A Theoretical Analysis of The European Union's Immigration Policies in The Case of The Ukraine and Syria Humanitarian Crisis: Is It an Identity Exclusion? A Xenophobic Double Standard?

Mehmet Recai Uygur
Hamza Bahadır Eser

Abstract: In this study, the different attitudes of the European Union towards Ukrainian and Syrian refugees in its migration policies were examined. The intellectual infrastructure of these attitudes is analyzed within the framework of international relations theories such as The English School, which emphasizes the phenomenon of international society, Social Constructivism theory which emphasizes the construction of common identity and Securitization theory, which examines the process of making a political phenomenon a security issue. In addition to these approaches, the reasons for the double standard of the European Union in their migration policies are also examined in terms of the framework of geographical proximity. It emphasized to what extent the historical memories of European countries have an impact on their migration policies in the text. The theoretical analysis of the different attitudes of the European Union in the face of basically two similar events examined how these policies evolved into xenophobia and how they are fed by the current xenophobic phenomenon in Western Europe. In conclusion, it can be stated that xenophobia is a socio-psychological phenomenon in Western Europe, and this phenomenon is effective both in the determination of daily populist politics and in the attitudes preferred in the face of refugee policies.

Keywords: xenophobia, Islamophobia, securitization, identity, migration, Ukraine, Syria, European Union

Öz: Bu çalışmada Avrupa Birliği'nin göç politikalarında Ukraynalı ve Suriyeli mültecilere yönelik farklı tutumları incelenmiştir. Bu tutumların düşünsel altyapısı, uluslararası toplum olgusuna vurgu yapan İngiliz Okulu, ortak kimlik inşasına vurgu yapan Sosyal İnşacılık teorisi ve siyasal bir olguyu güvenlik sorunu haline getirme sürecini inceleyen Güvenlikleştirme teorisi çerçevesinde incelenmiştir. Bu yaklaşımlara ek olarak Avrupa Birliği'nin göç politikalarındaki çifte standardın nedenleri de coğrafi yakınlık çerçevesinde incelenmiştir. Metinde Avrupa ülkelerinin tarihsel hafızalarının göç politikalarını ne ölçüde etkilediği vurgulanmıştır. Temelde benzer iki olay karşısında Avrupa Birliği'nin farklı tutumlarının teorik analizi yapılarak, bu politikaların nasıl yabancı düşmanlığına evrildiği ve Batı Avrupa'daki mevcut yabancı düşmanlığı olgusundan nasıl beslendiği incelenmiştir. yabancı düşmanlığının Batı Avrupa'da sosyo-psikolojik bir olgu olduğu ve bu olgunun hem günlük popülist politikaların belirlenmesinde hem de mülteci politikaları karşısında tercih edilen tutumlarda etkili olduğu görülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: yabancı düşmanlığı, İslamofobi, güvenlikleştirme, kimlik, göç, Ukrayna, Suriye, Avrupa Birliği

Öğr. Gör., SMK University of Applied Sciences, mrecai.uygur@gmail.com
Prof. Dr., Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, bahadireser@sdu.edu.tr

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1872-0885
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4063-051X

Introduction

Our study discusses the double standards of European democracy through migration and refugees. This study necessitates an extremely broad and deep philosophical discussion due to its scope. Here, not only xenophobia but also the foundations of the crippled democratic thought underlying xenophobia will be discussed. Many social theories that emerged and developed in the West could not go beyond to hiding the crippled side of Western democracies. The argument of Cox (1981), one of the pioneers of critical theory, implies that "Theory is always for someone and some purpose" (p. 198). This statement reveals this absolute reality with all its nakedness.

The changing war strategy and understanding at the international level greatly affect civilian areas. It has become an inevitable situation for societies that differ from each other culturally, ideologically, or religiously, who have to live together. Most states consist of societies of individuals with similar cultures and religious beliefs. Historical closeness and cultural fusion have created a sense of belonging among these societies. The relationship between Ukraine and other European states was similar. This formation, which can be shown as the upper version of the "family" structure, often does not welcome those who come from the outside for an indefinite period or permanently. In particular, those who came from outside had no common values and culture with the host countries. The instinct to protect what is "mine" reveals the state of martial law in a society where the law is almost suspended. In this process, where democracy is shelved, nationalist ideas come to the forefront.

At this point, it is predictable that the host community will not be sensitive about human rights at the expense of its pluralistic and democratic identity. In such a political climate, it can be expected that the discourses point out that pushing the refugees back will gain strength, and at least the host community will remain silent against such discourses.

In a country where these social and (of course) political demands are not met, it is a possible outcome that socio-political movements will arise (Tarrow, 1998, p. 3) Political parties, that focuses on that kind of demand, started to produce discourses pointing to preventing culturally or religiously different groups (in these case Syrian refugees) from entering the "European" territory (Mudde, 2007, p. 17) As a result those in power implemented practices that did not match with pluralistic democracy and human rights.

The mass migration movement that took place with the Arab Spring that started in Tunisia in December 2010 (Qadir Mushtaq & Afzal, 2017, p. 1) made the European states extremely uneasy. Particularly, European states, which increased their efforts

to use Turkey as a buffer zone against immigration from Syria (Council of The EU, 2018), showed a different approach towards another mass migration movement that started with Russia's occupation of Ukraine towards the end of February 2022. As of the 12th of September 2023, the number of Ukrainian refugees registered in European territory is 5,833,500 (The UN Refugee Agency, 2023). This manner has been evaluated as a political double standard. The European Union states, which claim that they are not in the capacity to handle the influx of immigration from Syria, have facilitated and encouraged the flow of immigration from Ukraine and opened their borders which are known as the "open door policy".

One important point should be underlined here. The phenomenon that is to be emphasized in this text is not: why Europe opened its borders to Ukrainians, but why it did not open its borders to Syrians. The opening of Europe's borders to Ukrainians is a valuable humanitarian step. The fact that the same steps were not taken for refugees from the Middle East makes the definition of human life value controversial. In other words, what makes human life precious? To be human or European. It is understood that the normative values adopted by European countries in general and the European Union in particular, as a principled policy (Manners, 2002), vary by country, region, culture, and identity. The various immigration policies of European states considering their location, identity, religion, or culture will be discussed through the aspects of different theories below. Two theories of international relations: Social Constructivism and the English School, that shed a great deal of light on the political and social structure of the European Union, are also the theories that draw the roadmap of the debate in this study. In addition to the aforementioned theories, what the European Union's different practices for migration mean in terms of securitization and desecuritization will also be discussed in the text.

The effect of different immigration policies in Europe on xenophobia is also an issue worth examining. The most effective way to understand a phenomenon is to go down to its origins. Otherwise, all solutions will be superficial and temporary. Considering this situation, we will consider the concept of xenophobia from a different point of view, and it will emphasize how xenophobic attitudes will evolve in the long run from the differences in attitudes of European states towards refugees from Ukraine and Syria.

Throughout history, Europe has been a hub of migration due to its persistent wars, conflicts, and struggles. However, post-World War II, the region transformed,

establishing a community[1] leading to economic growth and political stability. This growth spurred demand for labor, prompting countries like Germany and France to invite significant labor migration (Deley, 2018; Borkert & Bosswick, 2007). While Europe prospered, many regions globally grappled with conflicts. Drawn to European stability, many from war-torn areas migrated en masse. The fall of the Berlin Wall in the late 1980s and the Soviet Union's dissolution in 1991 intensified illegal immigration to Europe. On the one hand, important steps were being taken with Eastern European countries within the framework of the European Union's enlargement policy[2], on the other hand, stricter practices were introduced in immigration policies under the name of combating illegal immigration. (European Parliament, 1999). Recently Europe's biggest test against immigration began with the Arab Spring. The issues that took place, especially in the Balkan[3], the Middle East and North African geographies were facts that future generations would want to forget and shame on behalf of humanity. Against the mass migration that started with the Arab Spring, Italy, and Malta called on the European Union to make the temporary protection mechanism functional. (Ciger, 2022). Since Malta and Italy are coastal countries, they were the first stop of irregular migration, and as a consequence, they felt the result of immigration in advance. However, the European Union rejected the directives of Italy and Malta, stating that the necessary conditions for temporary protection were not met (Genç & Şirin-Öner, 2019, p. 7). In 2015, while the human tragedy was taking place on the shores of the Mediterranean[4] (Uybadın, 2015), the member states of the European Union started to set up fences on their borders (European Parliament, 2022). Greece started to close the Macedonian border, likewise, the Hungarian-Serbian border, and the Bulgarian-Turkish border with wire fences and they implemented harsh policies against the incoming influx of immigration. In addition, the European Union has been vigilant in all border controls, and the passage of many refugees based on the border has been severely blocked (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2016).

1   The concept of Community refers to the 1951 Treaty of Establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community (Paris Treaty), the Treaty of Establishment of the European Economic Community of 1957 (the Treaties of Rome), and the Treaty of Establishment of the Euratom of 1957 (the Treaties of Rome), in which the foundations of the European Union were laid.

2   The European Union pursued a policy of enlargement towards Eastern Europe after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

3   In September 2015, there was a significant incident in which Hungarian journalist Petra László visually documented the coercive act of "kicking" a refugee child in the middle of a crowd of refugees entering Hungary from the Serbian border.

4   On 2 September 2015, the lifeless body of a three-year-old Syrian boy named Aylan (Alan) Kurdi washed up on the shores of Bodrum. The picture that immortalized his lifeless body, on the other hand left a traumatic effect on our social memory.

European Union member states have naturally encouraged other methods to prevent asylum seekers, other than closing the border with wire fences and taking intense security measures. The behavior of a journalist against the refugees at the Hungarian border has left a permanent place in the memory of humanity. As it has been mentioned above, it was seen that the Hungarian journalist "kicked the refugees" while they were passing (O'Grady, 2018). It would have been very simple to explain this situation with the concept of xenophobia defined as: "fear and hatred of strangers or foreigners or anything strange or foreign". The origin of xenophobia is the combination of the Greek words xenos and phobos. Xenos was used to mean stranger or guest (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2023). It has a core point that reflects the fear of the "other" that Yakushko, (2008) refers to as the term xenophobia in this definition.

In Syria, the current regime, the opposition groups, different countries, communities, international military units, and terrorist organizations were in conflict[5]. It is clear that there is no difference between, the tragedy which is experienced by the people of Syria and Ukraine. On the one hand, is pleasing for humanity, and on the other hand, it has revealed a double standard situation for European countries. The changing policies of the European Union in Ukraine and Syria take their ideological background from identity and cultural differences. Policies are the result of these main differences. We will explain this issue with a comprehensive theoretical framework below.

Methodology of the study

 The research design of this study employs a qualitative research method, specifically a case study approach. A case study approach is appropriate for this study as it allows for an in-depth examination of a specific phenomenon or case, which in this current study is the different attitudes of the European Union towards Ukrainian and Syrian refugees in its migration policies.

The methodology for this research involves several key components. It includes an examination of legal reports from the European Parliament and policies pertaining to the article's topic. Additionally, a comprehensive literature review of academic journals, books, and pertinent sources is conducted to explore the European Union's attitudes toward migration policies, specifically about Ukraine and Syria. The study

---

5   Some actors involved in the Syrian civil war; the Syrian army, the Syrian government, and internal rebels in Syria, Daesh, Al Nusra, Kurdish, Turkmen, Druze, and Syriac groups, countries such as Russia, Iran, the United States, and Türkiye.

also involves the observation of relevant public events. Besides, this research is primarily guided by theoretical analyses, incorporating key theories such as the English school, social constructivism, securitization, and geographical proximity. These theoretical frameworks provide a foundation for understanding and interpreting the complexities of the European Union's migration policies. Notably, the theoretical analyses are informed by specific European Union policies, such as the activation of the temporary protection mechanism for Ukraine and the establishment of border fences in response to Syrian refugees.

Ethical considerations were taken into account during the data collection and analysis process. Informed consent was not required as the data sources used were public documents, reports, policies, academic journals, books, and public events. However, the researchers ensured that the sources used were reliable and trustworthy.

Historical Memory and Proximity Effect on European Migration Policy

Threat perceptions that people feel from outside vary according to the degree of proximity of the threat. The intensity of the perceived threat of an explosion, a civil war, or the existence of a terrorist organization in a distant country, may remain at very low levels. The fact that the aforementioned threat elements begin to occur in a closed country will begin to raise the fear and anxiety of the people to the next level. When individuals or society start to take precautions, it is the period when the threat has entered the country's borders. For this reason, when people choose their living spaces, they pay much attention to being away from the dangers that may come from nature or people. Construction companies emphasize security to increase the attractiveness of the buildings they promote. Living in safe cities, neighborhoods, and estates is expensive. Because the demand for such places is more intense than in any other place. The most comforting answer to the first reflex of an individual who hears the news of a big earthquake or an explosion, "Where did it occur" is the one that states that "it occurred in a distant place." With this answer, the daily life of the individual continues from where it left off, the tragedy that occurred in another part of the world becomes an ordinary event and is usually forgotten.

Europe experienced considerable chaos and war until 1945. The continent began its journey toward a more structured order with the 1648 Peace of Westphalia (The Peace of Westphalia, 1648). After WWII, Europe evolved into a more cohesive political entity. France's mistrust of Germany was addressed through shared cultural, economic, and political bonds (European Union, 2020). This European unity intensified during the Cold War, largely due to concerns about the USSR's territorial ambitions in Europe and other territories. The USSR's influence not only reached parts of the

European continent but also extended into regions like the Caucasus. But Europe had to prioritize its security over others. The European States, which put intense pressure on the United States of America (USA) to protect European lands against the threat of the USSR, were successful in their pressure and established the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) under the leadership of the USA.

Historically, phenomena that took place on European territory have had a great impact on today's European Union policies. These policies have manifested themselves in many areas, including political, social, and economic. With the disintegration of the USSR in 1991, the European Union implemented its eastward enlargement policy, and in 2004, by accepted a total of 10 countries, including Malta and the Greek Cypriot Administration. It was the biggest enlargement process in its history. (European Parliament, 2023) With the disintegration of the Soviet Union, concern about the direction of the Eastern European countries, which were celebrating their independence in confusion, meant an extremely broad maneuver for the European Union. The major factor behind this hasty and grand decision was to move Central and Western Europe away from the Russian border, thereby reducing the threat.

Analyzes and inferences to be made on the current immigration policies of the European Union within the framework of the mentioned facts are important. Because, according to a realist point of view, a region or country will keep human values in the background as a matter of national security strategy. In that case, the humanitarian aspect of the European Union's policy towards Ukrainian refugees is questionable. It can be thought that this inference put forward for the European Union countries, which opened their borders to Ukrainian refugees, is contradictory. We think that historical analysis and deconstruction of issues and policies will bring us a little closer to reality.

Existence and Mechanisms of EU Migration Policy

The development of a comprehensive European Union (EU) migration policy has been an evolutionary process, initiated by the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1999, which transferred immigration policy-making powers from individual states to the European level (Polat, 2006). Subsequently, the establishment of the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) marked a significant step toward a standardized approach to migration within the EU (Zaun, 2018).

The CEAS set out minimum standards for the treatment of asylum-seekers, including procedures for granting and withdrawing refugee status, reception conditions, and criteria for determining which EU country is responsible for examining an asylum claim (Luedtke, 2011)

The Dublin Regulation, integral to the CEAS, stipulates that asylum seekers must apply for asylum in the first EU member state they enter (Guild et al., 2015) This has been a contentious element of the EU's migration policy, with critics arguing it places a disproportionate burden on 'frontline' states such as Italy and Greece.

In 2015, as an emergency response to the refugee crisis, the EU introduced a temporary relocation scheme to support these frontline states (European Parliament, 2019). Yet, such schemes have faced resistance from several member states and questions remain about the EU's ability to enforce solidarity among its members in matters of migration policy (Brekke & Staver, 2018). Another key aspect of the EU's migration policy was the 2016 EU-Turkey deal, which aimed to stem migration flows by returning irregular migrants arriving in Greece back to Turkey (International Rescue Committee, 2022).

Effects and Externalization of EU Migration Policy

The effects of the EU's migration policy have been profound and multifaceted. EU policy has certainly offered refuge and safety for many individuals fleeing conflict and persecution. However, it has also received significant criticism.

One major criticism of the Dublin Regulation is the aforementioned imbalance it creates, placing a heavier burden on certain member states (Guild et al., 2015). This has led to significant tension within the EU, as the uneven distribution of asylum seekers has exacerbated political and social issues within the bloc (Brekke & Staver, 2018). Similar to this situation, the EU-Turkey deal has faced criticism due to concerns over refugee rights, given the deal's potential breach of the principle of non-refoulement, a core tenet of international refugee law that forbids the return of refugees to places where they face serious threats to their life or freedom (Médecins Sans Frontières, 2016). The migration crisis has influenced EU politics, contributing to the rise of anti-immigration sentiments and populist parties in several member states, presenting substantial challenges to EU solidarity and integration (Mudde, 2019).

Beyond internal mechanisms, the EU migration policy has increasingly focused on the externalization of border control and cooperation with third countries (Lavenex, 2016). For instance, the EU-Turkey deal in 2016 reflected this externalization trend.

The agreement aimed at curtailing the influx of refugees and migrants into the EU through Turkey, which had become a major transit route during the crisis (Çorabatır, 2016). The EU's relationships with African countries have been increasingly characterized by efforts to manage migration. This has taken shape through various partnerships, including the EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, aimed at addressing the root causes of irregular migration and displaced persons in Africa (Molenaar et al., 2017).

The meaning of the migration policy implemented in Europe from a social constructivist perspective: Ukraine and the European Union

Nicholas Onuf and Alexander Wendt contend that international political elements, like power and anarchy, are socially constructed rather than predetermined (Wendt, 1999, pp. 29-32). The international system is based on evolving norms and rules (Onuf, 1989, pp. 144-145). In a constructivist view, states first establish their identity and goals, and then interact and shape each other based on these identities (Wendt, 2013, pp. 23-25). This interaction creates identity bonds, turning the traditionally uncertain global landscape into one where actors are linked by shared identities.

The emphasis of social constructivism on the identities of states in their foreign relations highlights the importance of the social dimension of security. When states decide who they are, the first thing they refer to is their social and cultural structures. The characteristics of these social and cultural structures have great effects on whether states are democratic or authoritarian in the international system. Just as the system-actor interaction in the international system changes and transforms two phenomena, a similar interaction can be observed in the relations of states with their societies. It is inevitable for the government to be authoritarian in societies where authoritarian political culture understanding is dominant. Because the primary purpose of the government on the political scene is to get the support of society, to make themselves accepted by society and ultimately to be able to stay in power. This is the phenomenon behind the far-right parties that are starting to get stronger today.

Ukraine, which is geographically within the European territory, is also considered to be European in terms of identity. In the social constructivist theory, it is emphasized that states first decide who they are while determining their foreign policies. European states and the European Union have used this approach when determining their policies against mass immigration from Ukraine. First, they decide who they are. It is possible to talk about the existence of a common identity constructed in the historical process between Ukraine and other European countries, which are similar in religion, culture, and politics, and are geographically intertwined. Especially the fact that common threats[6] are felt politically making these identity ties stronger. Because the biggest factor affecting the formation of common identities is the perception of common security and threats. These perceptions begin to form natural bonds with those who struggle with the same thing as us and feel threatened by the same thing.

---

6   It is understandable that European countries, which historically have always felt the Russian threat on their east borders, show empathy and solidarity with Ukraine.

While the European states went so far as to put up fences on the borders during the Arab Spring process, it is noteworthy that they immediately put the temporary protection mechanism into place for the Ukrainian refugees. Ukrainian asylum seekers have the right to stay in the European territory for 3 months without a visa (European Council on Refugees and Exiles 2022). This emergency policy is the first common policy of the European Union on the temporal protection of refugees. It can be understood that the idea of protecting people who are part of our European society played an important role in this decision.

The meaning of The English School's International Society argument for Europe: is Syria not part of society?

In European territory, policies towards refugees from different parts of the world vary. As mentioned above it can be made more meaningful by evaluating it in a theoretical framework. The English school is another important approach that can help to understand European immigration policy from a different perspective. First of all, it will be necessary to mention the main approaches of the English school in international politics.

Three core approaches define international politics: the Hobbesian (realism) which sees global anarchy and war as constants, the Kantian (revolutionary idealism) which believes this anarchy can be reshaped or ended, even suggesting a world government as a solution, and the Grotian (rationalism), a middle ground. The English school, combining these traditions, provides a unique perspective (Devlen & Özdamar 2010, p. 44). Rooted in the Grotian tradition, it acknowledges the anarchic global system but posits that its inherent warfare can be moderated (Wight 1996, p. viii). Within this framework, states can engage in both conflict and cooperation due to interconnected economic and social relations (Bull 1977, p. 26). To Martin Wight, the essence of international politics is the continuous survival struggle among states, and any notions of evolving states or a unified government run counter to this core idea (Kardaş & Balcı 2018, p. 189; Wight 1977, pp. 35-36).

The English school's central contribution to international relations is the concept of "international society." This theory posits that international systems can evolve into societies based on specific norms and values. Buzan highlighted that the primary dynamics of such an international society revolve around their shared values (Buzan 2001, p. 477). Leading figures like Wight and Butterfield further emphasized that shared religious and cultural values are foundational for such a society to form (Hall 2014, pp. 6-7). As an illustrative case study, scholars often refer to the relationship between the Ottoman Empire and European states. Although the Ottomans had

significant interactions with Europe, Wight believed that, due to contrasting religious values, the Muslim Ottoman Empire could not be integrated into the predominantly Christian European society (Devlen & Özdamar 2010, p. 47). However, Hedley Bull perceived Europe as the core of this international society, with the Ottoman Empire forming its periphery, suggesting a more inclusive but hierarchical arrangement (Watson 1987, p. 148). These views from the English school, particularly emphasizing shared cultural and religious values, contrast starkly with Kant's more inclusive ideals. The implications are clear: Europe's deeply ingrained values could shape future political dynamics, potentially placing non-European entities, both states and their citizens, on the margins.

The discriminatory attitude of European states towards Syrians is very illuminating from the perspective of the English school. The biggest reason why the mass migration movement is not wanted in Europe is the fear that the demographic structure of the countries may change permanently. This is maybe the greatest threat felt by most European countries. The threat perception of the intense Arab immigration by the host countries' politicians and their voters caused human tragedy which experienced by immigrants at the borders of Europe in times of war. The attitudes of European states in the examples of Ukraine show that; Borders should be opened to people fleeing wars, and temporary protection mechanisms should be put in place. However, each country will carry out these practices against people who have similarities with their internal dynamics culturally, religiously, politically, or ideologically. It is possible to say that European mentality believes that it is a normal situation that politically and socially different societies are not allowed inside the border. If the war takes place in Europe, the European states will open their borders to the European ones, if the war is in the Middle East, They will not. This situation has become a reality that the English school has structurally placed and built.

Migration Policies of European Union: Securitization, Desecuritization, and Xenophobia

Securitization is a phenomenon that can be seen in every area and at every level of the daily life of the individual and society. It is possible to observe the phenomenon of securitization in the whole of social relations. The securitization approach, which is one of the critical theories of international relations, can be in question not only based on states and societies but even among small units, families, or friend groups. Because securitization has both macro and micro-scale structures. Talking about the chill and destructive power of the sea to a person who is about to go fishing will reveal that person's fear of the sea. Talking about paranormal, mysterious, and creepy stories to a young person living peacefully at home alone will make the peaceful life of that person uneasy. These phenomena, which point to extremely micro and abstract

levels, can be explained by securitization theory. Because security means being safe from any danger (Emancipation). It is not difficult to derive different examples to better understand the dimensions of securitization. People observing a family will find that parents often resort to securitization when raising their children. Parents who warn their children against the dangers of life, indicating which groups of friends are good and which are bad, that nothing should be taken from strangers that animals can bite, that a burning stove can burn people that bad words will be punished, and many similar advices are securitization applied within the framework of family discipline. It is seen that most of the cases mentioned have good sides as well, but parents mostly focus on their harmful aspects. When a mother or a father tells his child what a stove is by saying it is something that can burn people rather than a heater explaining everything.

After explaining with concrete examples how securitization should be understood at the micro level, it will be necessary to mention how it is handled in the critical security approach. The person who introduced the concept of securitization into our lives was Ole Weaver, one of the leading figures of the Copenhagen School (Weaver 1995).

Ole Wæver of the Copenhagen School, alongside Barry Buzan, posits that for securitization, there needs to be specific events seen as threats, a populace that believes in the threat, and political elites to vocalize it. The process begins with a "speech act" where political entities label a situation as a threat (Wæver 1989). This act of labeling by political elites creates security threats via discourse (Buzan, Wæver, & De Wilde, 1998). The School emphasizes the social construction of discourse over actual security threats. However, a speech act alone doesn't achieve securitization; it requires audience acceptance. The rise of far-right parties in Europe exemplifies this, using immigration as a potent topic for securitization, with refugees framed as threats and receptive audiences, like neo-nazists, accepting this narrative.

From the aspect of migration case, the existence of an object that can be shown as a threat is also necessary for securitization to be fully successful. So much so that it may not be a very successful attempt to present a phenomenon that is not disturbed economically, socially, or politically by the whole society as an object of security. So, what is the reason that the authorities brought this issue to their political agenda? Only a few complaints from some sections of society make them the first move. As can be understood from the migration example, for securitization to be fully successful, the existence of an object that can be shown as a threat is also necessary. The main reason why stray dogs are presented as an object of security in Turkey is that they sometimes become aggressive and sometimes lead to fatal consequences. The reason

why the authorities bring this issue to the agenda is the complaints received from some segments of the society. So much so that some people did not hesitate to behave cruelly against stray dogs, which they perceived as a threat to themselves, and committed inhumane behaviors to the extent of crushing the heads of dogs with shovels. The images of an elderly and apparently religious man who killed a dog lying defenselessly in the shade in the scorching heat of the summer in Kızıltepe district of Mardin by hitting it repeatedly with an iron bar, reveal the brutal and chilling consequences of the securitization of stray dogs in Turkey (Milliyet, 2023). The reason for the emphasis on the religious identity of the man in question is a warning against the blinded cruelty and inhumanity that can occur when religion merges with the far right. This is also the reason why xenophobia attributed to Europe is often associated with Islamophobia. This is the result of the combination of religion with the far right. The far-right masses, who are uncomfortable with immigrants, are similar to this. The silence of certain events by the legal authorities causes the wild nature of the human being to be released. When we continue with the example given in Turkey, we see that the same is not true for stray cats. Street cats are protected by the society and society welcome the existence of cats. Therefore, it will not be very successful for decision makers to point out cats as security objects in a possible situation. As it can be understood from here, another important issue required for securitization to come to an end is that the threat element is brought forward by the legal authorities or by people whose decision the society trusts. Governments build securitization based on an existential threat.

The far-right masses, who are uncomfortable with immigrants, are pushing these policies. The apparent inaction of legal and political authorities in response to incidents involving the deliberate destruction of workplaces and residences, as well as armed incursions into places of worship, property damage, assaults, and other forms of violence targeting immigrant communities, has led to a conspicuous portrayal of immigrants through a criminalizing lens within the media. Of particular note is the recent trend where actions undertaken against religious sanctuaries of immigrants are either met with inadequate humanitarian responses or altogether overlooked. This environment inadvertently fosters a milieu conducive to the bolstering of far-right elements.

As it can be understood from here, another important issue required for securitization is that the threat element is brought forward by trusted legal authorities or people who influence society. It can be said that governments, and politics who are on the side of populism build securitization on a built existential threat perception. On the other hand, when the decision-makers give the population what they want, they gain a large political area that is out of account.

Once securitization succeeds, we are faced with the reality that the phenomenon in question is now accepted as a threat by society, and society expects the state to produce a solution to this issue. Convincing the masses of an issue by asserting the existence and survival of the state and waiting for a solution for these masses to eliminate the threat pointed out by the state is in itself a harbinger of another danger. When securitization takes place in this way, society also approves of the government taking extraordinary measures. Now, government officials can justify their actions by basing them on the threat in question and they can carry out any action they wish. From this moment on, no one can question the actions of the government or raise a voice against their grievances. The climate of peace and tranquility that people once lived in has now become a longed-for dream far away. All authority now rests with Leviathan (Hobbes, 2019).

The speech-act approach categorizes policymaking into three levels of severity: non-politicized, politicized, and securitized (Hisarlıoğlu, 2019). While the Copenhagen school posits that securitization starts with a speech act, the Paris school, represented by Didier Bigo, believes it evolves over time via state control mechanisms (Bigo, 2000). As an illustration, border walls can be as influential in the securitization process as a speech act.

There are numerous works on xenophobia in Western Europe in the current literature. A brief summary of these studies is as follows: For decades radical-right and its effects on political parties in Western Europe have been one of the main interests of researchers such as Betz (1993), Kuechler (1994), Trotha (1995), Karapin (1998), Rydgren (2008), Eser and Çiçek (2020). One of the first comprehensive studies was made on four countries (Australia, Germany, Britain, and Sweden) by Hjerm (1998), a specific study on xenophobia in Germany was made by Boehnke et al. (1998), Adam (2014) also studied on German by the focus on asylum seekers and ımmıgratıon policies of Germany from the aspect of xenophobia, Melzer and Serafin (edit.) aboıt right-wing extremism in European counties (2013), a similar study was made by Kende, and Kreko (2020) in which they scrutinize the relationship between xenophobic prejudice and right-wing populism, a study on security and xenophobia in Greece was made by Dalakoglou (2013). There are also studies focused on xenophobic attitudes toward immigrants in both Germany and Poland sample (Taras, 2009). The number of these examples from the current literature can be increased.

Studies examining the relationship between xenophobia and securitization are very limited. (Brunet & Benedicto, 2018; d'Appollonia, 2017; Malmlöf, 2016; Lazaridis &Skleparis, 2015; Ünal-Eriş &Önel, 2021; Porotsky, 2021). Fear and anxiety in society begin with the process of securitization. With the start of the securitization process

mentioned above, the threat phenomenon begins to show itself. Society is warned about an object and the object now becomes a threat. If this object refers to a group, individual, or refugees and immigrants, it will inevitably evolve into xenophobia. Because over time, people begin to hold grudges against those whom they see as a threat. These are people who are unwanted and should be avoided. These individuals and groups are perceived as those who try to harm the indigenous (European) people or (culturally and religiously homogeneous) ingroup and aim to degenerate their culture, disseise their wealth, etc. Now it becomes easy to say that "They are enemies." The fear of heterogeneity, especially in religious identities brings another fear: Islamophobia. This is also a very important point that researchers focus on (For example See Taras, 2012; Helbling, 2008; 2014). In the European Union countries, it can be said that: Islamophobia and xenophobia are mixed phenomena. In fact, in today's world xenophobia has become a phenomenon that is attributed to the West. The fear of the one who is from the outgroup (xenophobia) is expanded to a specific form called Islamophobia can be summarized as fear of a different religious identity or choice. The desecuritization phenomenon, (which is the reverse of the securitization process as mentioned above) becomes difficult to compensate for xenophobia. Xenophobia is a chronic outcome of securitization. Once hatred is instilled in society, it will take several generations to change those feelings and perceptions. As one of the methods of struggling with the immigration wave that started toward Europe with the Arab Spring, the phenomenon of securitization was applied. We should note here as a footnote that the very concept of "struggling with the migration wave" poses a problem in itself. Because the refugees who immigrated from Syria fled the war, the same is true for those who immigrated from Ukraine.

During the Arab Spring, the asylum seekers phenomenon, which was securitized to such an extent that it would cause fear and anxiety in Europe, began to be desecuritized to welcome the Ukrainians with the Russian intervention in Ukraine. It should be noted here that the desecuritized phenomenon is not immigration itself, but asylum seekers. Because this situation is related to where the immigrants come from. The phenomenon of previously securitized migration (specific to Syrians) has not taken a very good place in the memory of European society. With the Russian intervention in Ukraine, the political authorities, who tried to ensure that the Ukrainians were well received, not because they favored the Ukrainians very much, but because they were afraid of the spread of the Russian threat, managed to draw the phenomenon of immigration, which had a bad image in the memory of the European society, to the political arena by desecuritization. This situation will not have the same effect on refugees from the Middle East. So much so that a government that warns its citizens not to drink from a marked fountain and that the fountain is poisonous will

then have a hard time convincing its citizens that the fountain is not poisonous. The situation for Syrians is similar. Once the Syrians are portrayed as a threat socially, economically, and politically, it will make it difficult for the local people to believe that they are not a threat later on. This is the exact reason why xenophobia is the chronic outcome of securitization.

Conclusion

After these explanations, the different attitudes of the European Union towards Syrians and Ukrainians in its migration policies can be analyzed better. From the perspective of the British school and social constructionism, we explained how the Syrians are not European, how this situation is constantly expressed by the Europeans, and what kind of consequences this situation has in the end. The findings of this study reveal that the attitudes of the European Union towards refugees in its migration policies are influenced by a complex set of factors that include security concerns, the construction of a common identity, and historical memories. The research also indicates that these attitudes have evolved into xenophobia and are fed by the current xenophobic phenomenon. The study contributes to the current literature by providing an in-depth analysis of the attitudes of the European Union towards refugees and by highlighting the impact of historical memories on migration policies. The study also emphasizes the importance of adopting a human-rights-based approach to address the challenges posed by the refugee crisis.

The English School's international society argument provides a theoretical explanation for the exclusionary attitudes of the European Union towards refugees. This argument suggests that those who are not Christian may not be considered part of the international society, specifically the European society, thereby reinforcing exclusionary attitudes towards refugees from different religious backgrounds. Social Constructivism's emphasis on the construction of a common identity highlights the role that shared culture and historical memories play in shaping attitudes toward refugees. This aspect was evident in the European Union's support for Ukrainian refugees due to the perceived threat from Russia, as well as the relative lack of support for Syrian refugees due to their different religions and cultural backgrounds.

The securitization of migration has legitimized the restrictive policies of the European Union towards refugees. The concept of securitization has created a political discourse that has framed migration as a security issue, leading to the adoption of measures such as border control and detention that have further reinforced exclusionary attitudes towards refugees.

The results of this study also indicate that the attitudes of the European Union towards refugees have been influenced by Islamophobia and xenophobia. The European Union's restrictive migration policies towards refugees from Muslim-majority countries reflect deep-seated prejudices and fears towards Islam and Muslims. These attitudes have been further reinforced by the rise of xenophobic sentiments across Europe, which have been driven by factors such as economic anxiety, political polarization, and populist far-right movements. The securitization of migration has been closely linked to these attitudes, as the framing of migration as a security issue has often been used to stoke fears of terrorism and extremism among European populations. This has led to the adoption of policies that are more focused on controlling and excluding refugees, rather than addressing their humanitarian needs. Furthermore, the concept of common identity has also played a role in shaping these attitudes toward refugees. The perception of refugees as "others" who do not share the cultural or religious values of Europe has reinforced xenophobic and Islamophobic attitudes among European populations. In light of these findings, it is clear that addressing Islamophobia and xenophobia must be a key component of any efforts to create a more inclusive and human-rights-based approach toward refugees in Europe. It is essential to challenge the deeply ingrained prejudices and fears that have contributed to exclusionary attitudes towards refugees and to work towards creating policies that are based on principles of equality and justice for all, regardless of their religion, culture, or background.

In parallel with social constructivist theory, the European Union's relationship with Ukraine has been influenced by the historical memory of Cold War divisions and the ongoing geopolitical tensions with Russia. As a result, Ukrainian refugees are often perceived as allies or victims of a common adversary, which enhances the EU's sympathy towards them. This shared history and the cultural and religious similarities have eased their integration into European societies, leading to more favorable migration policies towards Ukrainian refugees. The EU's refugee policies reflect an inherent bias towards Christian-majority Ukraine over predominantly Muslim Syria. This suggests an unconscious or perhaps even conscious privileging of Judeo-Christian heritage in the construction of European identity. This bias is detrimental as it overlooks the shared humanity of all refugees, regardless of their religious or cultural background, and contributes to the marginalization of Syrian refugees within Europe.

In the circle of proximity effect, another significant aspect to consider is the role of geopolitical context. The EU's relationship with Russia, especially in the wake of the Ukrainian crisis, has had significant implications on its treatment of Ukrainian

refugees. Ukraine is seen as a country under threat from a shared adversary, thereby justifying the more welcoming approach toward Ukrainian refugees. On the other hand, the Syrian crisis, being a complex web of international involvements and a breeding ground for radical groups, has become associated with the fear of importing extremism. The consequential securitization of Syrian migration leads to a pervasive belief that accepting Syrian refugees carries a potential security risk.

In the securitization part of the research, the dimension of xenophobia has been discussed. Accordingly, the influence of populist and far-right movements in European politics also cannot be ignored. These movements have effectively capitalized on the fear and uncertainties among European citizens, steering public opinion against the influx of Syrian refugees. In contrast, Ukrainian refugees, who are more likely to blend into European societies due to cultural and religious similarities, do not face the same level of societal rejection.

The exclusion or perception of outsiders in European society can profoundly reshape the European landscape, especially when viewed through the English School perspectives on international society. The differing treatments of Syrian and Ukrainian refugees might cause long-term disruptions in the EU's social fabric, intensifying socio-political cleavages. It's pivotal to recognize that true integration for refugees transcends mere acceptance-it involves social inclusion, employment, education, and leading a dignified life. The global community keenly observes the EU's stance on the refugee crisis. If the EU persists in its inconsistent policies, it may inadvertently endorse global discriminatory practices. However, an inclusive approach might establish a worldwide benchmark for refugee rights.

There's a glaring inconsistency in how refugees are treated across EU nations, compromising its unity. Addressing this requires a unified EU strategy based on mutual responsibility. Additionally, tackling the underlying causes forcing people to flee their homes, like crises in Syria and Ukraine, is just as crucial. The EU's biased attitude towards Syrian and Ukrainian refugees challenges its professed values of human rights and equality, calling for a thorough review of its policies. Solutions should target both immediate challenges and deep-rooted issues, underscoring the importance of global collaboration in conflict resolution. The EU's complex stance on refugees underscores the need for a human-rights-centered approach. The study's findings are pivotal for those aiming to refine refugee policies in Europe.

References

Betz, H-G. (1993) The new politics of resentment: Radical Right-Wing populist parties in Western Europe, *Comparative Politics, 25*(4). 413-427.

Bigo, D. (2000). When two become one: Internal and External Securitisations in Europe. in Morten, K. and Michael, W. (Ed.). *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration.* Routledge.

Boehnke, K., Hagan, J. & Hefler, G. (1998). On the development of xenophobia in Germany: The adolescent years. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 585-602. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1998.tb01237.x.

Borkert, M., & Bosswick, W. (2007). Migration Policymaking in Germany – between national reluctance and local pragmatism? *IMISCOE Working Paper*. Working Paper No. 20.

Brekke, J. P., & Staver, A. (2018). The renationalization of migration policies in times of crisis: the case of Norway. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 44*(13), 2163-2181.

Brunet, P., Benedicto, A.R. (2018). Building walls: Fear and securitization in European Union. *Transnational Institute*.

Bull, H. (1977). *The anarchical society: A study of order in world politics*. Macmillan.

Buzan, B. (2001). The English School: an underexploited resource in IR, *Review of International Studies, 27*(3), 71–488.

Buzan, B., Weaver, O., and Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A new framework for analysis*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Ciger, M.I. (2022). Reasons for the Activation of the Temporary Protection Directive in 2022: A Tale of Double Standards: Forum on the EU Temporary Protection Responses to the Ukraine War. ASILE, Global Asylum Governance, and European Union's Role. *Centre for European Policy Studies*.

Cox, R. (1981), "Social forces, states & world orders: Beyond international relations theory. *Millennium Journal of International Studies*, 10(2), 126-154.

Council of the EU. (2018). EU-Turkey statement. Press office - General Secretariat of the Council Rue de la Loi 175 - B-1048 *BRUSSELS*. *Press Release* 144/16 18/03/2016 Available; https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/03/18/eu-turkey-statement/pdf Access: 18 March 2016.

d'Appollonia, A.C. (2017). Xenophobia, racism, and the securitization of immigration. In Bourbeau, P. (Ed). *Handbook on Migration and Security* (pp. 252-272). Social and Political Science.

Dalakoglou, D. (2013). 'From the bottom of the Aegean Sea ' to Golden Dawn: Security, xenophobia, and the politics of hate in Greece. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*: *13*(3), 514-522.

Deley, M. (1983). French immigration policy since May 1981. *International Migration Review*, *17*(2), 196–211.

Devlen, B., Özdamar, Ö. (2010). Uluslararası ilişkilerde *İngiliz Okulu* kuramı: Kökenleri, kavramları ve tartışmaları, *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 7(25).

Eser, H.B., & Çiçek, A. (2020). Avrupa'da aşırı sağın ayak sesleri: Zenofobinin patolojik normalleşmesi, *Alternatif Politika*, 12 (1), 114-144.

European Council on Refugees and Exiles. (2022). Information Sheet – Measures in response to the arrival of displaced people fleeing the war in Ukraine. Retrieved 26 February 2023 from https://ecre.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Information-Sheet-–-Access-to-territory-asylum-procedures-and-reception-conditions-for-Ukrainian-nationals-in-European-countries. pdf.

European Parliament. (2019, November 20). Legislative train Schedule: 1st Emergency Relocation Scheme. In "Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs - LIBE." Rapporteur(s): Ska Keller. Retrieved from https://www.europarl.europa.eu/legislative-train/theme-towards-a-new-policy-on-migration/file-1st-emergency-relocation-scheme

European Parliament. (1999). Migration And Asylum in Central and Eastern Europe. Libe 104 En.February, Retrieved 26 February 2023 from https://www.europarl.europa.eu/workingpapers/libe/104/summary_en.htm.

European Parliament. (2022). Walls and fences at EU borders. EPRS | European Parliamentary Research Service. Retrieved 26 February 2023 from https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2022/733692/EPRS_BRI(2022)733692_EN.pdf.

European Parliament. (2023). The Enlargement of The Union. Fact Sheets on the European Union – 2023. Retrieved 26 February 2023 from https://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_5.5.1.pdf.

European Union. (2020). Schuman Declaration May 1950: 70 Years of Solidarity. Available at: https://european-union.europa.eu/principles-countries-history/history-eu/1945-59/schuman-declaration-may-1950_en Access: 26 February 2023

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2016). Asylum and Migration into the EU in 2015. FRA – European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights Schwarzenbergplatz 11 – 1040 Vienna – Austria. Retrieved 26 February 2023 from https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2016-fundamental-rights-report-2016-focus-0_en.pdf.

Genç, H.D. & Şirin-Öner, N.A. (2019). Why not activated? the temporary protection directive and the mystery of temporary protection in the European Union. *International Journal of Political Science & Urban Studies*. 7(1), 2630-6263.

Guild, E., Costello, C., Garlick, M., & Moreno-Lax, V. (2015). The 2015 Refugee Crisis in the European Union. CEPS Policy Brief No. 332, CEPS.

Hall, I. (2014). Martin Wight, Western values, and the Whig tradition of international thought. *The International History Review*. 36(5), 961-981.

Helbling, M. (2008). "Islamophobia in Switzerland: A New Phenomenon or a New Name for Xenophobia?" Annual Conference of the Midwest Political Science Association (MPSA) Chicago, 3 - 6 April.

Helbling, M. (2014). Opposing Muslims and the Muslim headscarf in Western Europe. *European Sociological Review*, 30(2), https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jct038.

Heribert, A. (2015). Xenophobia, Asylum Seekers, and Immigration Policies in Germany, Nationalism, and Ethnic Politics, 21(4), 446-464, https://doi.org/10.1080/13537113.2015.1095528.

Hjerm, M. (1998). National Identities, National Pride and Xenophobia: A Comparison of Four Western Countries, Acta Sociological, 41: 335, pp.335-347, https://doi.org/10.1177/000169939804100403

Hisarlıoğlu , F. (2019). Güvenlikleştirme. *Güvenlik Yazıları Serisi*, 24.

Hobbes, T. (2019), *Leviathan* (Semih Lim, Çev.). Yapıkredi Yayınları.

International Rescue Committee. (2022, March 18). A Europe that protects: What is the EU-Turkey deal? https://www.rescue.org/eu/article/what-eu-turkeydeal?gclid=CjwKCAjw8symBhAqEiwAaTA__BO-glxl_uBEmogdVfxiLnpO1tEnSkZMIvfZ1zrVhrIi9Fw_BY-2xoCP3sQAvD_BwE

Karapin, R. (1998). Radical-right and neo-fascist political parties in Western Europe. *Comparative Politics* 30(2), 213-34.

Kardaş, Ş. & Balcı, A., (ed.). (2018). *Uluslararası İlişkilere Giriş*. Küre Yayınları.

Kende, A., & Kreko, P. (2020). Xenophobia, prejudice, and right-wing populism in East-Central Europe, *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 34, 29-33.

Kuechler, M. (1994). Germans and 'Others': Racism, xenophobia, or 'Legitimate Conservatism', *German Politics*, 3(1), 47-74, https://doi.org/10.1080/09644009408404347.

Lavenex, S. (2016). Multilevelling EU external governance: the role of international organizations in the diffusion of EU migration policies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 42*(4), 554-570.

Lazaridis, G. & Skleparis, D. (2015). Securitization of migration and the far right: The case of Greek security professionals. *International Migration*. 54(2), 176-192.

Luedtke, A. (2011). Uncovering European Union Immigration Legislation: Policy Dynamics and Outcomes. International Migration, 49(2), 1-27.

MalMlöf, V.H. (2016). Fear: A risk that must be taken into account: The securitization of asylum seekers and refugees in Sweden, (Master's Thesis, Faculty of Theology, Uppsala University).

Manners, I. (2002). *Normative power Europe*: *A contradictions in terms*. Blackwell Publisher.

Médecins Sans Frontières. (2016). Obstacle Course to Europe: A Policy-Made Humanitarian Crisis at EU Borders, retrieved from; https://reliefweb.int/report/world/obstacle-course-europe-policy-made-humanitarian-crisis-eu-borders-december-2015.

Melzer, R. and Serafin, S (Eds.). (2013). *Right-wing extremism in Europe, country analyses, counter-strategies, and labor-market oriented exit strategies*. Friedrich Ebert Foundation.

Meriam-Webster. (26 February 2023). Xenophobia, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/xenophobia (Access Date: 26.02.2023).

Milliyet. (2023, August 18). Mardin'de vahşet! Yavru köpeği demir çubukla öldürdü. Milliyet. https://www.milliyet.com.tr/milliyet-tv/mardinde-vahset-yavru-kopegi-demir-cubukla-oldurdu-video-6992848

Molenaar, F., et al. (2017). A Line in the Sand: Roadmap for Sustainable Migration Management in Agadez. *Clingendael - Netherlands Institute of International Relations*.

Mudde, C. (2007). *Populist radical right parties in Europe*. Cambridge University Press.

Mudde, C. (2019). *The far right today*. Polity Press.

O'Grady, S. (31 October 2018). Remember the Camerawoman Who Kicked Refugees? She Was Just Acquitted. The Washington Post. Retrieved 26 February 2023 from https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2018/10/31/remember-camerawoman-who-kicked-refugees-she-was-just-acquitted/

Onuf, N. (1989). *World of Our Making: Rules and rule in social theory and international relations*. University of South Carolina Press.

Polat, C. (2006). The immigration policy and process of European integration: Supranationalism versus intergovernmentalism? *Ankara Review of European Studies, 6*(1), 69-80.

Porotsky, S. (2021). Rotten to the core: Racism, xenophobia, and the border and immigration agencies. *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal 36*(349).

Rydgren, J. (2008) Immigration sceptics, xenophobes or racists? Radical right-wing voting in six West European countries. *European Journal of Political Research* 47, 737–765, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2008.00784.x

Qadir Mushtaq, A., & Afzal, M. (2017). Arab Spring: Its causes and consequences, *JPUHS*, 30(1), 1-10.

Taras, R. (2012). *Xenophobia and Islamophobia in Europe*, Edinburgh University Press.

Taras, R. (2009). Transnational xenophobia in Europe? Literary representations of contemporary fears, *The European Legacy*, 14(4,) 391-407, https://doi.org/10.1080/10848770902999492.

Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics*. Cambridge University Press.

The UN Refugee Agency. (2023). Operational data portal: Ukraine refugee situation. Refugees from Ukraine recorded across Europe. Retrieved 26 February 2023 from https://data.unhcr.org/en/situations/ukraine

The Peace of Westphalia. (24 October, 1648). Retrieved from https://pages.uoregon.edu/dluebke/301ModernEurope/Treaty%20of%20Westphalia%20%5BExcerpts%5D.pdf

Trotha, T. V. (1995). Political culture, xenophobia and the development of the violence of the radical right in the federal republic of Germany. *Crime, Law & Social Change*, 24, 37-47.

Uybadın, A. (2015). Acıyı kayıt altına almak. Aylan Kurdi örneği. *Marmara* İletişim *Dergisi*.

Ünal-Eriş, Ö., & Öner, S. (2021). Securitization of migration and the rising influence of populist radical right parties in European politics. *Ankara Avrupa* Çalışmaları *Dergisi*, 20(1), 161-193.

Watson, A. (1987). Hedley Bull, states systems and international societies. *Review of International Studies*, 13, 147-153.

Weaver, O. (1995). Securitization and Desecuritization. In R. D. Lipschutz (Ed.), *On Security* (pp. 46-87). Columbia University Press.

Weaver, O. (1989). Security, the speech act analyzing the politics of the word. *Paper presented at the research training seminar, Sostrup Manor.* Center for Peace and Conflict Study.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics.* Cambridge University Press.

Wight, M. (1996). *International theory: The three traditions,* edite Leicester University Press for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1994 d by Gabriele Wight and Brian Porter.,

Wight, M. (1977). Sy*stem of the state*. Leicester Press University.

Yakushko, O. (2009). Xenophobia: Understanding the roots and consequences of negative attitudes toward immigrants. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37(1), 36–66. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000008316034.

Zaun, N. (2018). *EU asylum policies: The power of strong regulating states.* Palgrave Macmillan.