

Received: 31 October 2020
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33182/ml.v17i6.1159>

Hülya Kaya (2020). The EU-Turkey Statement on Refugees: Assessing its Impact on Fundamental Rights. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 238p. ISBN 978178990 9203, ISBN 978178990 9210.

Reviewed by Deniz Yetkin Aker¹

European countries, including Turkey, have a long history of immigration. Nevertheless, especially for Turkey, the number of irregular migration and international protection applications is increased significantly since 2016. After 2014, extraordinary numbers of irregular migrants and international protection applicants have moved to Turkey including individuals from Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan.² Although new migrants have been mostly registered under international temporary protection, there have been discussions about Turkey being safe third country or a country of insecurity (meaning source country for migration).³

Similar to these heated discussions and recent developments and by considering the Syrian refugee crisis, Hülya Kaya, in her *The EU-Turkey Statement on Refugees: Assessing its Impact on Fundamental Rights*, aims to discuss whether the EU-Turkey Agreement protects refugees under Turkey's control and "whether Turkey is a safe country for refugees" (3). In *The EU-Turkey Statement on Refugees*, Kaya has two main research questions are related to reasons about the difficulties that refugees and asylum seekers experience in accessing human rights (216) and related to responsibilities Turkey is encumbered with as a result of the EU-Turkey cooperation on the refugee issue (217). In her book, she asserts that the EU-Turkey Statement on the refugee issue is an insufficient agreement to assure refugees "a right to have rights" (viii) such as having rights to seek asylum; and secondly, she claims Turkey not being a safe country for them (viii). According to Kaya, EU-Turkey 'refugee deal' shows that neither the EU nor Turkey can guarantee the rights of refugees and asylum seekers. They are left in a 'rightless' position, cannot acquire citizenship anywhere. Thus, they are "left to 'an ex gratia' act of the Turkish government" (13).

To support these arguments, the study is designed as a case study, and qualitative research is designed to answer the research questions. Thus, by discussing legal facts as well as showing the conditions of the refugees in Turkey, Kaya could support her arguments: The interviews were conducted "with strategic participants who are working with refugees as lawyers, judges, civil servants, NGOs and international organizations in Turkey" (9) to understand refugees and asylum seekers' daily experiences in Turkey. (9) The book includes both a theoretical discussion and a literature review, as well as discussions on the legal system and asylum policies. Most importantly, for the book, she focuses on the EU-Turkey Readmission Agreement and Statement as a legal

¹ Deniz Yetkin Aker, PhD, Tekirdag Namik Kemal University, Turkey. E-mail: denizyetkin8@gmail.com.

² Erdoğan, M. M. 2020. *Syrian Barometer 2019: A Framework for Achieving Social Cohesion with Syrians in Turkey*. Ankara: Orion, p. 10.

³ Sirkeci, I. 2017. "Turkey's refugees, Syrians and refugees from Turkey: a country of insecurity", *Migration Letters* 14 (1): 127 – 144, p. 128.



framework and applies Arendt's political theory as a theoretical framework and uses data analysis to answer the main research questions. (11)

Similar to Arendt, Kaya argues that being *de facto* or *de jure* stateless (being refugee or being stateless) causes individuals to lose their all legal status and rights. (55) Both Arendt and Kaya link this situation with the loss of humanity by supporting human rights including right to live in dignity. From this point of view, the book is organized into seven chapters. In the first chapter, she provides general information about the study and a plan of the book. Most importantly, she discusses the theoretical framework of the study (13). In second chapter, she focuses on readmission agreements and questions whether they are compatible with "the principle of non-refoulement, the right to seek asylum and the effective protection of refugees" (36). As an example, she argues that readmission agreements fail to provide any safeguards against non-refoulement (69). In the two following chapters, she discusses the EU-Turkey Agreement and domestic asylum law (14).

The strength of the book lies in the detailed analysis of the fieldwork findings presented in Chapters 5 and 6. Its valuable contribution to the field lies in these chapters and the chapters support her hypotheses: By focusing on domestic asylum law, Kaya tries to uncover the real problems of refugees and asylum seekers in Turkey. As a result of expert interviews, it is concluded that the problems can be categorized as problems "accessing civil-political and socio-economic rights" (161). Besides, interviewees with various backgrounds claim that Turkey is not a safe country for refugees. They mostly argue that "Turkey could not provide effective protection for refugees and asylum seekers as envisioned in the 1951 Refugee Convention and human rights law" (193).

The book can serve a wide audience. It provides discussion for international law and migration scholars. It also provides data for academicians and suggestions for policymakers. However, it would be better if the author would prepare a shorter introduction and discuss the theoretical framework as a separate chapter where she would provide hypotheses as well. The author does not give detailed information about the method of the study (or the research design). For instance, even she gives some information, it is still hard to understand the scope of the interview questions. Whether interviews are semi-structured or which coding method is used, whether any software is used to analyze interviews are open to discussion. The book has many introductions and long headings like a dissertation (without mentioning it). Lastly, it would be better if the study would include a bibliography and at least two or three refugee interviews (discussing their problems by themselves). Besides of these criticisms, the book delivers its message and arguments very powerfully. As it states, "even newborn babies cannot obtain Turkish citizenship and so are *de facto* stateless" (190). For this reason, it is important to take the book's arguments and suggestions seriously and make further researches and to take action for ameliorating refugee protection and their conditions.

