (Buzan et al, 1998: 33). In addition to having facilitating conditions that aid in the success of securitization, Charett provides several questions that can be used to determine whether the security criteria, or the process of securitization, have been fulfilled, namely; “has the securitizing actor managed to mobilize support [audience acceptance]? Who is the audience and what are the facilitating conditions? Have extraordinary actions been taking? And what might be the impact of such securitizing acts on other units?” (2009: 14). Though measuring the impact of securitizing acts on others will remain outside of the scope of this thesis, the remaining questions will be discussed further in the chapter on methods.

As the research aim of this thesis is to understand how Turkey was framed as a safe third country, despite previously having been described as a nation guilty of breaching human rights, this thesis is mainly concerned with the reversal of securitization. In this process, also known as desecuritization, the securitized issue is returned to the realm of ‘normal politics’, either as a conscious action or as the result of a failed speech act (Freire et al, 2008; Wæver 1993: 57). For the Copenhagen School, and Wæver in particular, desecuritization is the preferable strategy as it allows problems to be dealt with in the sphere of normal politics, rather than within the sphere of extraordinary measures (Taureck, 2006: 55; Roe, 2004: 285; Roe, 2012: 252-3; Macdonald, 2008: 566). According to Roe, the preferred strategy for reaching desecuritization within the Copenhagen School’s framework is to “prevent issues from being frames in term of security in the first place” (2004: 285). Additionally, two other options are proposed the first is to ensure that responses to securitized issues do not create further security dilemmas thus managing securitization, and second, to move securitized issues back into normal politics (Roe 2004: 284). However, Roe and Taureck (2006) criticize the concept of desecuritization as underdeveloped in the work of the Copenhagen School, with Roe further criticizing Wæver’s preferred strategy for desecuritization as non-

securitization (2004: 285). A more detailed understanding of desecuritization, which will be discussed below, has since been developed .

2.1.2 *Beyond the Copenhagen School*

The Copenhagen School, despite its valiant efforts at restructuring the field of security, has received criticism from several scholars. The authors of these criticisms, among which Huysmans (1998), McDonald (2008), and Balzacq (2010), can be referred to as post-Copenhagen School. Important to note here is that they build on the work of the Copenhagen School, they do not dismiss it. In doing so, the core understandings of the Copenhagen School remain intact. For Balzacq, securitization is an

“assemblage of practices whereby heuristic artefacts (metaphors, policy tools, image repertoires, analogies, stereotypes, emotions, etc.) are contextually mobilized by a securitizing actor, who works to prompt an audience to build a coherent network of implications [...] about the critical vulnerability of a referent object, that concurs with the securitizing actor’s reasons for choices and actions, by investing the referent subject with such an aura of unprecedented threatening complexion that a customized policy must be undertaken immediately to block its developments” (2010: 3).

Balzacq undeniably relies heavily on the work of the Copenhagen School to explain securitization. Holding on to the securitizing actor and the referent object, and in keeping with the discursive nature of securitization, he adds here a broader focus on non-discursive practices and a stronger focus on the context in which securitizing moves take place. In his definition, Balzacq takes a step back from the strong focus on the speech act, and instead suggests that the discursive side of securitization is part of an interaction between context and practices and a discursive component that mediates this interaction, “to convince or persuade an audience to see the world in a specific way and thus act as the situation commands” (Balzacq in Routledge 2010: 63).

An important critique of the CS, as is also seen in Balzacq’s revised definition of securitization, is thus the limited focus on contextual features of security. As McDonald (2008) and Stritzel (2007) discuss, the facilitating conditions previously mentioned were a step towards a more encompassing understanding of securitization, though they remained underdeveloped by the Copenhagen School scholars. McDonald therefore states that to study security the researcher must “pay attention to the social, political and historical contexts in which particular discourses of security [...] become possible” (2008: 573). For this thesis the

facilitating conditions as proposed by the CS, will be formulated as follows: (1) the discursive practices of the securitization process following the grammar of security; (2) the position of authority of the securitizing actor; (3) the social, political and historical context of the threat. The questions as proposed by Charett (2009), thus still hold for the investigation of the lead-up to the EU-Turkey agreement.

Roe (2004), when criticizing the Copenhagen School's position on desecuritization, discusses a number of alternative strategies. Something that has been securitized can be desecuritized by adopting an objectivist, constructivist or deconstructivist strategy (2004: 285). The objectivist strategy, which is based in an objective-subjective understanding of security, consists of convincing the audience that an issue is not really a security issue (*ibid.*). Meanwhile, the constructivist strategy entails trying to understand the process of securitization rather than determining if something is a threat, and using this understanding to transform the securitized frame (2004: 286). Finally, the deconstructivist strategy suggests that "the security drama is not recounted from the outside looking in (constructivist), but from the inside looking out" (*ibid.*). In other words, the issue is approached in such a way that it reflects normal problems that can be dealt with by normal politics, rather than externally as with securitized issues. As this thesis aims to shed light on an expected process of desecuritization in the Turkish case, the more extensive conceptualization of the post-Copenhagen School process of desecuritization will be used later on in this thesis. Though the concept remains somewhat open to the interpretation of the security researcher, tracing the process will show if this understanding of desecuritization can account for the approach of Turkey in the lead-up to the readmission agreement. In conducting the research, this thesis is expected to show an adherence to the deconstructivist strategy of desecuritization at the governmental level. This expectation exists because there is evidence of Turkey previously having been placed in the realm of security within Dutch discourse, leading to the belief that the issue will now be approached as one that can be handled through normal politics.

As previously mentioned, the process of desecuritization is what this thesis aims to investigate. It would thus be wise to formulate questions like those of Charett (2009: 14), that will allow for the tracing of desecuritization in the period under study. Slightly altering the questions of Charett (2009) so that they may reflect the criteria of desecuritization as created by Buzan et al (1998) and Roe (2004), the following guide may be adhered to; (1) has the desecuritizing actor gained support [can we observe audience acceptance]?; (2) who is the audience and what are the facilitating conditions?; (3) has the issue been placed back into

normal politics?; and what might be the impact of such desecuritizing acts on other units? As previously stated, the last question remains outside the scope of this research. Additionally, altering the facilitating conditions for desecuritization leads to the following; (1) the discursive practices of the process do not adhere to the grammar of security; (2) the position of authority of the desecuritizing actor; (3) the social, political and historical context of the issue that is desecuritized.

2.2 Framing

This section will introduce the topic of framing in more detail. The concept of framing is used in this thesis as it provides a more detailed basis from which to understand the discursive practices of the securitization approach. At the end of this chapter, framing theory will be combined with the theory of securitization to construct a combined framework for the investigation into the framing of Turkey as a safe third country for refugees.

The use of frames is apparent in several disciplines, especially within communication and sociology, and in their simplest description they may be said to constitute fields of meaning. When a topic is framed, certain aspects of it are highlighted in such a way that the topic can be placed within a particular field of meaning, one that resonates with the intended audience. In relation to the lead-up to the previously described readmission agreement, the framing consists of the way political EU member state representatives and NGOs represented the situation in Turkey and organized the information to legitimize their claim. This of course can be done in a positive or a negative light, by focusing on different aspects of the situation for migrants in Turkey. A frame then, is a tool used to define a problem or an issue, to identify its causes and make moral judgements, and used to offer remedies to the defined issue (Entman, 1993:52; Samaras, 2002: 72). They can be “[used] as a tactic [...] by political entrepreneurs to coordinate individuals around particular interpretations of their problems” (Chong, Druckman 2007: 118). Framing, in other words, consists of highlighting certain aspects of a problem. An example of the framing process would be when a hate group, such as an extreme right movement is planning a rally. While a community is likely to oppose the occurrence of such a rally in their neighborhood, those in charge may address the rally as an issue of free speech in order to minimize the opposition. Those in charge will have invoked a free speech frame. (Chong, Druckman 2007:106).An example of a frame is the Cold War frame, which was a dominant frame in politics in the second half of the twentieth century (Stack 2013: 52). This frame “highlighted certain foreign events as problems (e.g. civil wars), identified their sources

(e.g. communist rebels), offered moral judgements (e.g. atheistic aggression) and commended particular solutions (e.g. support for the other side)” (Samaras, 2002: 89).

Repetitive use of frames allows for them to become part of the common understanding of the issue at hand. They are often invented by politicians, repeated by media outlets, and eventually taken over by the public. These widely used and accepted frames, amongst which we may include justice and injustice frames, are referred to as master frames within framing literature (Benford, 2013: 1). Used consciously or otherwise, they allow us to shape information to attribute more salience to particular elements of the information (Simmons et al. n.d: 8). This is especially apparent in politics, where actors consciously use frames to encourage the public to think about issues in a particular manner, often packaging complex political debates into much more simplistic frames (Semetko, Valkenburg, 2000: 95).

Framing is not a tactic of persuasion but instead a strategy of portraying *-framing-* issues in a way that will resonate with other politicians, interest groups, or the general public. Framing can be used to address issues in ways that will legitimize them amongst groups who might otherwise have a negative attitude towards the issue being discussed. This of course also works in the opposite direction where a political party or an NGO may frame a generally accepted process in such a way that the legitimacy of said process becomes questioned, this is known as frame contestation. Within this research, frame contestation is expected contesting the expected desecuritization frame at the Dutch governmental level. Frames are generally understood as interconnected with an individual’s attitude towards an issue. This attitude is what motivates them to evaluate an issue, either positively or negatively. There are many dimensions that may affect a person’s evaluation, referred to as their *frame of thought*. (Chong, Druckman, 2007: 105). It is through the use of particular frames that politicians and other influential actors aim to affect people’s evaluations of issues. The nature of frames as influential tools can help in the understanding of the Turkish case, as they may shed light on how precisely influential actors legitimized the readmission agreement and framed Turkey as a safe and secure third country. Additionally, the framing approach may aid in the understanding of why oppositional frames of, for example, the NGO’s described in the introduction to this thesis were not able to mobilize a halt to the implementation of the agreement.

Frames such as those often used by the political elite can be subdivided into three main types of frame. Each may belong to a *conflict frame*, a *consequence frame* or a *human interest frame* (Samaras, 2002: 72). According to Samaras the *conflict frame* highlights a topic or

issue in terms of the conflict between opposing interest groups. *The consequence frame*, on the other hand, focusses on the topic's consequence for some group. Lastly, the *human interest frame* focusses solely on the victims (2002: 72). Semetko and Valkenburg, offer three more types of frames namely the *economic consequences frame*, which highlights the economic consequences of an issue of topic, the *morality frame*, which portrays an issue in terms of moral prescriptions, and the *responsibility frame*, which is used so that we may attribute responsibility for an issue (2000: 96). The different types of frames illustrate how the same topic may be represented in a different way, furthering the idea that frames can be used intentionally to front certain aspects of the topic over others either to draw attention to these aspects or to draw attention away from aspects of the topic which remain underrepresented. Here too, we may use framing theory to gather an understanding of the manner in which the action-plan was framed, allowing the evaluation of the agreement through the particular nature of the frame used. In this thesis we may expect that the securitizing framing that is expected to be observable at the civil society level may find its roots in the consequence frame as presented by Samaras (2002). It is expected that the framing on this level is mainly concerned with the consequences of the readmission agreement on migrants, and the consequence is placed in the security sphere.

Frames may additionally be differentiated between episodic and thematic framing (Samaras, 2002: 75-6). An episodic frame, such as a terrorism frame, uses concrete evidence and a direct representation of the topic. In this way, it is a more individualistic frame as it draws on specific characteristics of the topic or issue. Thematic framing remains more general and is focused more on outcomes, while the actual event or issue is approached more generally, moving focus away from the individual (Samaras 2002: 75-6). Additionally, framing can fall into the category of naming or frame alignment (Joachim, Schneiker 2012: 375-6). Joachim and Schneiker (ibid.) explain the naming approach as involving referring to a topic in a particular manner, making it a self-referential type of framing. This category is also relevant to securitization theory, as will be developed further below. Frame alignment is a process, of which Snow et al (1986) have identified four types. Firstly, frame bridging, where two or more similar but unconnected frames are linked. Frame amplification, where an interpretive frame is clarified or invigorated. Frame extension, where the boundaries of a frame are extended to make it more applicable to a situation or more relevant to the audience. Finally, frame transformation, in which a frame is transformed to fit a topic or issue that would not resonate under the original frame (Snow et al. 1986: 467-473). This research

expects to show that the desecuritization of Turkey is similar to frame transformation, transforming the framing of Turkey so that the nation may be designated as a safe third country.

Frames are not static. They are dynamic and subject to change. According to Shmueli et al, frames may change due to new information or new experiences (2006: 214). This change of frame may be termed reframing and often occurs when existing frames are unable to provide a solution or common understanding of issues or conflicts (Shmueli et al, 2006). Frame change, or reframing, can occur through similar processes as those described by Snow et al (1986) under frame alignment. The knowledge that frames may change is highly relevant to the Turkish case, as a frame change is expected. Particularly, in terms of the framing utilized by governmental actors, which are expected to have engaged in frame transition moving Turkey out of a field of meaning in which the nation was seen as breaching human rights, to a nation that may be deemed a safe third country for migrants attempting to reach the EU.

Considering the influential nature of frames and their place in political decision making, investigating precisely how issues are framed “is particularly important [...] since this is the first step in interest formation and determines which institutions will take up these issues and which actors will pay attention to them” (Joachim, 249). Though frames tend to become part of regular discourse, making them less visible to those not looking for their presence, they are “a power mechanism in their own right” (Van Gorp, pg. 63). Due to their natural place in communication and culture, it is often difficult to distinguish particular frames. Yet, following a structured research strategy, such as those offered by Schreier (2013) and Chong and Druckmann (2007) and discussed in the methods chapter of this thesis, a researcher can distinguish frames from natural discourse. In terms of the case study at hand, the framing of Turkey is expected to have affected the decision to vote in favor of implementing the readmission agreement on the EU level. However, as the scope of this thesis is limited, this research will not set out to capture how a frame is assimilated by the public, merely investigating whether desecuritization frames or securitization frames feature in the media to create some insight into audience acceptance.

Regardless of the salience of a presented frame, successful inclusion of said frame in common discourse depends on frame acceptance (Watson, 2012: 284). This frame acceptance is highly dependent on the frame’s resonance with other actors, which is dependent on the level to which the frame matches the belief system of the other actors (Joachim, Schneiker,

2012 :376). Though the idea of frame acceptance is under-developed within framing theory, Entman suggests that we may determine a frame to be accepted if it is “noticed, processed, and accepted by the most people” (1993: 56). What we may gather from this is thus that audience acceptance is not guaranteed, and is dependent on the members of the audience more than those expressing the frame. A simple utterance will not lead to automatic success of a frame, which is relevant to the case of the readmission agreement. The mere presence of particular frames in the lead-up to the agreement does not guarantee the public will internalize them and this may be visible in the results of this research. Members of Dutch government may frame Turkey as a safe third nation, however, if the frame does not resonate it will not be adopted by the public. This is also seen in the securitization approach in which a securitizing move that does not gain audience acceptance cannot lead to securitization. While the study of frame adoption by an audience is certainly relevant to the case study, it will remain outside the scope of this research due to limitations in time.

The use of a frame may lead to a framing effect. A framing effect occurs when communication frames used by the elite influence the attitudes and frames of citizens (Chong, Druckman, 2007: 110). This thesis does not explore the effect the framing of Turkey or the suspected shift in the framing of Turkey has had in the public but rather, whether a shift in framing occurred and if so, how the frame changed in the period leading up to the implementation of the EU-Turkey. Additionally, this thesis is concerned with the expected frame contestation at non-governmental levels of Dutch discourse. Considering the manner in which frames “[draw] attention to certain aspects of an issue while minimizing attention to others” (Samaras 2002: 72), framing theory may help us understand the lead-up to the implementation of the EU-Turkey agreement. Framing shows us that actors can intentionally package information to motivate others to judge an issue or event one particular way, and we can investigate this process of framing in the case proposed. While framing theory has its critics, using framing theory in combination with securitization theory will allow us to uncover the strategy implemented by both proponents of and opponents to the readmission agreement. To use a combination of the two theories however, a framework must be created that incorporates framing theory into the general framework of securitization.

2.3 Securitization Framing

The discussion of securitization and framing above shows that the two theories share many commonalities. They can perhaps be said to be similar to the extent that we can include

the framing approach into the securitization framework (Carvalho Pinto, 2014: 162). Combining the two theories can give us an interesting way of analyzing the Turkish case. As framing consists of an actor representing information in a manner that is interpretable for their audience while shedding light on the topic in a way that serves the interests of the actor, we can relate this to the actions of the securitizing actor (Carvalho Pinto, 2014: 165). The securitizing actor, in speaking of a security issue, is *framing* the topic at hand as a security issue, in other words, the securitizing act is an act of frame creation or frame adoption (Vultee, 2010). Scott D. Watson, even suggests that security can be seen as a master frame, such as those described above (2012: 280). Undeniably, both securitization and framing consists of the construction of an opinion or view, whether it be by securitizing actors or by actors engaged in framing, and both share a strong focus on the linguistic components of this construction (Watson, 2012: 281). The shared basis of these theories is that “societal actors construct problem/threats through discursive practices”(Watson, 2012: 283). In addition, while according to Watson the audience may consist of different members for each of the theories; these audiences do have an active role in both the process of framing and the process of securitization, as they are part of the production of meaning (2012: 284). In other words, both the success of the securitization and the framing process is related to audience acceptance. We can thus place framing within the broader securitization framework, where framing theory represents a part of the securitization process. The need for the integration of framing into the securitization framework stems from the issues of under-theorizing of securitization scholars. Though securitization theory provides information on the discursive practices of the (de)securitization process, it does not provide detailed information into the various strategies and distinctions of frames, incorporating the two thus allows for a deeper understanding of the case study.

Incorporating framing into the securitization framework will thus allow the use of varying framing devices offered by framing theory –such as metaphors, visual images, symbols, advertisements- rather than being confined to the interpretation of securitization through speech acts (Watson, 2012: 297). As both securitizing frames and desecuritizing frames are expected to be observed in the period leading up to the readmission agreement, the combination of the two theories will provide a deeper insight into the framing of the agreement.

Chapter 3 : Methods

The methodology of this thesis consists of two parts. Firstly, a content analysis, or more specifically, a frame analysis, will be conducted. The frame analysis, though based on the content analysis is more narrowly focused on analyzing the presence of frames in particular. In conducting the frame analysis the thesis will draw on the method of analysis as presented by the likes of Mayring (2000) and Schreier (2013), refining their approach to meet the research aims of the thesis. This will be done by incorporating the process as proposed by Chong and Druckmann (2007). The two methods are highly similar, however; where Chong and Druckman (2007) focus on a step by step to identify frames in particular, Schreier (2013) provides extensive information on the development of a coding scheme. The frame analysis will be used to identify the presence of desecuritization frames in the period leading up to the implementation of the readmission agreement. At the same time, the content analysis will aid in the identification of the expected -counter- security frames in the articles of humanitarian agencies. Following from this, this research will engage in process tracing, basing this part of the research on the work of Beach and Pederson (2016). In doing so, the steps of desecuritization will be traced to test whether the causal mechanism as predicted by the securitization approach is present in the Turkish case. It is a deductive research strategy that depends on empirical evidence.

Below will be an outline of both content analysis and process tracing. These sections will show the approach followed in the research along with a motivation for these choices. These sections will be followed with an explanation of the data gathered and used for this thesis.

3.1 Frame analysis

A frame analysis can be seen as a sub-category of the content analysis approach as a whole. By engaging in the frame analysis, content can be analyzed to identify frames in particular. This thesis will thus follow the content analysis methodology and sharpen the method to allow for the analysis of frames within the content gathered. Mayring (2000), describes content analysis, and particularly qualitative content analysis, as “an approach of empirical, methodological controlled analysis of texts within their context of communication, following content analytical rules and step by step models, without rash quantification”. The core of this type of research is the creation of categories through coding to investigate the -

manifest and latent- message of human communication (Mayring, 2000; Kohlbacher, 2006; Hsieh and Shannon, 2005; Schreier, 2013).

The subject of a content analysis can be any type of recorded communication, though most commonly content analyses are conducted on transcripts of interviews or other written documents (Kohlbacher, 2006). The analysis in this thesis will depend on published governmental documents such as transcripts of press conferences and records of parliamentary meetings. Additionally, articles published by Amnesty International and Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk will be analyzed as well as news articles. There are two main approaches to conducting a content analysis, namely the inductive and the deductive approach (Mayring, 2000; Kohlbacher, 2006; Hsieh and Shannon, 2005; Schreier, 2013). While both approaches are highly similar, they differ in their use of categories. In the deductive approach the researcher works with previously created categories of analysis, whereas the inductive approach is undertaken when the researcher formulates their own categories, often due to insufficient previous theorizing regarding the event being studied (Mayring, 2000). The purpose of this analysis will be to identify the existence of (de)securitizing frames in the content under study. If a desecuritizing frame can be identified, it will provide evidence for the existence of a desecuritizing move.

For this thesis, a combination of inductive and deductive content analysis will be conducted. A deductive content analysis will be undertaken using securitization literature to identify expected types of discourse such as emergency and threat discourse. This will lead to an inductive search of the material, as working inductively means categories can be created following the material as closely as possible. The codes gathered deductively will be used as the main categories in the analysis, while the subcategories will be created inductively. Schreier sets out the following steps in a content analysis;

- “1. Deciding on a research question;
2. Selecting material;
3. Building a coding frame;
4. Segmentation;
5. Trial coding;
6. Evaluating and modifying the coding frame;

7. Main analysis;

8. Presenting and interpreting the findings” (2013: 7).

The coding frame is the center of the research, and consists of at least one category with at least two subcategories which must be both unidimensional and mutually exclusive (Schreier, 2013: 7-8). Due to the partially inductive nature of this content analysis, the subcategories created will be data-driven as opposed to concept-driven (Schreier, 2013: 10). In practice, this means that the process of building a coding frame will consist of “paraphrasing relevant passages, deleting from these passages anything that appears superfluous, and summarizing similar paraphrases which are then turned into categories and subcategories” (Schreier, 2013: 10). The process will furthermore include the creation of category definitions, the expansion and refinement of categories as more pieces of data are analyzed, and a pilot phase in which only a selection of the data is researched before entering into the main analysis phase (Schreier, 2013).

As this thesis focusses on the analysis of frames in particular, it combines the strategy as proposed by Schreier (2013), with that of Chong and Druckmann (2007). Chong and Druckmann (2007), in their article Framing Theory, extensively discuss framing, framing effects and ways to identify frames. They discuss the use of content analysis in their discussion of framing, suggesting that, to uncover frames, one should:

- (1) identify an issue or an event;
- (2) isolate a specific attitude;
- (3) inductively identify an initial set of frames to create a coding scheme;
- (4) select sources that may be used in the content analysis;
- (5) analyze the sample to confirm or deny the presence of the identified frame (2007: 106-7).

Their work thus suggests that content analysis is especially well suited to researching the presence or absence of frames in political or media discourse. Chong and Druckman’s (2007) proposed technique can be combined with Schreier’s (2013), who describes content analysis in more detail, to provide a methodology suited to the case investigated as part of this thesis.

The frame analysis will thus be used to identify possible securitization- or desecuritization frames in the period preceding the creation of the agreement. Distinguishing between the

frames will be done through analyzing the different types of discourse used, relying, as mentioned above, on categories found in securitization literature such as the main codes “ordinary/normal”, “democratic”, “non-threat”, “referent object” and, “safe” for the desecuritization frame and, the main codes “threat”, “risk”, “emergency politics”, “exceptional”, “referent object” and, “urgency” for the securitization frame. The presence of the categories will be taken as evidence for the presence of a desecuritization frame or a securitization frame respectively. In using this method, the researcher must be aware of its weaknesses. For one, as the frame analysis is mostly concerned with the description of empirical evidence, it does not lend itself to case studies with a theory-building aim (Schreier, 2013: 17). However, as this thesis aims to test the theory of securitization, this concern does not have to be accounted for. Additionally, the researcher should be aware of the consistency (reliability) and validity criteria (Schreier, 2013: 6; Bengtsson, 2016 :11). The validity criterium is concerned with “the extent to which the categories adequately describe the material and the concepts that are part of the research question” (Schreier, 2013: 15). This thesis accounts for this by engaging in trial coding of the material. If the code scheme requires few changes, validity is indicated. The consistency criterium means the same results should be gathered if the study was undertaken again (Bengtsson, 2016: 11). Though the preferred solution is for two independent coders to analyze the data, this option was not available in the creation of this thesis, therefore, as part of the research, a selection of data will be coded twice (Schreier, 2013: 13).

3.2 Process Tracing

For the process tracing segment of this thesis, the method illustrated by Beach and Pedersen (2016) will be followed. Process tracing will be used here to analyze the expected frame change -thus the process of desecuritization- using the frames identified during the content analysis described above. In particular, the approach will be used to trace the steps of desecuritization in order to uncover the causal mechanism as suggested in securitization theory. The reasoning for conducting this process tracing analysis is the desire to uncover the causal mechanisms at play in the frame change from previously securitized to, as expected, a desecuritized framing of Turkey. The second part of the research will thus consist of looking beyond what happened, namely the expected desecuritization framing of Turkey, and uncovering how this desecuritization happened (Vennesson, 2008: 233).

According to Beach and Pederson, process tracing methods can be used to study these causal mechanisms in a single-case research (2016: 2), making it a relevant strategy for the second part of this research. Initially introduced by these authors are the three different types of process tracing, namely theory-testing, theory-building and explaining-outcome process tracing (Beach and Pederson, 2016). Whilst the theory-building and theory-testing approaches are both theory-centric and aim to either test or create a generalizable causal mechanism, the explaining-outcome variant is case-centric. In the explaining-outcome approach, the aim is to create a minimally sufficient explanation for an outcome that is surprising or puzzling (Beach and Pederson, 2016: 3).

For this research, the theory-testing approach is most suited to the case study. Here, empirical evidence is used to show if every part of a causal mechanism, as predicted by a theory is present (Beach and Pederson, 2016: 3). It allows the researcher to make inferences about whether the mechanism functioned as predicted by the theory (*ibid.*). In this thesis the theory-testing process-tracing approach will thus be used to show if the desecuritization process is present in the case and indeed functions the way it has been predicted in the securitization approach. Following Beach and Pederson, each part of the mechanism will be discussed in the chapter on empirical analysis. The method consists of identifying entities and their actions and using empirical evidence to make within-case inferences about the presence of the mechanism (Beach and Pederson, 2016: 14). The empirical evidence that is analyzed allows the researcher to make claims about the presence of the mechanism and about whether the mechanism functioned as the theory predicts or if only certain element of the mechanism are present (*ibid.*). Though this method can provide a great deal of insight into the case under study, it cannot say anything about whether any other causes contributed to outcome.

In undertaking the theory-testing approach, the researcher must be aware that any inferences made will be case-specific (Beach and Pederson, 2016: 21). However, if the case study provides evidence for the causal mechanism that is tested, this does indicate that the mechanism is generalizable (*ibid.*). The nature of process-tracing will not be a reason for concern in this thesis. The gathering of case-specific evidence is suitable to the research aim. Additionally, if the causal mechanism proves generalizable, it can be applied in research of similar cases. The researcher must realize that in using this method, evidence for a particular causal mechanism does not rule out other causes for the outcome (Beach and Pederson, 2016: 3).

3.3 Case Selection

The case of the implementation of the readmission agreement was chosen for this thesis. The choice to address specifically the case of the EU-Turkey agreement is deliberate. Initially, because the use of this agreement as a case study allows for a detailed investigation of the processes at work in the area of interest. Through the intensive study of this event we work towards an understanding of a larger class of similar events (Gerring, 2006: 37). This is particularly relevant as a similar deal as the one between the EU and Turkey, could be made with other EU-border countries. In fact, the EU, in their attempt to curb irregular migration, has already shown interest in developing similar readmission agreements with other, particularly North-African, nations (Cassarino, 2007; BNR, 2018). Though the evidence of the research will be case-specific, gaining a deeper understanding into the desecuritization of Turkey is crucial for future research into similar occurrences. The representativeness of the case lies in the fact that it is a nation bordering directly with the EU, a nation that is used as a border crossing for irregular migrants travelling to the EU, and a nation that is willing to enter into partnerships with the EU. These factors are equally visible in other EU border nations, allowing us to make generalizable inferences through the study of the action-plan. Investigating the securitization-framing processes at work in the lead up to this plan may therefore allow us to gain insight into the processes that may be used in the securitization of other EU border nations.

Though the single case study approach leads to research with a stronger internal than external validity (Gerring, 2006: 43), it can still aid in the understanding of a larger population as the evidence for the causal relationship within-case can shape our approach of similar cases. As the outcome of the event under study is already known, namely the implementation of the readmission agreement, the interest lies with the mechanisms at work in the lead up to the agreement, which is an aim best reached through the use of case study research (Gerring, 2006). Does the mechanism show the presence of securitization and desecuritization by relevant actors in the lead-up to the agreement? Additionally, the choice for this case was motivated by a gap in the existing literature. While research has been conducted regarding immigration and securitization (Bigo, 2002; Messina, 2014), the framing of individual nations in this context has not received extensive attention. Examining the desecuritizing of individual nations for immigration is important however, as contemporary EU migration and refugee policy sees the EU looking to create similar readmission agreements with other EU-border nations. This is especially visible in the proposed agreements with North-African countries such as Libya (Cassarino, 2007; BNR, 2018).

Finally, this research will focus on the (de)securitization frames that can be found in Dutch discourse. While this choice rests partially on delimiting the scope of the research, it rests more significantly on the role the Dutch played in the creation and legitimization of the readmission agreement. To begin with, the one-in, one-out aspect of the agreement which stipulates that for every Syrian that the EU returns to Turkey, one Syrian that has been registered in Turkey will be resettled within one of the EU member states (European Council, 2016), was proposed by Dutch politician Diederik Samsom (NRC, 2016). Additionally, the Netherlands acted as EU chairperson for the first half of 2016 (Wiegman, 2016), the time when most of the negotiations regarding the deal were held. Since the Netherlands was actively involved in shaping the agreement, they form an excellent source of data for this thesis. Additionally, though the entire EU struggled as a result of the increased number of migrants arriving in the union, Europe in general was hit with a 300 per cent rise in refugee arrivals, whereas the Netherlands reported that the number was 350 per cent higher than two years earlier. With such an active role in the negotiations and the pressure on Dutch society resulting from the increased refugee arrivals, we can expect to find numerous examples of securitization and framing in available Dutch data sources. Dutch data from the five years leading up to the implementation of the readmission agreement will be used to explore the processes of (de) securitization framing. This time frame consists of data gathered between March 1, 2011 up to and including March 31, 2016.

3.4 Data

In conducting the research, data will be gathered from three different levels, namely the level of governmental actors, the civil society level, and the level of the media. Approaching the research in this manner will provide an insight into securitizing-framing across the Netherlands. As previously mentioned, the time frame taken for this research was between March 1, 2011 and March 31, 2016. This time frame was chosen because it consists of the five year directly prior to the implementation of the deal. It is expected that this period will provide enough time to see a possible frame transformation. The governmental level will give an insight into the framing at the level that is most closely related to the agreement and will give the clearest insight into a possible change in the framing and securitization of Turkey. Data will consist of any press-releases, media texts and Parliamentary reports available on the official government website while searching for ‘Turkey AND migrant/refugee’.

The civil society level will serve as a source for counter frames in Dutch discourse. If the expected contestation frames are as prevalent as expected, this will indicate the level of frame acceptance. Data will be gathered from the websites of Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk and Amnesty International. These two humanitarian agencies were chosen because of their focus. The former focusses especially on refugees and the latter on the protection of people in general. It is expected that using these two sources will provide a well-rounded overview of frames used at the civil society level. The search terms remain the same as for the governmental level.

Additionally, the level of the media will show whether media, such as leading newspapers in the Netherlands have adopted the framing used at the governmental level. This level is analyzed to provide some initial insight into the acceptance of the (de)securitizing frames, though extensive research into this remains outside the scope of this thesis. Media level data is collected from two of the most read newspapers in the Netherlands, namely de Telegraaf and de Volkskrant, the newspapers have a daily circulation of 382.089 copies and 217.796 copies respectively (NOS, 2017). These newspapers in particular were selected as de Telegraaf is a somewhat sensationalized newspaper containing a lot of entertainment categories and de Volkskrant represents a ‘quality newspaper’. In choosing these two newspapers this thesis aims to present a well-rounded representation of the Dutch media level.

Chapter 4: Empirical Analysis

This chapter illustrates the background of the research namely the EU-Turkey readmission agreement and the context in which the agreement was created. It then turns to the (de)securitization frames that can be observed in the five year period leading up to the agreement. In doing so, this analysis provides an insight into the discursive practices of the desecuritization process, showing the expected presence of desecuritizing frames. The empirical analysis will also for inferences to be made about who is the audience, audience acceptance and, the placing of the issue into normal politics This chapter will be followed by a chapter presenting an empirical process tracing of the expected desecuritization of Turkey by illustrating the entities and actions involved in this case.



Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk “Bescherming in Nederland” *Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk*.

<https://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/feiten-cijfers/cijfers/bescherming-nederland>



Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk “Bescherming in Europa” *Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk*.

<https://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/feiten-cijfers/cijfers/bescherming-europa>

4.1 Towards the EU-Turkey readmission agreement

At the height of the European refugee crisis in 2015, a total of 1.257.610 first time applicants applied for asylum in the EU (Vluchtelingenwerk, 2018: 33). It was in the midst of the refugee crisis that the EU and Turkey drafted their plans for a joint EU-Turkey readmission agreement (Collet, 2016; Batalla Adam, 2017). A deep understanding of the deal depends on an understanding of both the European refugee crisis and EU-turkey relations. In order to illustrate the circumstances that surround the research of this thesis, this section will highlight both Turkey’s road towards EU-membership and the details of the migration crisis the EU faced in 2015.

The conflict in Syria had reached its fifth year in 2015, forcing an increasing amount of Syrians to cross countries in search for refuge. Of the arriving migrants, over 75 per cent originated from Syria, Afghanistan or Iraq (Spindler, 2015). The main route for migrants traveling to Europe had become the crossing from Turkey to Greece, with over 3,550 migrants losing their life making the journey to Europe (ibid). Europe was struggling to deal with the unprecedentedly high numbers of people applying for asylum in their countries and the EU sought for ways to make the crisis more manageable. However, as several EU nations - such as Hungary- started closing of their borders, the image of a small boy from Syria, named

Aylan Kurdi, washed up on a beach having drowned trying to reach Greece from Turkey, reached the various European news outlets (Spindler, 2015). The image was shocking. In order to relieve pressure for the EU-member states, halt the 1,700 daily irregular crossings from Turkey to Greece (Batalla Adam, 2017: 45), and prevent more tragedies such as Aylan's, the EU and Turkey initially agreed on a Joint Action Plan to manage the migration flow on November 29, 2015 (ibid). November 29, 2015 was the first of three meetings "dedicated to deepening Turkey-EU relations as well as addressing the migration crisis" (European Council, 2016). As part of the plan, the EU would provide Turkey with 3 billion euro, speed up visa liberalization for Turks travelling to the EU and, reignite accession talks (ibid). In return, starting on March 20, 2016, Turkey would start taking back all irregular migrants "crossing from turkey into the Greek Islands" (ibid). Additionally, Turkey agreed to take measures to stop refugees leaving Turkey (Batalla Adam, 2017: 45). Furthermore, the agreement included a one-for-one agreements, which stated that "for every Syrian readmitted to Turkey from the Greek islands, another Syrian from turkey would be resettled to the EU member states" (ibid). The EU-Turkey statement presenting these measures emphasized that the return of migrants would be "in full accordance with EU and international law"(European Council, 2016).

The compatibility of the agreement with the international laws the statement refers to has been questioned however (Batalla Adam, 2017: 46). Legally, migrants can be expelled for two reasons. According to Collet, migrants may be expelled if they do not qualify for asylum, or they may be expelled if they could have 'claimed protection' in the country from which they arrived (2016). The second reason for return is dependent on the *safe third country* principle, which can be found in the 2013 Asylum Procedures Directive. According to Article 38 (2013) a country may be deemed a safe third country if the migrant in this country is treated according to the following principles;

- (a) life and liberty are not threatened on account of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion;
- (b) there is no risk of serious harm as defined in Directive 2011/95/EU;
- (c) the principle of non-refoulement in accordance with the Geneva Convention is respected;

(d) the prohibition of removal, in violation of the right to freedom from torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment as laid down in international law, is respected; and;

(e) the possibility exists to request refugee status and, if found to be a refugee, to receive protection in accordance with the Geneva Convention (APD, 2013, Art. 38)

The principle of non-refoulement which is mentioned in section c, protects the enjoyment of all people of their “human rights, including the rights to life, to freedom from torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, and to liberty and security of person” (UNHCR, 1997). In implementing the agreement between the EU and Turkey, the latter was deemed a safe third country. To put this in perspective, the relationship between Turkey and the EU must be addressed.

Turkey has been a special partner to the EU for several decades and while the relationship between the EU and Turkey is at times close, it is most often tumultuous. Negotiations for Turkey to become an official EU-member started in 2005 (Rankin, 2016). However in over a decade, negotiations have not resulted in Turkey becoming more than a candidate nation (ibid.). The road to these negotiations has been long. Turkey first joined the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1963, applied to join the EU in 1987 and was recognized as a candidate for membership in 1999 (European parliament, 2017; Reuters, 2009). One of the reasons why negotiations have been so cumbersome is related to the human rights record in Turkey (HRW, 2000). Throughout the years of EU-turkey negotiations, the concern into the human rights situation in Turkey has been vocalized numerous times by both EU organizations and representatives of EU-member states. Stating, for example, that Turkey inflicts systematic human rights violations (Bowcott, 2015), emphasized the incompatibility between Turkey and the EU’s standards and morals. A similar stance is present in the Dutch attitude to Turkey’s accession to the EU. Current Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte for one stated in 2006 that if Turkey did not improve its situation -regarding freedom of speech, recognition of Cyprus and, minority rights- within two years, it should lose its EU-candidacy (ANP, 2006). The concern about Turkey’s upholding of human rights was also frequently discussed in Dutch Parliament (Bhikie, 2015). At a governmental level, the Dutch placed Turkey in a realm of security by emphasizing the risk of human rights violations in the country. Yet, when the EU and Turkey were in negotiations to implement the Joint Action Plan, the official stance of the Dutch government was that it agreed with the European Commission’s decision to place Turkey on a list of safe third countries (Toepassing van het

concept veilige landen). In agreeing with Turkey's placement on the safe third country list, the country was removed out of a sphere of security. It is this shift that this thesis aims to analyze.

The section below will look at the period prior to the implementation of the readmission agreement to identify the framing used on a Dutch governmental level in particular. As already mentioned in the chapter on the theoretical framework, this research expects to find the presence of desecuritization frames at the governmental level. The presence of desecuritization will provide evidence as to how Turkey moved from a nation securitized to a nation deemed a safe third country. The civil society level and the media level analyzed through the frame analysis will provide information to the success of the expected desecuritization move.

4.2 Desecuritization and securitization frames

In this section the frame analysis conducted as part of this thesis is discussed. A frame analysis was conducted on the governmental, the civil society and the media level. Through using a coding scheme in which main categories were gathered deductively from the securitization approach and subcategories were gathered inductively from the content, desecuritization frames and securitization frames were analyzed to determine how Turkey was framed in the lead-up to the readmission agreement.

4.2.1 Governmental level

Throughout the five year period under study, the situation of migrants in Turkey was discussed extensively at a governmental level. Especially the period between November 2015 and March 2016 showed an intensification of discussions regarding the topic. Throughout the entire five year period, press conferences, Parliamentary discussions, question and answer sessions and Parliamentary texts were dedicated to discussing the EU-Turkey agreement and its effect on migrants. Below will be an analysis of the framing used in these publications.

In a document stemming from 2011, the Dutch Parliaments problematizes the human rights record in Turkey. The document states that Turkey's accession to the EU is not on the agenda due to the many issues present in Turkey regarding the Copenhagen criteria –which state among other things that a nation must respect human rights and minority rights before becoming an EU-member state- (kabinetsappreciatie EU-uitbreiding, 2011). In discussing the situation in Turkey, the document states that Dutch Parliament agrees with the European

Commission's (EC) priority in addressing human rights in Turkey (ibid.). This statement indicates the element of urgency that is part of securitization as presented by Buzan et al. (1998). Additionally, a 2012 human rights rapport published at the governmental level states that, "in 2012, there was hardly any improvement in the human rights situation in Turkey" (Mensenrechtenrapportage 2012, 2013). This claim indicates that the situation in Turkey presents a threat to the referent object. The sense of urgency present in these documents in addition to the portrayal of threat to the human rights and thus livelihood of the referent object, indicate an adherence to a securitizing frame in this period. It must be noted however, that reporting on this issue was limited during these years. As mentioned above, documents related to the referent object –migrants in Turkey- became much more frequent in the years 2015 and 2016.

An alternative approach to framing Turkey becomes apparent in the report by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs stemming from 2014. In the document named 'Human rights in Turkey [Mensenrechten in Turkije]', issues regarding the human rights violations in Turkey are discussed, however, the document also states that there are also positive developments in Turkey such the creation of a "legal framework for refugees and migrants [een nieuw wettelijk kader gekomen voor vluchtelingen en migranten]" (Human Rights in Turkey). The discussion of Turkey is removed out of the realm of security. Additionally, we see that the document points to the issues in Turkey being dealt with through measures such as funding projects aimed at improving human rights in the country (ibid.). It should be noted that in the document, though there is an awareness of a previous risk to the livelihood of migrant in Turkey, the issue is now being portrayed as an issue that can be dealt with through normal, non-emergency politics. To frame the situation in Turkey as such is to adhere to the deconstructivist strategy explained by Roe (2004: 286). Similarly, in a letter discussing the placement of Turkey on a safe third country list, then Minister of Defense Klaas Dijkhof, stated that Parliament agreed with the EC's decision to place Turkey on said list (Toepassing van het concept veilige landen). Labeling Turkey as safe for migrants effectively removed all notions of threat and security. If the referent object is said to be safe in Turkey, emergency measures can no longer be justified and no change in policy is urgently needed. In removing the threat and placing Turkey back into the realm of normal politics, a desecuritizing move is made.

Similarly, in 2015, a document was published containing questions and answers about the EU-Turkey summit. It reflects questions from members of the Dutch lower house, or

House of Representatives, and answers from Prime Minister Rutte. Members of the Green Party (GroenLinks) and the Democratic Party (D66), ask for the Prime Minister's view on reports that Turkey shows "a negative trend with regards to rule of law, human rights and press freedom [negatieve trend op het gebied van de rechtsstaat, mensenrechten en persvrijheid]" (EU-Turkije top op 29 november 2015), and the effect of this trend on migrants. The response of the Prime Minister does not include a reference to the threat to migrants in Turkey, but instead addresses the issues by stating that through the readmission agreement Turkey commits to improving the situation of migrants in the country (ibid.). Additionally, the Prime Minister states of those migrants in Turkey that they are in "difficult circumstances, but not in mortal danger [in moeilijke omstandigheden, maar niet in levensgevaar]" (ibid.). The threat to the referent object is downplayed to such an extent that the issue is moved out of a securitized context and into the realm of normal politics. The same strategy is apparent in the document regarding the parliamentary assessment of EU-enlargement from December 2015 (Kabinetsappreciatie uitbreidingspakket 2015) and the document regarding the Parliamentary assessment of the Commissions measures (Kabinetsappreciatie maatregelen Commissie d.d. 15 december 2015). Here too, the document focusses on the positive developments in Turkey such as "the implementation of a law for foreigners and international protection. With this, initial steps were taken towards appropriate protection of asylum-seekers [de implementatie van de wet over buitenlanders en internationale bescherming. Hiermee zijn de eerste stappen gezet naar een gepaste bescherming van asielzoeker]" (Kabinetsappreciatie uitbreidingspakket 2015, 2015). The statement places the referent object from a position of insecurity into a position of security.

The practice of moving the situation of migrants in Turkey into normal politics is repeated numerous times in the various published documents on the governmental level. In six press conferences held by Prime Minister Mark Rutte in the period January 2016 to March 2016, the situation of migrants in Turkey is discussed without invoking terms relating to threat, risk or urgency to the referent object. In these press conferences, there is no mention of violations of human rights, or of a risk to the livelihood of migrants in Turkey. Rather, the Prime Minister speaks of improving the living situation of migrants in Turkey through the use of funding (Persconferentie na ministerraad 5 februari 2016). This statement shows the indication of an issue in Turkey, however, by framing it as an issue that may be solved through financial means, the issue does not appear to be threatening in nature. This practice indicates that the issue has been returned to the realm of normal politics, which, to Freire et al

(2008) and Wæver (1993), is a sign of desecuritization. In a similar sense, the Prime Minister has stated that “we are willing to help with improving the circumstances [we zijn bereid om te helpen met het verbeteren van de omstandigheden]” (Persconferentie na ministerraad 22 januari 2016). Here too the issue is framed as non-threatening. These speeches thus portray a desecuritizing move using the deconstructivist strategy (Roe, 2004: 286) previously referred to. In this strategy the story, or issue, is recounted in such a way that it reflects normal problems that can be dealt with on the inside rather than externally as in securitization (ibid.).

Likewise, in the Parliamentary response to the Samsom Plan (Kabinetsreactie op “plan Samson” voor het beperken van illegale migratie naar de EU), when the readmission of migrants to Turkey is discussed, the situation of migrants in the country is described without referring to a possible existential threat to the referent object. The document instead states that “parts of the action plan see to i.a. the improvement of the living conditions of refugees in Turkey [Onderdelen van het actieplan zien o.a. op het bevorderen van de levensomstandigheden van vluchtelingen in Turkije]” (Kabinetsreactie op “plan Samson” voor het beperken van illegale migratie naar de EU). Though the parliamentary reaction here shows an awareness to issues regarding the current living conditions of migrants in Turkey, the issue is not presented as threatening to migrants. The document alternatively, frames the situation in Turkey as an issue that may be solved within the limits of normal politics. There is no indication that extraordinary measures must be undertaken to deal with the issue. Moreover, two further documents discussing the EU-Turkey summit, extensively discuss the readmitting of migrants to Turkey, while refraining from referring to Turkey in relation to threats to migrants, both documents merely allude to the fact that the returning of migrants to Turkey adheres to the international regulations of the protection of refugees (Verslag van de EU-Turkije top en daaropvolgende informele Europese Raad van 7 Maart 2016; Verslag van de Europese raad van 17-18 maart 2016). These documents therefore also follow the conditions of a desecuritizing move as the situation that migrants face in Turkey is placed back into the realm of normal politics, as is indicated through the reference to international regulations.

Finally, the absence of threat terminology features strongly in the remaining governmental documents published in March 2016. In a document dealing with questions surrounding the asylum policy for example, then Minister of Defence Klaas Dijkhof states the following when answering questions about the designation of Turkey as a safe third country for migrants: “Turkey, as a party to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and

Fundamental Freedoms, is bound to the treaty obligations as set out by i.a. Article 3 of the convention [Turkije als verdragspartij bij het Europees Verdrag tot Bescherming van de Rechten van de Mens en de Fundamentele vrijheden (EVRM) gebonden aan de verdragsverplichtingen die voortvloeien uit onder meer artikel 3 EVRM]” (Beantwoording Kamervragen over onduidelijkheden rond het asielbeleid). In referring to the Convention, Dijkhof states that Turkey can be called a safe third country (ibid.). In referring to Turkey as safe, the notion of insecurity is removed from the frame, thus indicating desecuritization. As securitization can be identified by the positioning of an issue or event as an existential threat to a referent object (Wæver, 1993; Buzan et al., 1998; Balzacq, 2005; Stritzel, 2007), desecuritization can be identified by the absence of an existential threat to a referent object when discussing a previously securitized issue. Additionally, the absence of threat is observable in a report in visa-liberalization, which states that the Dutch Parliament welcomes the improvements made by Turkey in the situation of refugees (Tweede voortgangsrapportage visumliberalisatie Turkije, 2016). The final document under study follows the same pattern as those mentioned earlier. Namely, when discussing the readmission of migrants to Turkey it states that “Turkey will likely have to implement a number of legal amendments regarding [...] the protected status of all refugees [Turkije moet naar verwachting ook een aantal wetswijzigingen doorvoeren met het oog op [...] de beschermingsstatus van alle vluchtelingen]” (Appreciatie Commissiemededeling uitwerking EU-Turkije-akkoord 16 maart 2016). Here too, we see the deconstructive practice of desecuritization (Roe, 2004: 286), in addition to an absence of threat. The situation of migrants in Turkey is moved out of the realm of extraordinary politics. Though the document shows that currently the situation in Turkey is not optimal, by stating that Turkey may implement some amendments to their laws, this issue is moved back into normal politics.

4.2.2 Civil Society level

The content analyzed on the civil society level, portrays Turkey using more securitizing language, rather than the downplaying of issues seen in the discursive practices at the governmental level. Here, both Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk and Amnesty International did not publish any articles regarding the situation for migrants in Turkey in the years 2011 and 2012, with Amnesty International publishing only one article in 2013. Though both organizations discuss the issue in one article stemming from 2014, the years 2015 and 2016 show a thickening of interest/concern into the matter.

In July 2013, Amnesty published an article reporting on Greece's policy of returning migrants to Turkey. In this article they stated that the practice was "endangering the lives of refugees [hierdoor worden de levens van vluchtelingen in gevaar gebracht]" (Amnesty International, 2013). The article represents the first indication that there is an existential threat to a referent object. Stating that the lives of refugees are endangered once they are readmitted to Turkey is to state that the refugees, who are the referent object in this research, are existentially threatened. If the refugees continue to be sent to Turkey their lives are in danger, following the definition of an existential threat by Buzan et al., that if the issue -existential threat- is not tackled "everything else will be irrelevant (because we will not be here or will not be free to deal with it in our own way" (1998: 24). Similarly, in 2014, both the humanitarian agencies used in this frame analysis published an article discussing the position of migrants in Turkey. The article by Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk (2014) in particular shows a level of urgency in stating that emergency help [noodhulp] is needed in the country to improve the situation of the migrants who are located there. Additionally, the article presents a call for an exceptional measure -a measure above or beyond regular policy- in calling for the Netherlands to "resettle more refugees [meer vluchtelingen hervestigd]" (Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk, 2014).

The concerns expressed in the publications from 2013 and 2014 became more frequent in the two years that followed. In an article published by Amnesty International the risk to refugees is stressed once again in referring to the "deplorable situation in which many refugees find themselves and the risk of human rights violations [de deplorabele situatie waarin veel vluchtelingen verkeren en het risico op mensenrechtenschendingen]" (Haan, 2015). The risk of refugees' human rights being violated in Turkey returns time and again in the articles by both humanitarian agencies, including an article from December 2015 by Amnesty International. This article also shows a call for "Prime Minister Rutte to ensure that EU-funding for the Turkish detention centers [for refugees] is suspended [roept premier Rutte op te zorgen dat EU-financiering naar Turkse detentiecentra wordt opgeschort]" (Amnesty International, 15 Dec 2015), until there is an improvement in the situation of the refugees. The category human rights violations was taken to be a subcategory to the category of threat in the securitization frame. Its repeated presence in the publications by both Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk and Amnesty International thus points towards the presence of a securitization frame in the discursive practices of these organizations. Additionally, the call for exceptional measures can be observed in multiple instances further supporting the

presence of the securitization frame. A further instance of threat to the referent object is portrayed in the claim that “Turkey arrests, detains and abuses refugees and asylum-seekers [Turkije arresteert, detineert en mishandelt vluchtelingen en asielzoekers]” (Amnesty International, 15 Dec 2015). The statements made in these articles do not reflect the framing used at the governmental level, rather, they are counter frames, used in response to the desecuritization framing at the governmental level.

The opinions conveyed in the articles above are also visible in the articles stemming from 2016. Coverage of the issue by both humanitarian agencies intensified in the months leading up to the implementation of the agreement, with 14 articles published between January and March of that year. Several of the articles published in this year emphasize that Turkey is not a safe country for migrants. All five articles by Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk from 2016 for example, state that “Turkey is not a “safe third country”” (Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk, 28 Jan 2016; 29 Jan 2016; 18 Mar 2016; 21 Mar 2016; 24 Mar 2016). In challenging the notion that Turkey can be designated a safe third country, the organization repeatedly stresses the existence of an existential threat to the migrants residing in Turkey. As Turkey is deemed unsafe -a subcategory to the category of threat that was deductively gathered from the work of Buzan et al. (1998)- residence in Turkey is presented as a threat to the lives and livelihood of this specific social group. Additionally, the issue of human rights violations is repeated in these articles, for example, in stating that by readmitting migrants to Turkey “you are paving the way for human rights violations [werk je mensenrechtenschendingen in de hand]” (Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk, 28 Jan 2016). The organization also portrays a sense of urgency in their framing of Turkey and the situation for migrants there when stating that they want to speak to PvdA Chairman Samsom and Prime Minister Rutte “urgently” as not doing so could lead to “further humanitarian misery and violations of human rights [verdure humanitaire ellende en schending van de mensenrechten]” (Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk, 29 Jan 2016). These articles follow the markers of a securitizing frame in their use of an existential threat to the referent object –migrants-, and the sense of urgency in dealing with this issue. These are the conditions for securitization as set out by the likes of Buzan et al (1998), Stritzel (2007) and Balzacq (2010), and by adopting these codes into their discursive practices, Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk is performing a securitizing move.

The securitization frame is also present in the publications of Amnesty International stemming from 2016. In these articles also, the claim that Turkey is not a safe country is emphasized repeatedly (Amnesty International, 28 Jan 2016; 17 Feb 2016; 8 Mar 2016; 23

Mar 2016; 31 Mar 2016). The organization also stresses the need to deal with the issues urgently in calling for “immediate action [onmiddellijke actie]” (Amnesty International 25 Jan 2016) to be undertaken. Additionally, the claim that “Turkey is becoming less safe by the day [wordt met de dag minder veilig]” (Amnesty International), shows that the organization presses for immediate action in dealing with the issue. This is reflective of the description of the existential threat by Buzan et al. (1998) which presents an issue in a way that it must be dealt with while it is still possible to do so. By framing Turkey as unsafe for migrants and calling for urgent action, Amnesty International prompts its audience to focus on the “critical vulnerability of a referent object (Balzacq, 2010: 3), the referent object being composed of the group of migrants in Turkey. Following Balzacq’s understanding of securitization, Amnesty International frames Turkey “with such an aura of unprecedented threatening complexion that a customized policy must be undertaken immediately to block its developments” (ibid.). The notion of a customized policy can be found in the organization’s call for the creation of “safe, legal routes for refugees [veilige, legale routes aan vluchtelingen]” (Amnesty International, 17 Feb 2016). The articles thus indicate that the lives of migrants are existentially threatened when these migrants are sent to- or living in Turkey. Additionally, Amnesty International suggests that to return migrants to Turkey is to “put the lives of refugees at risk [levens van vluchtelingen op het spel zet]” (Amnesty International, 23 Mar 2016). This final claim by the organization captures the definition of securitization as it places the issue of readmitting migrants to Turkey as a threat to the livelihood of the migrants.

4.2.3 *The media*

In this section the frame analysis on the media level will be discussed. The content on this level was analyzed to investigate whether the same desecuritization framing as on the governmental level was also visible on the level of the media. The presence of a similar frame in media level content would give an initial indication into frame acceptance. Below is the analysis of articles from De Telegraaf and De Volkskrant. It should be noted that the first articles related to the position of migrants in Turkey stem from 2013. Turkey itself was reported on frequently in the five year period under study, however, searching for “Turkey” in combination with the term “migrant/migration/refugee” resulted in a total of 25 articles, with 23 of these articles having been published in October 2015 or later.

In 2013, each of the newspapers published an article about the readmittance of migrants to Turkey. Both articles discuss the various issues present in Turkey, but neither use

any codes that can be placed under the risk or threat category. While one article does state that “Turkey has some work to do regarding human rights [heeft Turkije nog wat zaken rond mensenrechten te regelen]” (Telegraaf, 2013), it does not specifically speak of these rights being violated in Turkey nor does it mention any form of threat to the migrants. A similar situation is observed in the second article from 2013, in which the reporter comments on changes that must be made in Turkey such as reforming the asylum system to adhere to a European model (Ziel, 2013), but here again, the reporter does not present any form of threat, risk, urgency or emergency politics. Instead, it addresses the changes that are to be made by stating that financial aid will be provided to Turkey to realize the necessary improvements (ibid.). The latter article thus alludes to solutions to the issue stemming from normal politics, placing it outside of the realm of securitization.

A significant number of the articles published in the period 2015 to 2016 do include the categories previously identified for the securitization frame, expressing concern for the situation of migrants in Turkey. One of the articles, in discussion the readmission of migrants to Turkey, refers to a claim by Prime Minister Mark Rutte from 2006 in which he stated that “Turkey has two years to improve i.a. human rights. Otherwise the nation could forget about EU-membership [Turkije twee jaar de tijd krijgt om onder meer de mensenrechten te verbeteren. Anders kon het land het EU-lidmaatschap op de buik schrijven]” (Telegraaf, November 2016). With this statement the article questions the morality of returning migrants to Turkey as part of the readmission agreement, placing the human rights situation in Turkey as a threat to the migrants. Similarly, another article shows concern for the livelihood of migrants when discussing human rights violations in the country (Telegraaf, 11 November 2015). They frame this situation with a sense of urgency stating that they hope the situation will be improved quickly (ibid.). However, the presence of securitization categories in the articles is limited. Another similar example is found in an article discussing the return of migrants to Turkey that states that “the human rights situation in Turkey has significantly worsened in the past year [de mensenrechtensituatie in turkije het afgelopen jaar sterk is verslechterd]” (Vos, 2 November 2015). The articles portray a concern for the lives of migrants in Turkey, but they do not offer a solution to the issue, nor do they provide any direct statements that indicate that the lives of migrants are directly at risk when they reside in Turkey. The articles thus do not represent an existential threat to the referent object, despite the occurrence of securitization codes in the publications.

Additionally, a number of articles question whether Turkey can be deemed a safe third nation. One such example is visible in the statement “Turkey is a safe country for Turkish inhabitants [...] but for refugees from the ‘third country’ Syria, this remains questionable [Turkije geldt wel als veilig land voor Turkse inwoners [...] maar voor vluchtelingen uit het ‘derde land’ Syrië is dat nog twijfelachtig]” (Vos, 2 October 2015). Another article states that Turkey is close to receiving the status of safe third country (Peeperkorn, 28 January 2016). A third article questions “if Turkey is a safe country [of Turkije wel een veilig land is]” (Ellenbaas, 2016), yet it does not provide a clear answer to this question. Despite featuring the category “safe” multiple times, placing the category into the context of the sentence or paragraph in which it was found illustrates that the articles are not easily recognizable as adhering to either desecuritizing or securitizing framing. Though the framing used at the governmental level is questioned in these articles, it is not being dismissed.

Finally, several of the articles discuss the situation of migrants in Turkey as a result of the impending readmission agreement, without invoking threat terminology, or using terms that indicate risk to the referent object. For one, an article from 2016 states that “Ankara is willing to take back nearly all refugees who arrive in Greece via Turkey [Ankara is bereid vrijwel alle vluchtelingen terug te nemen die via Turkije in Griekenland aankomen]” (Peeperkorn, 8 March 2016). Any mention of risk, threat or urgency are avoided in the article. This message can be observed in several more articles in which the return of migrants to Turkey is discussed without framing the return as problematic or the situation in Turkey as a threat to the migrants as a social group (Telegraaf, 2 March 2016; Gessel, 2016). In the articles which showed no instances of codes gathered for the securitization frame, one mentioned that Turkey needed to improve the living conditions for refugees in the country, but it also mentioned that funds would be provided to reach this goal (Gessel, 2015). This is reminiscent of the deconstructivist strategy of desecuritization (Roe, 2004), as though the article admits the presence of an issue, this issue is placed in the realm of normal politics by indicating it may be dealt with through financial support. These articles, as opposed to those discussed above, adhere to the same strategy as observed in the governmental publications stemming from 2014 onwards. These final articles thus seem to have adopted the desecuritization frame visible at the governmental level.

4.3 Tracing desecuritization

The following section will build on the frame analysis in tracing the process of desecuritization. The process is traced following the steps provided in the securitization literature. Falling back on the questions proposed by Charett (2009) to determine whether the securitization process was present, this section will use the questions amended for desecuritization to empirically analyze the process. To recap, the questions were as follows; (1) has the desecuritizing actor gained support [can we observe audience acceptance?]; (2) who is the audience and what are the facilitating conditions?; (3) has the issue been placed back into normal politics?; and what might be the impact of such desecuritizing acts on other units? As was already discussed in chapter two, the final question regarding the impact of desecuritizing acts on other units will remain outside the scope of this thesis.

4.3.1 The audience and facilitating conditions

The expectations expressed in chapter two, placed the Dutch government, in particular the Dutch upper house, in the role of desecuritizing actor. The frame analysis has made clear that the audience that the desecuritizing actor intends to convince is varied. On the one hand, several of the publications at the governmental level address the Dutch lower house, specifically answering their questions regarding the status of migrants in Turkey. On the other hand, the governmental level content includes several press releases. These press releases are available to the public and aim to inform the public of the meetings the Dutch Prime Minister has had in the European Council. The audience is thus based in a broad base, consisting of governmental members and Dutch society as a whole. However, as this research is limited in its scope, the acceptance of the desecuritizing move in Dutch society will not be discussed outside of frame adoption by the media. Furthermore, as previously noted as an expectation in the second chapter, the referent object that can be identified in the content are the migrants living in or being returned to Turkey. The referent object is thus a social group. It is possible to identify migrants as such due to the Copenhagen School's widened understanding of referent objects (Buzan et al, 1998: 6).

As previously discussed, the success of the desecuritizing move is dependent on both the audience and the facilitating conditions (Buzan et al, 1998). The first facilitating condition relates to the discursive practices of the desecuritizing process. The section on framing at the governmental level illustrated that the content at the governmental level indeed avoided the grammar of security. The categories that were taken to be representative of the securitization

frame did not feature in the documents on the governmental level after the year 2013. Though the earlier documents still placed migrants in a threatened position when in Turkey, this notion was not repeated in the later years under study. In these later documents, though some acknowledged that the situation of migrants in Turkey did indeed present itself as an issue, there was no use of terms such as threat or urgency. Therefore, this analysis indicates that the documents on the governmental level -unlike those on the civil society level- contain a desecuritizing move.

The second facilitating condition is related to the position of authority of the desecuritizing actor. The point of interest here according to Buzan et al. is “the relationship between speaker and audience and thereby the likelihood of the audience accepting the claims made” (1998: 33). As this thesis identified the Dutch upper house as the desecuritizing actor, and the Dutch lower house -and to a lesser extent the Dutch public- as the audience, the position of the desecuritizing actor is likely to improve the likelihood of audience acceptance. Both the upper and lower house of Dutch Parliament is democratically chosen, its members are thus made up of people who have the support of members of Dutch society. Additionally, the Dutch government is generally seen as a respectable governing body. Though the role of (de)securitizing actor is not limited to the elite (Vultee, 2012: 34), if the actor is part of the elite, this can favor the actor’s position of authority. As the relationship between the identified desecuritizing actor and audience is one of collaboration and both parties are in constant contact through meetings and debates, the familiarity of the relationship is likely to be conducive in the acceptance of claims made by the desecuritizing actor. A second layer of audience was identified to be the Dutch public, and though this part of the audience will not be dealt with extensively, this thesis posits that the position of authority of the desecuritizing actor -Dutch upper house- in relation to the public who have democratically chosen this formation, will be conducive to the acceptance of the claims made.

The position of authority must also be mentioned with regards to the civil society level in the analysis. Though the empirical evidence does not suggest that the civil society sector was intended to be part of the desecuritizing agent’s audience, the civil society did position itself as part of the audience. The nature of the securitizing actor as having been democratically chosen, initially points to this position as conducive in the relationship between the desecuritizing actor and the civil society as the audience. The presence of contestation frames arising out of civil society however, suggest that this part of the audience does not accept the claims made by the desecuritizing actor. Though civil society could be

studied as a securitizing actor in this thesis, due to the limitations of space and time, this approach will remain outside the scope of this research.

Finally, the social, political and historical context of the issue that is desecuritized need to be investigated. The context can be said to be partially conducive to the audience acceptance of the claim that Turkey is a safe third country. The context in which the EU-Turkey readmission agreement was created is complex. Politically, Turkey has been a special partner for decades (Rankin, 2016), the country is an EU-trade partner and has been a recognized EU-membership candidate since 1999 (European parliament, 2017; Reuters, 2009). The close relationship between the Netherlands and Turkey is likely to improve the success of the desecuritizing move. Additionally, the social context in which the desecuritizing move is made is one in which Dutch society is under pressure due to the European refugee crisis. This too can be said to facilitate the desecuritizing actor. However, in the historical context, Turkey historically speaking, has a bad record with human rights. The structural violation of human rights has historically place Turkey in a realm of security. The historical context is therefore unlikely to be conducive to audience acceptance of the desecuritizing move.

4.3.2 Audience acceptance

Buzan et al. state that for securitization to be successful, it must be accepted by the audience (1998: 25). What exactly audience acceptance entails however, is not discussed. Drawing on the framing approach set out in the second chapter, audience acceptance can be indicated a frame is noticed, processed and accepted by the majority of people, this can present itself in frame adoption (Entman, 1993: 56). Though frame adoption will be left for future research, the frame analysis conducted can heed evidence for audience acceptance.

The Dutch lower house was identified as the audience for the desecuritizing move conducted by the Dutch upper house. As content analyzed as part of the frame analysis showed that the lower house or House of Representatives did not oppose the implementation of the readmission agreement or the designation of Turkey as a safe third country, the empirical analysis indicates that the desecuritization frame was accepted. The acceptance of the frame was not immediately visible however. The frame analysis showed that several of the documents on the governmental level consisted of question and answer sessions between the

two houses in which the House of Representatives questioned whether Turkey was indeed a safe third country.

The civil society level was also taken to be an audience member to the securitizing move. The content analyzed at this level, indicates that the desecuritization frame was not accepted. In fact, some of the articles analyzed at this level were a direct response to the desecuritizing move enacted by the desecuritizing actor. As the civil society level contained the repeated use of the categories gathered for the securitization frame, the empirical analysis shows audience contestation rather than acceptance.

Finally, the media level, analyzed as part of this thesis to provide an indication of frame acceptance, showed both acceptance and contestation. The framing used in the news articles was partially that of desecuritization, repeating the desecuritizing categories also found on the governmental level. However, a number of articles at the media level also contained the repeated use of categories related to the securitization frame. This suggests that the desecuritizing frame was partially accepted at the media level.

4.3.3 The realm of normal politics

In looking at securitization, Charett poses the question whether extraordinary actions been taken (2009: 14). However, a sign of desecuritization is the placement of an action back into the realm of ‘normal politics’ (Freire et al, 2008; Wæver 1993: 57). Tracing desecuritization should thus involve looking at whether the issue or event is framed as though it may be dealt with by ordinary actions, through normal politics. The interpretation of what constitutes the realm of normal politics however, is open to the researcher. Neither the members of the CS or the post-CS scholars define the limitations of what can be understood as normal politics. It is thus somewhat difficult to state with certainty if the issue is placed back into normal politics. In the realm of emergency politics exist security issues that “pose an extreme challenge to political actors. If they do not successfully neutralize these threats, they lose their political character” (Huysmans, 1998: 491). Additionally, chapter two also illustrated that to securitize an issue is to place it in a particular rhetorical structure (Huysmans, 1998: 492), namely a structure of threat, and urgency. Restructuring this idea to follow the reversal of securitization, it should be noticeable then that the solutions posed to an issue are not emergency measures, and the rhetorical structure within which the issue is dealt should not follow the security or threat rhetoric.

Following the frame analysis, the discursive practices at the governmental level showed a move away from the rhetoric of securitization. Comparing for example the rhetorical structure found on the civil society level, in which many instances of the terms “danger”, “emergency”, “risk”, “human rights violations”, “not safe”/”unsafe” and, “urgency” were observed, with the rhetorical structure at the governmental level, shows a different approach. At the governmental level in the period after 2013, the terms “risk”, “threat” and, “urgency”, for example, are not present. Instead, the rhetorical structure at this level uses the term “safe” in several instances. Removing the rhetoric of securitization from the discourse allows the for the deconstruction of security. As security can be constructed through invoking a particular rhetorical structure (Huysmans, 1998), non-security can be constructed in a similar fashion. Besides the rhetorical structure, desecuritization is thus also characterized by non-emergency measures. For Wæver, an issue is desecuritized when it is placed into “the ordinary public sphere’ where they can be dealt with in accordance with the rules of the (democratic) political system” (1998: 29). The measures proposed as part of desecuritization must therefore be fitting with the democratic political system. A measure that is proposed at the governmental level to deal with the issue of the ‘situation for refugees in Turkey’, is to provide financial aid to turkey. The measure is not extraordinary. Instead, it is a measure that may be easily legitimized in the democratic process.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

In this final chapter, the empirical analysis will be summarized and the research question posed in this thesis will be answered. To recap, the research question posed in the introduction was;

How was Turkey framed as a safe third nation in the process of creating the EU-Turkey agreement despite the strained relationship between Turkey and the European Union?

After the summary of the analysis this chapter will delve into the reflection on and limitations of the research. Finally, this concluding chapter will highlight some recommendations for future research.

5.1 Empirical evidence

As previous chapters have already pointed out, the main aim of this thesis was to investigate the way Turkey was framed in the lead-up to the EU-Turkey readmission agreement. In order to complete this aim, a frame analysis was undertaken.

The frame analysis provided evidence for the presence of a desecuritization frame in the content analyzed at the governmental level. Though the publications from 2011 and 2013 showed the use of categories that were deemed part of the securitization frame in the creation of a coding scheme for this thesis, the prevalence of these categories was limited and the number of documents was scarce. Though this provides limited evidence for the existence of a securitization frame in the years prior to the outbreak of the European migration crisis, stronger inferences can be made based on the frame analysis of later publications at this level. Publications from the year 2014 and later namely, show the repeated use of desecuritizing categories. In these documents, the securitization rhetoric is abandoned and the framing of Turkey is transformed to one of desecuritization. Strongest evidence of this shift is in the use of the category “safe”. As discussed in the previous chapter, use of this category removes any notion of threat from the frame, there is no longer an instance of Turkey representing an existential threat to migrants. In adhering to a deconstructivist strategy (Roe, 2004: 285), the empirical analysis shows evidence of frame transformation as presented by Snow et al. in which an existing frame is transformed to fit a topic or issue that would not resonate under the original frame (1986: 467-473).

The frame analysis was also used to investigate the expected existence of counter-frames at the civil society level. Significant evidence was gathered to corroborate this expectation. Though no articles regarding the subject under study were published at the civil society level in 2011 or 2012, the analysis of the articles published from 2013 onwards showed that they each used a securitizing frame when addressing the situation in Turkey. In these articles, residing in Turkey was presented as an existential threat to the referent object which this research identified to be the social group migrants. Though future research may investigate the civil society actors discussed here as a securitizing actor in the context of this case, for this thesis these actors were taken to be part of the audience. Following the framing literature, the discursive practices at the civil society level can be indicated to show frame contestation. This contestation is used to call into question the legitimacy of designating Turkey as a safe third country. The securitization framing at the civil society level shows what framing literature describes as the consequence frame (Samaras, 2002: 72).

The media level was analyzed as an indicator of frame acceptance. In analyzing whether news articles invoked the securitization frame or the desecuritization frame, this thesis aimed at providing evidence for audience acceptance. Evidence gathered from this level of analysis however, showed that the articles were divided in their use of either frame. In other words, the analysis of the frames used at the media level indicated that the desecuritization frame was partially accepted.

The abovementioned evidence gathered from the frame analysis provides evidence for the existence of a desecuritizing move on the part of the desecuritizing actor -the Dutch upper house or Dutch Parliament. To speak of desecuritization however, this section turns to the process-tracing analysis conducted as part of this research. Buzan et al. state that a securitizing move can only become securitization if there is audience acceptance (1998: 25). The same was taken to be true for desecuritizing, building on the notion that a desecuritizing move without any form of audience acceptance does not show successful desecuritization. Another indicator of successful desecuritization was found in the facilitating conditions. As the Dutch upper house used the discursive practices of desecuritization, the position of authority of the securitizing actor was deemed favorable to the likelihood of audience acceptance of the desecuritizing move, and of the contextual features, the social and political context were taken to be conducive to the acceptance of the desecuritizing move.

Thus, in answer of the research question; Turkey, in Dutch discourse, was framed as a safe third country through a process of desecuritization. The framing can be observed at the

governmental level. Though frame contestation is visible at the civil society level and partially at the media level, the research does provide evidence for desecuritization. This evidence is deemed to be present due to the partial frame acceptance, the partially conducive facilitating conditions and the return of the issue -the situation of migrants in turkey- back into what this thesis takes to be the realm of normal politics.

5.2 Validity of results

The validity of the results of this thesis carries two implications. First, due to this thesis using a single-case study approach, the results have a validity that is internal to the case-study. Though the validity of results may seem to suggest that this research is only relevant to the case-study at hand, the research does allow us to gain a better understanding of desecuritization as a process and the theory of securitization as a whole. Since the Turkish case was studied in detail, this thesis is able to provide an extensive insight into the framing used in the lead-up to the agreement. In doing so, this thesis also contributes a critical evaluation of desecuritization and the extent to which it can be used in research in its current state. Additionally, the validity is affected by the choice to conduct a theory-testing process tracing analysis. The choice for this method again causes the results to represent internal validity, however, this does not present an issue to the research. The aim of this thesis was to provide an insight into the framing practices used in the period leading up to the implementation of the readmission agreement and additionally aimed to test the causal mechanism of desecuritization. This means that though the results are case-specific, the method would allow for the gathering of evidence into a generalizable causal mechanism (Beach and Pederson, 2016).

5.3 Reflection and limitations

In creating this thesis, a number of limitations were encountered, most of which have already been alluded to in the various chapters of the thesis. Additionally, as part of the reflection after completion of the research, some parts of the writing process were identified which, if this thesis were to be undertaken again, would be approached differently. The limitations most relevant to this research are laid out here.

First and foremost, a limitation was encountered in the under-theorization of the process of desecuritization. As shown in the theory chapter, desecuritization is understood as the

return of an issue to- or the maintaining of an issue in- the realm of normal politics (Roe, 2012: 252). This understanding of desecuritization originated in the work of Wæver (1998) and was criticized by post-CS scholars as being under-developed. In an attempt to improve the understanding of desecuritization, three strategies of desecuritization were conceptualized namely; the objectivist, the constructivist and, the deconstructivist strategy (Roe, 2004: 285). Yet, desecuritization as process remains vague. As a result of the absence of clear limitations to desecuritization, the process becomes one that is to be filled in by the security researcher. Desecuritization, in this sense, remains open to interpretation, which can potentially lead to biased results in the analysis. Though careful steps were undertaken as part of this thesis to ensure the research would be replicable -such as the transformation of the facilitating conditions for securitization to fit desecuritization, and a transformation of the questions for testing securitization as proposed by Charett (2009)- the lack of clear cut guidelines to follow in studying desecuritization proved to form a noticeable limitation to this thesis.

Additionally, as features such as audience acceptance and what can be taken as an emergency measure or indeed as normal politics are not clearly defined in the securitization literature, it remains up to the researcher to determine what can be seen as evidence for these elements. It would be helpful for researchers if the various parts of securitization theory would be defined more concretely just as it would help give weight to the evidence gathered as part of research. In the case of this thesis, the lack of clear criteria for audience acceptance and especially the limited theorization regarding the concept of 'normal politics' made it difficult to determine whether the issue of migrants residing in Turkey could be said to have been placed back into the realm of normal politics. Taking normal politics to mean the lack of security rhetoric and policy measures that could easily be legitimated in democratic politics, this research tries to provide its own structure to the tracing of desecuritization. What becomes clear though is that for desecuritization to be studied rigorously, this part of the securitization approach needs to be developed much more extensively.

Finally, the method used as part of this thesis also provided a limitation to the research. As previously mentioned in chapter three, the coding of content as part of the frame analysis rests on two quality criteria; validity and reliability (Schreier, 2013; Bengtsson, 2016). Though every effort was undertaken to guarantee the quality of the research, this thesis would have benefited from a second coder. Despite conducting a trial coding and coding part of the content twice, the analysis may have a lessened reliability as both measures were undertaken by a single researcher. The frame analysis provides excellent opportunities for a descriptive

study into the frames present in various types of content, however, due to the reasons of reliability the method is better suited to research conducted by more than one researcher.

5.4 Future research

The research undertaken as part of this thesis aimed to show the framing used in the lead-up to the EU-Turkey readmission agreement. In doing so a frame analysis was conducted on content gathered from Dutch sources on three levels; the governmental, the civil society and, the media level. Though this provided an insight into the framing used in Dutch discourse and allowed for the study of the desecuritization mechanism at a Dutch governmental level, future research is possible by expanding the scope to include the European level. Incorporating this level will enhance the societal relevance of the research. The societal relevance was previously discussed in the introductory chapter of this thesis as represented in the importance of understanding how framing is used in this case study. The EU-Turkey agreement shows how policy at a European level may be reshaped and, understanding the causal mechanism at play in this process is crucial as more deals such as the readmission agreement with Turkey may be created with other nations in the future. Though the inferences made as part of the analysis are case-specific, as Beach and Pederson point out, if theory-testing process-tracing provides evidence for the theorized causal mechanism, it not only strengthens the causal mechanism, it also provides the researcher with a generalizable causal mechanism (2016: 21).

The discussion of the causal mechanism present in desecuritization introduces the second recommendation for further research. As mentioned above, the process of desecuritization, despite the best efforts of post-CS scholars such as Roe (2004), remains highly under-theorized. However, as desecuritization can provide important insights into policy change at both a national and European level, it is crucial that more research is done into this field. Securitization theory provides many opportunities for investigating how a threat or security is constructed, however, the various underdeveloped areas in the theory, such as desecuritization and audience acceptance, limit the theory's usability in the field of research. If an issue or event can be securitized it must be able to be desecuritized (Roe, 2004: 280). Investing into this area of the security approach can thus provide the scholarly community with many opportunities for further study into the construction of desecuritization or the deconstruction of security.

Bibliography

- Almasy, Steve "EU leaders to present new refugee plan to Turkey" *CNN*. 18 Mar 2016. www.edition.cnn.com/2016/03/17/europe/eu-turkey-refugees/index.html
- Amnesty International. "Greece: A blue print for despair. Human Rights impact of the EU-Turkey Deal". <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/eur25/5664/2017/en/>. 17 feb 2017.
- Batalla Adam, Laura. "The EU-Turkey Deal One Year On: A Delicate Balancing Act." *The International Spectator* 52.4 (2017): 44-58.
- BBC. "Migrant crisis: EU and Turkey plan one-in, one-out deal" *BBC News*, 8 March 2016. [Www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-35749837](http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-35749837). Accessed 2 April 2018.
- Bengtsson, Mariette. "How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis" *Nursing Plus Open* 2 (2016): 8–14
- Benford, Robert D. "Master frame." *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements* (2013).
- Besselink, Nicole. "Kamer vreest versnelde toetreding Turkije tot EU." *Trouw*. 6 nov 2015: 870 words. Nexis. Web. Date Accessed: 2 April 2018.
- Bhikie, Avinash. "Rutte bestrijdt dat Europa visumbeleid Turkije versoepelt" *NU.nl*. 1 Dec 2015. <https://www.nu.nl/politiek/4175071/rutte-bestrijdt-europa-visumbeleid-turkije-versoepelt.html>
- BNR. "Rutte Wil Vluchtelingendeals in Noord-Afrika." *BNR Nieuwsradio*, BNR, 22 June 2018. Accessed 23 June 2018.
- Bouteillet-Paquet, Daphne. "Passing the buck: A critical analysis of the readmission policy implemented by the European Union and its Member States." *European Journal of Migration and Law* 5.3 (2003): 359-377.
- Bowcott, Owen. "British lawyers warn of human rights violations in Turkey" *The Guardian*. 28 Sep 2015. <https://gu.com/p/4cm6h/sbl>
- CBS. Asielverzoeken: nationaliteit, vanaf 1975. 2 Feb 2018. www.statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=80059NED&D1=a&D2=0&D3=a&HD=180812-0946&HDR=T,G1&STB=G2&CHARTTYPE=1

- Charett, Catherine "A Critical Application of Securitization Theory: Overcoming the Normative Dilemma of Writing Security" *SSRN Electronic Journal* 7 (2018).
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1884149
- Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. "Framing theory." *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 10 (2007): 103-126.
- Collett, Elizabeth. "The paradox of the EU-Turkey refugee deal." *Migration Policy Institute* (2016).
- Entman, Robert M. "Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm." *Journal of communication* 43.4 (1993): 51-58.
- European Council. "EU-Turkey statement, 18 March 2016" European Council.
<https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/03/18/eu-turkey-statement/>
- Gil-Bazo, Maria-Teresa. "The practice of Mediterranean states in the context of the European Union's justice and home affairs external dimension. The safe third country concept revisited." *International Journal of Refugee Law* 18.3-4 (2006): 571-600.
- Gorp, Baldwin van. "The constructionist approach to framing: Bringing culture back in." *Journal of communication* 57.1 (2007): 60-78.
- JRS Europe. "The EU-Turkey Deal. Analysis and Considerations" *Jesuit Refugee Service Europe*. 30 April 2018. Web. 20 February 2018.
- Joachim, Jutta. "Framing issues and seizing opportunities: The UN, NGOs, and women's rights." *International Studies Quarterly* 47.2 (2003): 247-274.
- Joachim, Jutta, and Andrea Schneiker. "New humanitarians? Frame appropriation through private military and security companies." *Millennium* 40.2 (2012): 365-388.
- Mihăilă, Viorel. "Security Branding and National Security. Concepts at Work." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 187 (2015): 424-428.
- NRC. "Samsom bedacht de formule achter Turkijedeal" NRC, 29 March 2016,
www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2016/03/29/migrantencrisis-samsom-bedacht-de-formule-achter-1604143-a910497

- Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk. "2 jaar EU-Turkije-deal: de balans opgemaakt"
Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland. 18 March 2018. Web. 19 March 2018.
- Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk "Bescherming in Nederland" *Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk*. 2018.
www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/feiten-cijfers/cijfers/bescherming-nederland
- Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk "Bescherming in Europa" *Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk*. 2018.
www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/feiten-cijfers/cijfers/bescherming-europa
- UNHCR "Note on the Principle of Non-Refoulement" *Refworld*. November 1997. Web. 8
 January 2018.
- Zavallis, Achilleas. "UNHCR expresses concern over EU-Turkey plan." *UNHCR*, UN, 8 Mar.
 2016, www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2016/3/56dee1546/unhcr-expresses-concern-eu-turkey-plan.html
- Simmons BA, Charnysh V, Lloyd P. "Frames and Consensus Formation in International
 Relations: The Case of Trafficking in Persons." *European Journal of International
 Relations*. Forthcoming.
- Samaras, Athanassios N. "Frames and framing in international relations." *Defensor Pacis* 11
 (2002): 71-96.
- Stack, Morgan. "The Application of a Master Frame: Tracing the War on Terror in the Irish
 Times 2001-8." *Irish Communication Review* 13.1 (2013): 4.
- Taureck, Rita. "Securitization theory and securitization studies." *Journal of International
 Relations and Development* 9.1 (2006): 53-61.
- Wæver, Ole. *Securitization and desecuritization*. Copenhagen: Centre for Peace and Conflict
 Research, (1993): 48-79
- Stritzel, Holger. "Towards a theory of securitization: Copenhagen and beyond." *European
 journal of international relations* 13.3 (2007): 357-383.
- Huysmans, Jef. "Revisiting Copenhagen: Or, on the creative development of a security studies
 agenda in Europe." *European journal of international relations* 4.4 (1998): 479-505.
- Freire, Maria Raquel, et all. "The Securitization of Environmental Policies. Grasping the
 Nexus? The Darfur Case" *SAIS Europe Journal* (2008). Web. Retrieved on 14 May
 2018.

- Semetko, Holli A., and Patti M. Valkenburg. "Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news." *Journal of communication* 50.2 (2000): 93-109.
- Snow, David A., et al. "Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation." *American sociological review* (1986): 464-481.
- Shmueli, Deborah, Michael Elliott, and Sanda Kaufman. "Frame changes and the management of intractable conflicts." *Conflict resolution quarterly* 24.2 (2006): 207-218.
- Carvalho Pinto, Vânia. "Exploring the interplay between Framing and Securitization theory: the case of the Arab Spring protests in Bahrain." *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 57.1 (2014): 162-176.
- Watson, Scott D. "'Framing' the Copenhagen School: Integrating the literature on threat construction." *Millennium* 40.2 (2012): 279-301.
- Vultee, Fred. "Securitization: A new approach to the framing of the 'war on terror'" *Journalism Practice* 4.1 (2010): 33-47.
- Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap De Wilde. *Security: a new framework for analysis*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998
- Gerring, John. *Case study research: Principles and practices*. Cambridge university press, 2006.
- Cassarino, Jean-Pierre. "Informalising readmission agreements in the EU neighbourhood." *The International Spectator* 42.2 (2007): 179-196.
- Bigo, Didier. "Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the governmentality of unease." *Alternatives* 27.1_suppl (2002): 63-92.
- Messina, Anthony M. "Securitizing immigration in the age of terror." *World Politics* 66.3 (2014): 530-559.
- Beach, Derek, and Rasmus Brun Pedersen. *Process-tracing methods: Foundations and guidelines*. University of Michigan Press, 2016.
- Mayring, Philipp. "Qualitative Content Analysis" *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 1.2 art.20 (2000).

- Kohlbacher, Florian. "The Use of Qualitative Content Analysis in Case Study Research" Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research 7.1 art. 21 (2006).
- Vennesson, Pascal. "12 Case studies and process tracing: theories and practices." Approaches and methodologies in the social sciences (2008): 223-239.
- Hsieh, Hsiu-Fang, and Sarah E. Shannon. "Three approaches to qualitative content analysis." Qualitative health research 15.9 (2005): 1277-1288.
- Schreier, Margrit. "Qualitative Content Analysis." The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis. Uwe Flick. 55 City Road: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2014. 170-183. SAGE Knowledge. Web. 29 May. 2018, doi: 10.4135/9781446282243.n12.
- Balzacq, Thierry. "The three faces of securitization: Political agency, audience and context." European journal of international relations 11.2 (2005): 171-201.
- NOS. "Telegraaf verliest meeste lezers" NOS. 30 Mar 2017 <https://nos.nl/l/m/2165673>.
- Rankin, Jennifer. "Turkey's long road to EU membership just got longer" The Guardian. 20 July, 2016. www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jul/20/turkeys-long-road-to-eu-membership-just-got-longer
- Reuters. "Timeline: Turkey's long and winding road towards EU" 18 Jan 2009. www.reuters.com/article/us-turkey-eu-accession-timeline/timeline-turkeys-long-and-winding-road-towards-eu-idUSTRE50H0R320090118
- HRW. "Turkey: Insufficiently Clear Human Rights Agenda for E.U. Accession" 7 Nov 2000 www.hrw.org/news/2000/11/07/turkey-insufficiently-clear-human-rights-agenda-eu-accession
- Spindler, William. "2015: The year of Europe's Refugee Crisis" UNHCR. 8 Dec 2015. Retrieved from <http://rfg.ee/VuB5h>
- ANP. "Rutte voor stoppen met EU-onderhandelingen Turkije". De Volkskrant. 8 Nov 2006. <https://www.volkskrant.nl/es-b16b0fed>
- European Council. "EU-Turkey statement, 18 March 2016". EC. 18 Mar 2016. Retrieved from www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/03/18/eu-turkey-statement/

UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), UNHCR Note on the Principle of Non-Refoulement, November 1997, available at:

<http://www.refworld.org/docid/438c6d972.html>

European Parliament. “New beginnings: reassessing EU-Turkey relations” 27 Apr 2017.

www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/world/20170426STO72401/new-beginnings-reassessing-eu-turkey-relations

European Union: Council of the European Union, Directive 2013/32/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on common procedures for granting and withdrawing international protection (recast), 29 June 2013, OJ L. 180/60 -180/95 ; 29.6.2013, 2013/32/EU, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/51d29b224.html>

Wiegman, Marten. “#EU2016NL: Nederland aan het roer van Europa” NOS, 1 Jan 2016.

<https://nos.nl/artikel/2078129-eu2016nl-nederland-aan-het-roer-van-europa.html>

Wright, Ben. “Reality Check: How soon can Turkey join the EU?” *BBC News*, 17 March 2016. www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-referendum-35832035. Accessed 18 March 2018.