



Bio-Political Implementations of Western States and The Refugees as A Modern Concern *

Batı Devletlerinin Biyo-Politik Uygulamaları ve Modern Bir Mesele Olarak Mülteciler

ABSTRACT

Migration has always existed in human history, yet the impact has never been in such a large scale as it is in the 21st century. The refugee crisis is in fact a matter of modern state of modern time. The extremely increasing number of refugees has begun influencing the trajectory of international politics gaining a global scale. While many countries in the West are affected by the refugee flows originating from the Middle East, those countries that are adjacent or easy to reach are affected most. Most of the European states have contemplated on various policies to cope with the crisis intending to keep the possible harm at the minimum level fundamentally for themselves. Their policies and implementations are basically related to securing the order, preserving or improving the economic and social structure within the state, and mitigating the crisis with minimum cost and maximum benefit. That is what Michel Foucault calls as bio-politics of population. This study mainly focuses on the biopolitical approach of asylum-granting states towards the refugees. It firstly explicates Michel Foucault's disciplinary mechanisms and theory of biopolitics, which helps trace the foundations of modern governance while it helps also analyze and understand the motivations of host states in employing their policies. The second part on the other hand elaborates on the border policies, practices and strategies of host countries from economic, political and social perspectives; additionally, it aims to explore the causes for the fear of Other and the impacts of that fear on the refugees by offering examples mainly from camps, and by relating the discussions to biopolitics.

Keywords: Refugee crisis, Bio-politics, discipline society, fear of the Other, Camps.¹

ÖZET

İnsanlık tarihinde göç her zaman var olmuştur ancak etkisi hiçbir zaman 21. yüzyılda olduğu kadar büyük çapta olmamıştır. Mülteci krizi aslında modern zamanların modern meselesidir. Mültecilerin sayısının artması, küresel boyut kazanan uluslararası politikanın gidişatını da etkilemeye başlamıştır. Ortadoğu kaynaklı mülteci akınından Batı'daki pek çok ülke etkilenirken, en çok komşu veya ulaşılabilecek kolay ülkeler etkileniyor. Avrupa devletlerinin çoğu, temelde kendilerine gelebilecek zararı minimum düzeyde tutmak amacıyla, krizle baş etmek için çeşitli politikalar tasarlamışlardır. Politikaları ve uygulamaları temel olarak düzenin sağlanması, devlet içindeki ekonomik ve sosyal yapının korunması veya iyileştirilmesi, krizin minimum maliyet ve maksimum fayda ile hafifletilmesine yöneliktir. Michel Foucault'nun nüfusun biyo-politikası dediği şey budur. Bu çalışma esas olarak sığınma hakkı veren devletlerin mültecilere yönelik biyopolitik yaklaşımına odaklanmaktadır. Bu çalışma, öncelikle Michel Foucault'nun disiplin mekanizmalarını ve biyopolitika teorisini açıklıyor; bu, modern yönetişimin temellerinin izini sürmeye yardımcı olurken aynı zamanda ev sahibi devletlerin politikalarını uygulamadaki motivasyonlarını analiz etmeye ve anlamaya da yardımcı oluyor. İkinci bölümde ise ev sahibi ülkelerin sınır politikaları, uygulamaları ve stratejileri ekonomik, politik ve sosyal açılardan ele alınıyor; ayrıca Öteki korkusunun nedenlerini ve bu korkunun mülteciler üzerindeki etkilerini, ağırlıklı olarak kamplardan örnekler sunarak ve tartışmaları biyopolitikayla ilişkilendirerek araştırmayı amaçlamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mülteci krizi, Biyo-politika, Disiplin toplumu, Öteki korkusu, Kamplar.

INTRODUCTION

Given that migration and forced displacement have always been a matter occupying the history of humanity, the massive migration proliferating, especially in the 21st century due to civil wars and inter-state conflicts brought the issue of security to the foreground more than ever. The augmenting influx of migrants and refugees has affected international relations and world politics while the issue, gaining a global scale, has extremely occupied the agendas of states, media and scholars from different fields. The debates mostly constitute the policies and perspectives about security dilemma: the individual security of refugees or the state security of host countries. Considering that each perspective requires a thorough and in-depth analysis, this study will exclusively deal with the security-related measures and policies of host governments (particularly in Europe). Due to their relative

Asila Ertekin¹

How to Cite This Article

Ertekin, A. (2024). "Bio-Political Implementations of Western States and The Refugees as A Modern Concern" International Social Sciences Studies Journal, (e-ISSN:2587-1587) Vol:10, Issue:7; pp:1148-1156. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12820505>

Arrival: 05 April 2024
Published: 27 July 2024

Social Sciences Studies Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

* Bu çalışma doktora tezinden üretilmiştir.

¹ Ress. Assist. PhD Student, Dokuz Eylül University, Department of American Culture and Literature, İzmir, Türkiye. ORCID: 0009-0001-7371-1415

proximity compared to more distant destinations like the United States and Canada, European nations are profoundly influenced by the refugee flows originating from the Middle East. Therefore, it is no surprise that those governments have articulated various statements emphasizing the importance of their internal security and have accordingly established border and refugee policies. Moreover, the media prominently gives place for news and posts exacerbating the atmosphere of 'insecurity.' Unsurprisingly, this pervasive narrative has significantly affected the public perception and policy discourse about all kinds of migrants and refugees in Western countries. So, this study aims to examine the border policies adopted and implemented by host governments to preclude the arrival of asylum seekers by analyzing the security discourse and mechanisms. Additionally, it will elaborate on the public opinion about refugees as the Other by referring to mixophobia and the citizens' feeling of ontological insecurity. In order to be able to thoroughly understand and analyze the motivation behind the public fear and the policies of security embraced by the governments, it is essential to consult Michel Foucault's theory of bio-politics and discipline society whose starting point he addresses as the 18th century vagabondage and mercantilism that necessitated the development of new mechanisms and strategies of security and power contributing to the contemporary understanding of governance in the Western world.

FOUCAULDIAN BIO-POLITICS

Even though the concept of security has always been one of the most critical elements of governance, Foucault, scrutinizing security in relation to power, elucidates how the concept has transformed from being a mere protection of territory and sovereign to a protection and management of population starting from the 17th century. According to Foucault, that transformation was mainly triggered by the rise of the mercantile economy while such historical incidents as leprosy, plague, vagabondage and the Great Confinement contributed to this transformation resulting in a new form of power: bio-power/bio-politics. Bio-politics designates the major form of contemporary governance that mainly indicates "the administration of bodies and the calculated management of life" and population (Foucault, 1978: 140). While delineating the process of evolution, Foucault divides the periods into three as the archaic, modern and contemporary which successively correspond to juridico-legal mechanisms, disciplinary mechanisms and lastly, mechanisms of security, denoting that neither of them replaces the preceding one but comprises a complicated and correlative form of power relations. The ancient notion of *patria potestas* that provided the basis for the sovereign power over life in juridico-legal system gave way to disciplinary power. It should be stressed straightaway that although the former also carries a corrective and disciplinary objective like the latter, they are distinguished from each other in terms of their targets and penal systems. Whereas the disciplinary power utilizing penitentiary techniques aims the correction and the rehabilitation of *individual* through disciplining body and soul, the archaic penal code, on the other hand, aims to prevent the relapse of the crime in the territory through public torture and execution instead of the correction of the culprit. To Foucault, the major reason for such a shift is the rising of the mercantile economy that rendered additional labour force necessary at the time (Foucault, 1975: 25). With mercantilism, the focus shifted from the destruction to the economical usage of the body; that is, "the body and its forces, their utility and their docility, their distribution and their submission" (Foucault, 1975: 25). The primary objective of disciplinary mechanism is then to create productive and docile individuals by subjugating them and transforming them into an object of knowledge and politics. The real concern is to make the individual live in accordance with the social order, to integrate him/her into the system by optimizing his/her capabilities, and to make him/her internalize the norms thanks to the institutions like prisons and schools thanks to the continuous control, surveillance and obligations so that the system achieves to generate a self-controlling and self-disciplining individual who becomes both productive and useful.

18th century vagabondage was one of the most significant phenomena that triggered the development of disciplinary power and security *dispositifs* in the long run. Vagabondage was the symbol of two main issues: firstly 'dangerousness' and 'control', and secondly 'laziness' and 'productivity'. Vagabondage was associated with "the shift from a criminality of blood to a criminality of fraud . . . resulting in stricter methods of surveillance, a tighter partitioning of the population, more efficient techniques of locating and obtaining information" (Foucault, 1975: 77). Thus, it became a matter of police and the vagabonds were seen as threat to the social order and a source of disorder and chaos, needing control and regulation through laws and institutions within the body of disciplinary system. As the vagabond was marginalized, falling outside the norm and categorized neither as a producer nor a consumer in the mercantile society, s/he was either confined with the idle, unemployed and demented, or punished. The state was not late to produce solutions and justifications to render them useful and productive. Accordingly, the evil acts of vagabonds were taught to have originated from their laziness, for this reason, making the offender work and produce was believed to keep the mind busy and purify the soul from such hazardous tendencies towards crimes (Foucault, 1975: 106). It is in this way that a new kind of institution emerged: the houses of confinement or labour houses where the useless and the dangerous are put to work and produce for the good of society. The

successful integration of such marginalized people into the system through rehabilitative and punitive practices even today falls under the profession of disciplinary mechanisms.

There seems little doubt that it is also vital to elaborate on the influence of both leprosy and plague in order to better understand how the seeds of contemporary discipline society were sminated. Even though the two are distinctive cases, they are not incompatible with each other in that they constitute a complementary structure contributing differently to the emergence of the disciplinary system. Michel Foucault epitomizes the influence of these two phenomena upon analyzing the change in the exercise of power and outlining its strategies and technologies. Leprosy which vanished at the end of the Middle Ages, comes to stand for the exclusion of the leper and the demarcation of a pure community marked with an illness and fixed in a place where there is no attempt to differentiate. The response to leprosy can be regarded as a practice of rejection and a sharp binary division between lepers and non-lepers while the formula to manage the phenomenon was to cut off all human contact with the leper and to prevent the dangerous mixtures. As for the plague, it differs from leprosy regarding the instruments and techniques utilized in the management of the crisis. The plague-stricken people were not completely excluded but kept in quarantine, which means that a method of meticulous partitioning grid and control of the space and relations was applied. Whereas the leper was in “exile”, the plague-stricken people were in “arrest” (Foucault, 1975: 198). The techniques of plague then propound the control and the management of the excluded. “Generally speaking, all the authorities exercising individual control function according to a double mode; that of binary division and branding (mad/sane; dangerous/harmless; normal/abnormal); and that of coercive assignment, of differential distribution” (Foucault, 1975: 109). Indeed, the disciplinary project aims to analyze, control and alter the excluded and marked at the individual level. The response to plague, in this sense, underpins the contemporary form of prison and disciplinary mechanisms, for it involves in confinement, hierarchical observation, surveillance, recording & reporting info, segmentation and individualization. Such a strategy of interference brought about the emanation of microphysics of power, which means that power permeated into the slightest parts of life and relations proving that the sovereign is entitled to interfere even in the private space when necessary. Consequently, such a permeation makes the individual a “property of society, the object of a collective and useful appropriation” (Foucault, 1975: 109). It is far too apparent that the system of disciplinary mechanisms mainly derived from the procedure carried out during plague underlies the general form of contemporary discipline society and consolidates the bio-political governance thanks to its complementary elements that enable and produce the individual in a sense.

The way to exercise power has evolved from sovereign power finally into bio-power, which Foucault defines as “power that exerts a positive influence on life, that endeavors to administer, optimize and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulations” (Foucault, 1978: 137). In other words, “the ancient right to take life or let live was replaced by a power to foster life or disallow it to the point of death” (Foucault, 1978: 138). This is not to say that bio-power or bio-politics overthrows juridico-legal and disciplinary systems all together but rather that it is “a way of making the old armatures of law and discipline function in addition to the specific mechanisms of security” (Foucault, 2007: 10). Bio-power or the apparatus of security offers a more complicated structure and operation of power by getting the instruments of both the disciplinary system and juridico-legal code work in its own system. Moreover, what is at stake here is that bio-power additionally deploys new tactics, technologies, strategies and formulations in addition to the existing mechanisms of governance. Yet, the three mechanisms differ from each other in terms of their focus. The legal form or the sovereign power aims to eliminate any danger to the existence of sovereign, and to protect the territory even when it is unpopulated. The disciplinary power focuses on “the body as a machine: the optimization of its capabilities, the extortion of its forces, the parallel increase of its usefulness and its docility, its integration into systems of efficient and economic controls” (Foucault, 1978: 139). He characterizes that form of power as the “*anatomo-politics of the human body*” (ibid. 139, italics original). Bio-power, on the other side, centers on the fact that human beings are a species and mainly deals with the biological processes of human body and the conditions that may affect them. “Their supervision was effected through an entire series of interventions and *regulatory controls: a bio-politics of the population*” (ibid. 139, italics original). Bio-power then substantially concentrates on a whole population and the conditions and the materiality surrounding it. What is more, the security works on a number of material givens and operates within a given space in contrast to the operation that the disciplinary mechanisms carry out. The primary purpose is to organize the circulation, “maximizing the positive elements, for which one provides the best possible circulation, and of minimizing what is risky and inconvenient, like theft and disease, while knowing that they will never be completely suppressed” (Foucault, 2007: 19). As in case of smallpox and scarcity in the 18th century, the attempts were to nullify the cases gradually. Foucault shows in his analysis of smallpox that the apparatus, unlike the discipline in the case of leprosy, does not separate people as the sick or the healthy but rather deals with them as a whole, that is, as a population. In that respect, population as a notion comes to stand for a new political personage in the sense that

it diverges from the territory and becomes an area of politics on which power is exercised via new strategies and techniques within a new form of governance.

In *Society Must Be Defended*, Foucault asserts, “The role of the modern state is to manage life, to ensure the health and productivity of the population” (241). At the core lies the security of population, the welfare of the social body as a whole. Any risk, any danger or any threat to the productivity, well-being and security of population is calculated, checked and regulated through the mechanisms of bio-power, and finally nullified. Herein, gathering such information as the rate of morbidity, mortality and births, the number of people affected or infected by the case and their age, the level of health, etc., become substantially vital in nullifying the phenomenon in question. At this juncture, statistics as the new instrument and the calculation of possibilities play a fundamental role in that they serve as preventive components of the security *dispositifs* and enable the state to manage the crisis with the minimum cost and effort. It will be in place to remind the well-known phrase, “knowledge is power”. In the biopolitical power system, the norm, knowledge, regulation, surveillance, control and intervention intertwine. It is where the norm gains importance. Accordingly, those who are abnormal, thus useless or dangerous are excluded from society or confined. Through the correlation of knowledge and power, the state knows whom “to make live or let die”.

THE BIO-POLITICAL STANCE OF HOST STATES REGARDING THE REFUGEE CRISIS

The exacerbating refugee flows, in one way or another, influence almost each state in the world, making them contemplate on the issue and envisage effective strategies to deploy so that they can minimize the harm that may come from the outsiders and maximize and protect the wellbeing of their society. Herein, it will be appropriate to elaborate on two main forces shaping the base for the refugee policies of the host states. The first is the urge to maintain and fortify the capabilities of the state in terms of productivity and docility. A system that produces productive, conforming and docile individuals indeed is the precondition for the running of neo-liberal economy. The improvement of capitalism rests on “the controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and the adjustment of the phenomena of population to economic population”; that is to say, bio-politics and capitalism go hand in hand (Foucault, 1978: 141). From that perspective, the states expect to include individuals who are liable to be disciplined, subjugated and normalized within their body. The discipline determines the norm and intends to position every individual according to that norm finally marking them as normal or abnormal. The abnormal, who are seen as useless and as surplus, are either excluded or confined in order to secure the order and the capitalist system. Currently, almost all the refugees are positioned outside the norm, taught as posing threat to the welfare of the host state and the way of life. Most of the states are unwilling to accept asylum seekers due to the fact that they assume the refugees do not fit within the norms they have generated so far. For this reason, the application processes of most refugees are protracted and stay/kept unresolved as the states are most likely to analyze the profile of the applicant carefully if not to intend to dissuade him/her. Alexander Betts argues that the establishment of refugee regime relies on the emergence of the modern state system (2014: 63). As expected, the responses of host countries to people who are on the move are more radical today than it was in the pre-modern era because the number of refugees or migrants was notably manageable and controllable at that time. They were not seen as a threat for the allocation of local resources and social services, or as a cause for competition in labor market; on the contrary, the states used to celebrate their arrival due to their contributions thanks to their professions and the money they bring with. Currently, the refugees are so much more that the states perceive them as a burden and an irregular crowd that is difficult to control and incorporate into their society both economically and socially.

It is commonly believed that repatriation appears as the best solution to mitigate the current refugee crisis (Gibney, 2014: 56). Because the prolonged procedures and the difficulty in integrating the refugees into the societal structures with minimum cost and maximum security create precarious scenarios not only for the refugees but also for the host countries. In this vein, the asylum-granting states look out for their own interests as the bio-politics suggests and they choose to insert the elements into their constitution, which only serve to preserve or improve their existing order. It is quite expectable that most of the Western countries accede to grant asylum mostly to refugees who possess university degrees and professional qualifications in fields such as engineering, healthcare and education. As noted by the International Labor Organization (ILO), “A survey of Syrian refugees resettled in Germany found that over 50% had completed secondary education, and around 30% held university degrees” (ILO, 2019: 27). In a report, Brookings Institution gives the examples of Germany and Canada where the refugees with no formal education are employed at lower rates compared with the educated (Brookings, 2018: 35). In parallel with this, the UNCHR report displays that the uneducated individuals are more disadvantageous in finding jobs while this makes them depend on the social aid programs (UNCHR, 2001: 54). That is not to say that those refugees with high levels of education and qualification can readily take place in the labor market; in fact, they face

various challenges and obstacles because of factors like language and re-certification barriers. In the same way, Morrice approves that the similar situation applies to the well-educated refugees in the U.K. as well (308) Still, refugees with educational and professional advantages are more likely to be recruited in jobs that suit their professions rather than working well below their qualifications (Brookings, 2018: 19). Despite the fact that there is a disproportion between the qualifications of refugees and the quality of jobs that they get, one should concentrate on the primary objective during the processes of acceptance. Rajesh Kumar points out that the factor of high-level education makes the applicant refugees more desirable and increases the possibility of their acceptance in the end (2021: 145).

From the perspective of host states, the underlying idea to prefer refugees with such profiles indicated above is that they have the potential to abide by the necessities of being a member of discipline society; a potential for docility and productivity that is preemptive for the capitalist economy. John Smith affirms that the asylum-granting states embrace a biopolitical approach in the selective processes and prioritize the applications that may optimize and enrich both the economic and social life (2020: 34). Moreover, even though these strangers were subjected to disciplinary system and institutions in different societies, their institutional background proves their liability to develop self-controlling mechanisms and to internalize the norms of society of which they become a part. Both the adaptation skills and the contribution to the economic growth underpin the refugee asylum policies while these factors are extremely associated with educational and professional background. Such individuals are more likely to integrate into society in many terms and they will possibly be less dependent less on refugee social assistance. Self-sufficient individuals not only enhance the economy but also reduce the cost in the long run for the host states, which is witnessed especially in the protracted refugee situations. As the process of application is prolonged, the expenses increase since all the spaces that are populated with the refugees like the detention centers, refugee camps, and self-settlements in the local area, require forces and mechanisms of arrangements and security. In addition to the economic concerns, security is the foremost focus of the host countries since securitization is an umbrella term comprising all the elements of a population from economy, social order, and mental health to integrity. For this reason, modern states come to deploy bio-political strategies and policies, while Western states are those that invest most in the issue.

As Foucault puts forward in *Security, Territory, Population*, states develop mechanisms to manage populations and secure territories “so as to optimize a state of life” while this optimization involves classifying and controlling groups deemed as “risky” (2007: 11). Emma Haddad in relation to this, points out that

If questions of membership, territory and legitimacy become security issues, persons will accordingly be given ‘insider’ or ‘outsider’ status. Each individual will either add to the internal security of the community or threaten its cohesion by not belonging. An organised political entity is ‘internally peaceful, territorially enclosed and impenetrable to aliens’, preserving its identity in the face of threats from those who may want to destroy it. (2008: 49)

In order to protect the entity that Haddad speaks of, Western states erect impassable walls that keep “the werewolf” outside their lands. Strangely enough, “[t]he refugee is included while being excluded and excluded while being included” just like the leper or the plague-stricken people in history (Diken, 2004: 84). Foucault indicates that the meaning and the values that were associated with the leper as a symbolic figure persisted for centuries in different guises (1988: 6). Contemporary refugees today take the leper’s place that was also occupied once by the vagabonds, the demented, the criminals and the idle in a similar way. They were seen as the figures who pester society with chaos and idleness, while the leprosy and the plague were correlated with the contagiousness; contagiousness of not only the sickness but also the meaning attached to it. The underlying themes of “dangerousness” and “control” that were attributed to them remain consistent, demonstrating a continuity in how marginalized groups are perceived, managed and regulated. Likewise, refugees are often viewed through the lens of suspicion and such a perception results in a tendency to exclude and supervise. The techniques employed during the plague are today repeated in refugee camps and detention centers in the same way. They are surrounded by fences, put under surveillance by the guards, and inspected through the checkpoints, which are the basic devices of disciplinary system. However, the employment of these mechanisms does not aim to correct, rehabilitate or integrate as it is supposed to be for the citizens of the host country. The very reason for building refugee camps in the first place is then to keep the refugees away from the center and the local people so that they will be prevented from penetrating into the local area and from occupying the social services and resources. In that way, the states expect to keep the movements of refugees under control and to eliminate the harm that may come from the unknown.

Through knowledge, one can control, regulate and intervene. What is unknown is formidable. In that sense, what the Western world is scared of is the possible corruption of their local and cultural order with regard to the arrival

of newcomers about whom they know little. Vamık D. Volkan, relevant to this, stresses the reactions of nation-states to globalization, and technological advancements that have accelerated and facilitated the process of globalization, particularly with the beginning of the 20th century. He also addresses the neo-racism and xenophobia in Germany beginning with the arrival of guest laborers from countries like Greece, Turkey, and Tunisia in the 1950s and 60s; following with 235.000 refugees from Yugoslavia in 1992. He adds such perception of the Other was also the case in different parts of Europe at that time, and notes the discrimination, violence and animosity against outsiders. The massive migration flow has ineluctably reinforced that fear (2019: 16-19). Bauman asserts that such fear has almost caused a “moral panic” which can be explained as the fear towards a group of people who are suspected to threaten the well-being and the social order of society (9). Additionally, the citizens of the host countries also have economic anxieties besides the social and cultural in that they think refugees come and steal their jobs while their states also share again economic concerns in terms of the distribution of resources.

Anthony Giddens’ conceptualization of ontological security may help us analyze the fear that pervades the local citizens of host countries. Giddens defines the terms as a sense of continuity in events and self-identity, and consistency with the social and physical environment (1991: 243). “Obsessive exaggeration of risks to personal existence, extreme introspection and moral vacuity” can be regarded as the main characteristics of ontologically insecure individuals (Possamai-Inesedy, 2002: 27) while feeling ontologically secure is only possible when the relationships with important others are routinized (Mitzen, 2006: 341).² The significant point here is that the individual feels ontologically secure when knowing which dangers and risks to confront and which to ignore, how to react and how to act. So, strangers are fearsomely unpredictable and in the first place *strange* from the perspective of local people in Western countries. Because of that, Bauman says, there comes out contradictory impulses of “mixhopilia” and “mixophobia”; that is, the attraction towards the different and unexplored experiences, and the fear of the unknown and the uncontrollable (Bauman 12). Likewise, Henrietta Moore denotes that “individuals interviewed in Australia were generally enthusiastic about differences and engagements with others . . . but these positive elements were accompanied equally by discourses of fear and anxiety, worries about global homogeneity and suspicion of others” (2013: 99). Even though people celebrate the differences, they fear the newcomers will not be able to fit in their life and adopt the customs and the norms.

That fear of the Other, in this scenario the refugees, manifests itself in various forms in media, politics, art and daily life. Media overflows with the news of massive migration of refugees exacerbating the fear and anxieties on the side of host countries. The most influential ones are suggesting the association of refugees with terrorism and the assumptions that each is potential terrorist. As many can remember, Alan Kurdi, at the age of three, has become the face of the tragedy of all faceless refugees after he drowned in the Mediterranean Sea. That incident has led several Western states to confront what they turned their faces and listen to their conscience. They announced to accept more refugees in their countries. However, two months later, 2015 Paris terrorist attacks have reversed the situation, even becoming a catalyst for employing strict border policies. Uçarer summarizes the general frame of the policies by asserting that we are at the point of a “shift from the protection of asylum seekers to protection from them” (qtd. in Newman, 2003: 7). One of the most radical leaders, the Prime Minister of Hungary, Victor Orbán proclaimed his anti-refugee stance saying that “[a]ll terrorists are migrants” (qtd. in Bauman 23). Again, it is Hungarian government who erected walls to protect his backyard by building wire fences so that the aliens could not get in. Indeed, that is a strategy of security that they employed via new technologies of bio-politics in order to preclude the arrival of asylum seekers or to deter them even from coming to their gates. It is no surprise that right-wing parties have begun to gain power, especially after 2015, as many voters agreed on the idea that refugees do not belong to their world. To illustrate, the far-right party leader, Geert Wilders came out on top in the Dutch parliamentary elections. The Islamophobic party had promised to ban mosques and made a call for a freeze on asylum and a more restrictive immigration policy (Armstrong, 2023: n. pag.). Another example is from Dover, United Kingdom. Local people there demanded from the authorities to limit the number of refugees to be accepted in their country declaring that they are posing a threat to the existing structure and fabric of society and the way of life. In Germany, two graffiti artists, Oğuz Şen and Justus Becker, drew Alan Kurdi’s picture on a wall so that it could raise awareness among the local people. However, that picture of Alan displaying his body on the shore is spoiled by far-right radicals and they left a note on the picture saying that “borders save lives”. When the entrance of asylum seekers from the borders cannot be hindered, meta borders are drawn inside the countries and the urban planning is prepared accordingly. That is why the refugee camps are almost always outside the city, bearing the liminal space for refugees who are neither inside nor outside. To use Sennett’s striking phrase, refugee camps or detention centers serve as “urban condom”, which protects the local people from all kinds of threats that could be

² Here, I would like to clarify a point about refugees; it is a definite thing that refugees face challenges throughout -even before- their journey that render them ontologically more insecure since their whole environment change and the actors they attach are considerably lost. Nevertheless, this study concentrates basically on the people who dwell in the host countries.

posed by the newcomers (1994: 228). The detention centers in Nauru and Christmas Islands, and the Woomera refugee camp in Australia can be examples of non-places and a zone of indistinction between inclusion and exclusion.

It is possible to observe how the biopolitical methods of Western states affect the refugees and how the motto “make live or let die” works to enable the local citizens and disable the refugees on the move. Abandoned by their state and deprived of legal status and recognition, asylum seekers appeal to Article 14.1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: the right to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution. Nevertheless, the host countries do not lean towards asylum seekers’ penetrating their borders. They turn their faces from the refugees by employing strict border policies and lay them aside by watching them suffer to death in many cases. Because of legal restrictions and regulations, the expensive and lengthy process of legal applications and the need to reach a secure sense of self leads refugees to apply for illegal ways to pass the borders. At that point, smuggling becomes a crucial factor that poses insecure conditions for both refugees and the host countries. Smugglers indeed make use of refugees and other migrants economically and in other ways. The fees the smugglers charge migrants/asylum seekers make them vulnerable in that the economically desperate people are exposed to such conditions as exploitation, unhealthy conditions and hunger. The fees may be strikingly costly according to the person’s profile even though the routes or means to the negotiated destination may not promise a safe and comfortable journey. Moreover, smuggled refugees are also vulnerable to a range of other forms of crime. Some of the frequently reported ones experienced by smuggled migrants include violence, rape, theft, kidnapping, extortion and trafficking in persons (UNODC, 2018: 9). According to the data obtained from the International Organization for Migration, 58 % of the deaths were caused by drowning in sea routes, 19% were due to illness and difficult conditions (UNODC, 2018: 9). The number of people who died during their journey to cross the borders is estimated over 28.000 in Mediterranean, over 14.000 in Africa, over 8.000 in Americas, and over 5.000 in Asia since 2014.³ Even though those people can manage to reach the door of a host state, their struggle does not end there due to the bio-political mechanisms that secure her people and the necro-political stance against refugees that somehow helps them die, as elaborated before.

The camps and detention centers are the responses of states to the refugee problem although self-sufficient refugees who are legally recognized are allowed to settle outside the camps. Even though minimum treatment conditions are enumerated in the 1951 Convention, the refugees are exposed to several inhumane and illegal treatments in the camps. Denial of the rights such as freedom of movement and searching for employment possibilities consolidate refugees’ vulnerability as they most of the time depend on the diminishing international assistance. Limiting access to the local area and the opportunities of getting jobs is a strategy to control the refugees this way, they become dependent on outer sources. It is very common that being reliant on social or international assistance leads to various precarious situations for the refugees. At times, it becomes difficult to even reach basic needs since “[t]he aid pipeline is often vulnerable to problems with funding and logistics that mean goods are delivered in reduced volumes, late, or not at all” (Bakewell, 2014: 133). Although the host states are disturbed by the prolonged presence of asylum seekers in camps since this increases the cost in the long run and causes deficiencies of security, they provide the basis for conditions that protract the stay of the inmates of the camps. Another critical point of being a refugee, whether inside camps or outside camps, is that sexual and physical violence can also become prevalent in refugee camps, while refugee women, children, the elderly, and the disabled all suffer from the deficiency of protection especially when their stay is protracted. Similarly, the self-settled refugees without legal documents living in the local area are also discriminated against, cannot reach social services and find a shelter or a job to live on like a dignified citizen since they are deprived of the legal protection supplied by citizenship (Milner, 2014: 155). As the length of stay is prolonged, it gets harder to sustain a sense of self for the asylum seekers. Even though camps are transitory places, they often prove to be a permanent transience. “The average duration of a refugee situation is now closer to 20 years. As a result, several generations of the same family can now be found in many refugee camps” (Milner, 2014: 153). Where refugees remain in camps for many years, the buildings may come to resemble the permanent structures of the local area. Buduburam refugee camp and older sections of Meheba refugee settlements can be shown as examples of such structures and the permanent nature of those temporary and transitory non-places.

CONCLUSION

It is certain that mass migration is a global and modern concern while the crisis led the modern states in the West to embrace harsh policies utilizing modern strategies, technologies and techniques of security apparatus. The host

³ See <https://missingmigrants.iom.int/data> for further information

countries have searched for the best solutions to preserve the world they are accustomed to living in and to minimize the risks that may destroy the structure and the system they have built so far. The underlying theme of the fear of the Other deserves attention, for this fear implies a bio-political concern. The fear of the Other indicates economic and social anxieties. The states are not willing to accept migrants or refugees as a part of their entity, who are uneducated or unqualified in any field. They fear that not only will these people fail to contribute to the country's economy, but they will also become an extra economic burden overwhelming the social services, resources and labor market if provided with freedom of movement. The host countries prioritize the well-being of their own population in order to inhibit any counter-conduct from them and to prevent the deterioration of the system. As the party states signing the international treaties accede to share the burden of the crisis, they choose to fulfill their responsibility by carrying out a selective process. The application processes of the candidates with high-level of education and profession are positively resolved in a shorter period on the grounds that these refugees are thought to compensate for some areas that the local capacity is in short. Over and above, asylum seekers with qualified profiles are supposed to integrate into society and the economy more easily and to join civic activities in the same way. Their educational background gives hints about their tendency to adapt to the new environment and adopt social norms.

Besides the motivation and deployment of biopolitical policies of the host countries, it is vital to elaborate also on the repercussions of these policies for the refugees. The media rarely display the plight of those people in search of hope throughout their journeys and struggles. Their condition is more vulnerable, and their anxieties are more serious considering their situation since they are deprived of legal protection and trapped in the non-place belonging nowhere. On the other hand, they demand to regain their very human rights. However, the fear that overwhelms Western citizens overrides the moral responsibility for the members of global civil society and turns it into "moral blindness" instead. People who lose their lives on the way searching a home to stay are turned into just numbers without faces. The precariousities and the inhumane treatments both at the gates and the camps reveal how bio-politics can be deadly. Bio-politics as *making live* at home and *letting* the Other *die* beyond the borders strikes as a paradoxical conduct. As Stéphane Baele remarks, "Western states are building an increasingly deadly border control policy and importing military technologies to design sophisticated control systems and impassable fences in Greece, Bulgaria or the Spanish enclaves in Morocco. This truly creates the 'conditions of possibility for others to die'" (Baele, 2016: n. pag.). In conclusion, it will be striking to finish with Achille Mbembe's repositioning of sovereignty as the one keeping "the power and the capacity to dictate who may live and who must die", by which he raises awareness for the fact that bio-politics stands for necro-politics as much as it stands for itself (2003: 11). He reversed the phrase "make live or let die" to "kill or let live".

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, Martin. "Where Europe's Far-Right Has Gained Ground." *Statista*, 23 Nov. 2023, <https://www.statista.com/chart/6852/seats-held-by-far-right-parties-in-europe/>.
- Baele, Stéphane. "Foucault's Prediction of 'Live and Let Die'." *Refugees Deeply*, The New Humanitarian, 26 Apr. 2016, <https://deeply.thenewhumanitarian.org/refugees/community/2016/04/26/foucaults-prediction-of-live-and-let-die-2>.
- Bakewell, Oliver. "Encampment and Self-settlement." *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Gil Loescher, Katy Long, and Nando Sigona, Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 127–138.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. *Strangers at Our Door*. www.politybooks.com/eula
- Betts, Alexander. "International Relations and Forced Migration." *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Gil Loescher, Katy Long, and Nando Sigona, Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 60–73.
- Brookings Institution. "Why Accepting Refugees Is a Win-Win-Win Formula." *Brookings*, 2018, www.brookings.edu/research/why-accepting-refugees-is-a-win-win-win-formula.
- Diken, Bülent. "From Refugee Camps to Gated Communities: Biopolitics and the End of the City." *Citizenship Studies*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2004, pp. 83-106.
- Gibney, Matthew J. "Political Theory, Ethics, and Forced Migration." *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Gil Loescher, Katy Long, and Nando Sigona, Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 48–59.
- Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Polity Press, 1991.

- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books, 1975.
- . *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Translated by Richard Howard, Vintage Books, 1988.
- . *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*. Edited by Michel Senellart, translated by Graham Burchell, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- . *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*. Edited by Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, translated by David Macey, Picador, 2003.
- . *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume 1*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Haddad, Emma. *The Refugee in International Society: Between Sovereigns*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- International Labour Organization. *Migrants' Involvement in Irregular Employment*. 2019. ILO, www.ilo.org/migrants-involvement-irregular-employment.
- Kumar, Rajesh. "Asylum Policies and the Biopolitics of Refugee Selection." *Migration Policy Review*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2021, pp. 140-160.
- Mbembe, Achille. "Necropolitics." *Public Culture*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2003, pp. 11-40. Project MUSE, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/39984>.
- Milner, James. "Protracted Refugee Situations." *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Gil Loescher, Katy Long, and Nando Sigona, Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 151-162.
- Mitzen, Jennifer. "Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma." *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2006, pp. 341-370.
- Moore, Henrietta. "The Fantasies of Cosmopolitanism." *After Cosmopolitanism*, edited by Rosi Braidotti, Patrick Hanafin, and Bolette Blaagaard, Routledge, 2013, pp. 97-110.
- Morrice, Linda. "Journeys into Higher Education: The Case of Refugees in the UK." *Journal of Refugee Studies*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2009, pp. 304-320.
- Newman, Edward and Joanne van Selm. Introduction. *Refugees and Forced Displacement: International Security, Human Vulnerability, and the State*, by Newman and Selm, United Nations University Press, 2003, pp. 3-30.
- Possamai-Inesedy, Alpha. "Beck's Risk Society and Giddens' Search for Ontological Security: A Comparative Analysis between the Anthroposophical Society and the Assemblies of God." *Australian Religion Studies Review*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2002, pp. 27-43.
- Sennett, Richard. *Flesh and Stone*. Faber and Faber, 1994.
- Smith, John. "The Impact of Education on Asylum Acceptance Rates in Europe." *Journal of Migration Studies*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2020, pp. 34-56.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. *The Refugee Convention, 1951: The Travaux Préparatoires Analysed with a Commentary by Dr. Paul Weis*. 2021. UNHCR, www.unhcr.org/publications/2021/therafugeeconvention1951.html.
- UNODC, *Global Study on Smuggling of Migrants* 2018 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.18.IV.9).
- Volkan, Vamık D. *Göçmenler ve Mülteciler: Travma, Sürekli Yas, Önyargı ve Sınır Psikolojisi*. Pusula Yayınevi, 2019.