

The History of Türkiye's Migration Policies

Türkiye'nin Göç Politikası Tarihi

Leyla AKCAN¹

Abstract

Migration is a universal phenomenon with deep roots in human history. It is known that large migration movements took place in prehistoric times in order to adapt to environmental conditions. Today, migration is a multifaceted phenomenon with demographic, economic, political, psychological, anthropological and sociological effects. Migration movements are too complex and diverse to be limited to a single discipline; they have a close relationship with economic, political, social and other developments. Therefore, in order to understand and analyze the phenomenon of migration, it is necessary to make use of different disciplines such as political science, law, psychology, history and geography. Since migration movements are as old as the history of humanity, migration and historical science are closely related. Since Türkiye has been used as a bridge for very important migration movements throughout history, it is important to analyze migration policies in Türkiye.

Keywords: Migration, Migrant, Migration Policies.

Öz

Göç, insanlık tarihinde köklü bir yere sahiptir. Tarih öncesi dönemlerde, çevresel koşullara uyum sağlamak için çok sayıda insan göç etmiştir. Günümüzde göç, demografik, ekonomik, politik, psikolojik, antropolojik ve sosyolojik faktörlerden oluşan karmaşık bir fenomendir. Göç hareketleri çok karmaşık ve çeşitlidir ve ekonomik, siyasi, sosyal ve diğer gelişmelerle yakından ilişkilidir. Sonuç olarak, göç kavramını anlamak ve analiz etmek için siyaset bilimi, hukuk, psikoloji, tarih ve coğrafya gibi çeşitli disiplinler kullanılmalıdır. Göç ve tarih bilimi, insanlık tarihi kadar eski olan göç hareketleriyle yakından ilişkilidir. Türkiye, tarih boyunca önemli göç hareketleri için bir köprü olarak hizmet verdiği için, Türkiye'deki göç politikalarının değerlendirilmesi çok önemlidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Göç, Göçmen, Göç Politikası.

Introduction

Migration is a universal phenomenon with deep roots in human history. It is known that large migration movements took place in prehistoric times in order to adapt to environmental conditions. Today, migration is a multifaceted phenomenon with demographic, economic, political, psychological, anthropological and sociological effects (Karpas and Sönmez, 2003). Migration movements are too complex and diverse to be limited to a single discipline; they have a close relationship with economic, political, social and other developments. Therefore, in order to understand and analyze the phenomenon of migration, it is necessary to make use of different disciplines such as political science, law, psychology, history and geography. Since migration movements are as old as the history of humanity, migration and historical science are closely related. Since Türkiye has been used as a bridge for very important migration movements throughout history, it is important to analyze migration policies in Türkiye.

When analyzed historically, the first of Türkiye's major migration waves occurred in 1923 in the context of the Turkish-Greek exchange. During this period, 395 thousand immigrants from Greece came to Türkiye between 1922 and 1938 (History of Settlement, 1932: 18). The migration movement from Yugoslavia can be listed as another important example (Baklacioğlu, 2015). The third major wave of migration was the arrival of approximately 1

¹ Doktorant, Gazi University, Gazi Education Faculty, akcanleyla6514@gmail.com

million migrants to Türkiye after the Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1979 (GIGM, 2017). Another one of the great waves of migration to Anatolia came from Bulgaria. Especially in 1989, more than 300 thousand Bulgarian Turks and Pomaks, Muslim Slavs, migrated en masse from Bulgaria to Türkiye. Then, in 1991, due to the Gulf War, about half a million migrants sought refuge in Türkiye from Northern Iraq (Kirişçi and Karaca, 2015). The most recent wave of mass migration to Türkiye started with the arrival of Syrians in 2011 and forced migration continues due to instability in Syria. Türkiye provides temporary protection status to a large number of Syrians. Since the early 1920s, Türkiye has been the target of mass migration of former Ottoman subjects in different time periods (Polat, 2021).

When the literature on international migration policy in Türkiye is examined, İçduygu (2004) categorized irregular migration movements to Türkiye in four different periods in the historical process: 1979-1987, 1988-1993, 1994-2000/2001 and post-2001. İçduygu defined the 1979-1987 period as the initial period of irregular migration, the 1988-1993 period as the growth period, the 1994-2000 period as the maturation period and the post-2001 period as the aging period. Dedeoğlu and Gökmen (2011) draw attention to three main developments within the framework of legal regulations on migration during the foundation years of the Republic of Türkiye. First, there was the desire of Turkish migrants to return to their homeland as a result of the growing nationalist movements in the Ottoman lands. The second is the end of the Turkish-Greek war with the signing of the Lausanne Peace Treaty in 1923 and the article added to the treaty for the exchange of citizens; the last is the Settlement Law No. 2510 in 1934, which was drafted to encourage the return of Turkish descendants. Furthermore, İçduygu et al. (2014) examined the interaction of international migration movements with the processes of nation-state construction and preservation within the modernity project in Türkiye. In this study, Türkiye's migration policy is analyzed in three periods: 1923-1950, 1950-1980 and 1980-2014. In the first period, the foundation of the nation state was laid; in the second period, the nation state and modernity took root locally; and in the last period, the impact of globalization increased and Türkiye's nation state gained more interaction with the world (Polat, 2021).

In the years following the establishment of the Republic of Türkiye, in addition to immigrants of Turkish descent, peoples who were Ottoman subjects also migrated to Türkiye. Article 1 of the 1934 Law No. 2510 on Resettlement states, "The Ministry of Internal Affairs has been entrusted with the task of correcting the settlement and distribution of the population in Türkiye due to their attachment to Turkish culture, according to a program to be made by the Executive Deputies in accordance with this law." (Şakacı, 2020). At the same time, Article 3 of the Law reads as follows: "Settled or nomadic individuals of Turkish ancestry, tribes and settled people of Turkish culture who wish to come from outside, individually or collectively, to settle in Türkiye are accepted by the order of the Deputy Interior Ministry in accordance with the provisions of this Law. These people are called 'muhajir'. The decision of the Board of Executive Deputies shall determine who and which people of which country will be accepted as being attached to Turkish culture." With this statement, it is seen that the issue of the acceptance of the population that can enter Türkiye is left to the decision of the Board of Executive Deputies or, in today's terms, to the Council of Ministers (Baklacioğlu, 2010). The 1934 Law on Settlement mainly focused on the admission of individuals of Turkish culture. However, the fact that the decision on the admission of the population requesting entry to the country was left to the Council of Ministers suggests the possibility that the Law on Settlement did not only admit individuals who were affiliated with Turkish culture, but also non-Turkish individuals who were deemed to be affiliated with Turkish culture by the Executive Board of Deputies (Erdil, 2019).

In fact, the 1934 Settlement Law went beyond emphasizing Turkish ancestry or Turkish culture and aimed to take into account the past shared history of the Ottoman Empire. This

shows that, contrary to the thesis, it includes areas of action that are not limited to Turkish culture. Moreover, the Passport Law No. 5862 enacted in 1950 in Türkiye states that "In general, the admission of refugees and foreigners who come to Türkiye with the intention of settling in a country other than the legislation on settlement, whether they have a passport or not, depends on the decision of the Ministry of Interior." This shows that loyalty to Turkish ancestry and Turkish culture is not a prerequisite. However, within this framework, it is possible to explain the mass migrations of Albanians, Bosnians and Pomaks who were not of Turkish descent but were admitted to Türkiye (Arslan, 2022).

Öksüz (2000) states that in the years following the proclamation of the Republic, the racial factor was generally at the forefront of migration to Türkiye. He states that 1,200 Albanians who came to Türkiye in 1923 were not accepted, but Türkiye opened its doors for Muslim Albanians living in difficult conditions in Bulgaria. Baklacioğlu (2010), on the other hand, states that 240,000 Albanians migrated to Türkiye from Kosovo, Montenegro, Sandzak and Macedonia between the First and Second World War, as a result of the application of Albanian demographers such as Hivzi Islami. Furthermore, Kirişçi emphasizes that against the structure of the 1934 Settlement Law, which emphasized Turkish identity, the religious factor was also effective in the acceptance of immigrants. While ethnically non-Turkish Muslim Albanians, Bosnians and Pomaks were admitted to Türkiye as refugees or immigrants, Orthodox Gagauz Turks or Shiite Azerbaijanis could not benefit from this privilege (Danış, 2004). Macar (2015) states that in the population exchange between Türkiye and Greece, although the supporters of the process adopted religious homogeneity, the population that came to Anatolia during this exchange was settled in nineteen cities in eight predetermined settlement areas in and around nineteen cities, in the residences left behind by the Greeks or in newly created settlements in rural areas (Cengizkan, 2004).

According to Albanian sources, the majority of the population that migrated from Yugoslavia to Türkiye after the Second World War were Albanians, while Turks constituted 20% of the migrants. In response to this thesis, an argument was presented that since the Ottoman period, the Turkish population in the regions of Macedonia and Kosovo has been small and that the inhabitants of these regions call themselves Turks, but that the inhabitants of these regions are originally Albanians. Albanian sources attribute this to the fact that Albanians see Turkish and Muslim identities as identical and identify themselves as Turks because they are Muslims. This is based on the fact that they were part of the Muslim subjects during the Ottoman period (Baklacioğlu, 2015). Moreover, as Marinov notes, between 1950 and 1951, Roma and Pomak Turks migrated to Türkiye along with Bulgarian Turks, and B. N. Şimşir records the number of these migrants as 154,393, while M. Saray reports that 130,000 more migrants came to Türkiye through family reunions until 1978 (Kamil, 2016). This shows that Türkiye opened its doors to immigrants from Bulgaria, who were considered Muslim subjects during the Ottoman period.

Contrary to the claims of Albanian sources, as Baklacioğlu states, the majority of migrants from Yugoslavia to Türkiye were of Turkish origin, but it is still difficult to reach a definitive conclusion in the debate on ethnic identities. Baklacioğlu (2015) states that it is difficult to fully distinguish between Turkish and Albanian identities in the Kosovo and Macedonia regions of the former Yugoslavia and that in those years Albanians identified Turkish identity with Islamic identity, therefore they identified themselves as Albanians and likewise identified themselves as Turks. This situation points to a period in which both communities shaped their identities through a process of mutual assimilation, which complicated the perception of identity. In this context, Baklacioğlu argues that this situation undermines the credibility of Albanian literature and merges the Turkish history in the region into the Albanian identity. In this regard, Ağanoglu (2017) points out that a common point

where Turks and Albanians can come together is the Islamic identity. Islamic identity represents a space where both communities can unite. Karpaz (2017) states that Islam played an important role among the factors that brought migration to the Ottoman Empire and later to Türkiye. However, it may be misleading to consider religion alone as the cause of migration. Although religion or Islam provides individuals with a common identity, the most important factor is the Ottoman subject status. This means that individuals adopted the political culture of the Ottoman Empire and shared common values.

When the legal regulations enacted in the early years of the Republic and all these theses are put together, it can be concluded that ethnic identity alone was not the main determinant in the admission of immigrants, as Albanians felt a sense of belonging to Türkiye as former subjects of the Ottoman Empire and migrated to Anatolia. The acceptance of Albanians as citizens, although not explicitly stated in the decisions of the Executive Board of Deputies, shows that ethnic identity was not the main determinant in the acceptance of immigrants in the early years of the Republic (Polat, 2021). Karpaz (2017) emphasizes the society and individuals shaped by the unique behaviors, attitudes and cultural heritage of the Ottoman Empire. This cultural structure did not end with the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, but has continued to the present day and is referred to as Turkishness in Türkiye. Beyond religious debates, this Turkish culture is a result of the forces that have made the immigrants and natives from different regions and using different languages to resemble each other. These factors are related not only to religion but also to cultural interactions and shared values. Therefore, having an Ottoman culture allowed migrant groups to more easily harmonize with the native population in Anatolia. Karpaz's analysis constitutes one of the main reasons for the better acceptance of Syrians by the locals in Türkiye compared to European societies and the more successful social integration processes of Syrian migrants. In this period, the effects of the understanding of Muslim and non-Muslim subjects in the Ottoman Empire were also seen in international migration policy. Within the framework of this policy, an "open door policy" was applied to immigrants who were not of Turkish descent but who were Muslims or who converted to Islam when they arrived in Türkiye. As a result of the examination of the legislation, it was observed that the admission and settlement of mass migrants within the scope of this policy was not seen as a problem at the national and local level. For this reason, the 1934 Law on Settlement dealt with the issue of the admission and resettlement of immigrants more predominantly, but did not include regulations on integration (Polat, 2021). In other words, the social cohesion of migrants was not an important issue considered in the early years of the republic. According to Sarı (2011), the international migrant resettlement policy implemented in the early years of Türkiye dealt mostly with shelter and subsistence. In this context, Sarı states that "ordinary resettlement" was applied to Muhajirs, and according to Kökdemir, he explains this concept as "Regardless of whether they had property in their homeland or not, they were provided with a household to shelter them, a shop, a plot of land, or a plot of land, vineyard, garden, olive grove, etc. in the ratio and amount determined by the distribution instructions." In other words, the resettlement policy in this period was aimed at providing shelter and livelihood opportunities to migrants.

In addition, Law No. 5683 on the Residence and Travel of Foreigners in Türkiye, which was published in 1950 and entered into force, stipulates that foreigners seeking asylum in Türkiye for political reasons should only reside in areas authorized by the Ministry of Interior. This shows that the residence restriction for migrants is limited to those arriving for political reasons and addresses the national security dimension. In this sense, in the first period of policies towards immigrants arriving in Türkiye, the open door approach towards former Ottoman subjects, mass admission, settlement policies focusing on housing and livelihood needs, and national security considerations were decisive.

With Türkiye's 1961 accession to the 1951 Geneva Convention, Türkiye's migration policies have been influenced by the western liberal approach to migration, which focuses on the individual (Barkın, 2014). In this approach, the United Nations (UN) has been the main guide and the European Union (EU) has established its own international migration policy based on UN legislation (Tepealtı, 2020). However, EU member states are authorized to determine their own international migration policies at the national level. Türkiye, on the other hand, initially acted within the framework of the UN and then shaped its own international migration policies and laws in accordance with the western-centered liberal individual-oriented understanding, especially since the early 1990s within the scope of the EU harmonization process (Polat, 2021). The great humanitarian losses during the First and Second World Wars and the forced migrations caused by the war environment led to the formation of many refugee groups around the world. This situation brought the issue of refugees to the agenda as a priority problem in the post-war period and the first step in this context was taken by the League of Nations (MC) (Şen & Özkorul, 2016).

The League of Nations initiated studies on refugee law in the 1920s. The MC aimed to develop refugee law through various conventions, but did not fully achieve this goal (Ergüven and Özturanlı, 2013). After the Second World War, refugees and displaced persons became the focus of the international agenda. In 1946, the United Nations General Assembly resolved to prohibit the forced return of refugees and displaced persons. However, this issue was not addressed as a problem that needed to be solved urgently. During this period, the International Refugee Organization (IOM), the first post-war private organization, was established within the UN and was successful in finding solutions to refugee problems (Taneri, 2012). Founded by the UN in 1947, the NAM has been active in helping refugees and providing support to refugees in need. The organization resettled refugees who did not want to return to their home countries in other countries and helped them build a new life. However, the NAM has been criticized for being biased in resettling refugees and transporting low-cost labor to western countries. As a result of these criticisms, the support of the member states decreased and the organization's activities ended in 1951 due to restrictions in the budget of the NAM (Polat, 2021).

In 1948, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and regulated the rights of refugees within the framework of human rights. However, after a while, it became clear that the work of the International Refugee Organization (IOM) was insufficient and in order to provide better support to refugees and to find deep-rooted solutions to their problems, the United Nations General Assembly decided to establish the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in 1950. In 1951, the Commissionerate started its activities and in the same year, the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (Geneva Convention) was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. However, the Convention entered into force in 1954 (Ergüven and Özturanlı, 2013). Türkiye ratified the Geneva Convention of 1951 in 1961 with a geographical limitation. According to this limitation, while Türkiye can grant refugee status to foreigners from Europe, it excludes foreigners from outside Europe and does not recognize them as refugees. This geographical limitation is an important factor regulating Türkiye's migration policies and refugee admission (Polat, 2021).

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) is a non-political international organization mandated to provide protection to refugees and find solutions to their situation. The 1951 Geneva Convention is also entrusted to UNHCR to monitor its implementation by the state parties. The mandate, duties and organizational structure of this organization are set out in the UNHCR statute. UNHCR's mandate has expanded over time to include other categories of asylum seekers not covered by the refugee convention. This includes groups such as stateless persons and returnees. Although UNHCR envisages cooperation with

national authorities, it remains unclear how cooperation on refugee or asylum-seeker status determination will be carried out. UNHCR can provide its views when assessing asylum applications and, where persons are recognized as refugees, can offer solutions, such as providing residence in another country. It is an important international actor working to help refugees and asylum seekers (Çiçekli, 2016).

In Türkiye, the Passport Law No. 5862, enacted in 1950, determined and regulated the entry and exit procedures for foreigners and Turkish citizens. This law regulated the entry and exit of foreigners into and out of Türkiye and regulated the right to reside and travel in Türkiye for foreigners arriving in accordance with the provisions of the passport. Law No. 5683 on the Residence and Travel of Foreigners in Türkiye, which was published and entered into force in the same year, is another important piece of legislation regulating the residence and travel rights of foreigners in Türkiye. Article 1 of the Law states that foreigners have the right to reside and travel in Türkiye, subject to certain conditions, if they are prohibited by law from entering Türkiye and if they have arrived in accordance with the provisions of the Passport Law. These laws include basic regulations on the rights of foreigners to enter and reside in Türkiye and were enacted to determine the rights and obligations of foreigners in Türkiye (Özdemir, 2023).

Law No. 5862 on Passports introduced regulations with a particular focus on passport procurement procedures, issuance of passport-like documents and transit outside Türkiye. Law No. 5683 on the Residence and Travel of Foreigners in Türkiye, which entered into force in 1950, regulates the entry, internal travel, residence, and changes in marital status of passport holders who comply with predetermined rules. However, there are no specific regulations for foreigners entering the country without a passport. In this context, there is a lack of legislation on refugees and asylum-seekers in domestic legislation during this period. In addition, the Passport Law No. 5862 authorized the Ministry of Interior to admit individuals coming to the country permanently, regardless of whether they held a passport or not (Polat, 2021).

Adopted in 1951, the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees regulated the legal status of refugees at the international level; however, over time, the lack of content came to the fore and the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees was adopted in 1967 to remedy this deficiency. The 1967 Protocol revised the definition of refugee and stated that a refugee is "any person who, owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, refuses to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who has no nationality and is outside the country of his former habitual residence and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it" (Tepealtı, 2019).

According to the 1951 Geneva Convention, individuals who have the conditions specified in the definition as a result of events occurring before that date are recognized as refugees and a date limitation is imposed. This limitation was based on the rationale that the aim was to ensure the return of those who migrated from Europe after the Second World War. The Protocol adopted in 1967 abolished the date limitation. Türkiye ratified this Protocol on 01.07.1968 with the Council of Ministers Decision No. 6/10266. In this context, Türkiye maintained the geographical limitation but abolished the time limitation. The entry into force of the Protocol in Türkiye was set for July 31, 1968. With these international arrangements, Türkiye recognized refugee and asylum-seeker status for migrants from within Europe, while recognizing a temporary asylum-seeker status for those coming from outside Europe. This shows that Türkiye was influenced by global migration developments and became a part of international regulations, albeit to a limited extent. Moreover, with this period, Türkiye tended to adopt a Western-centered liberal understanding of migration based on the individual (Bozbeyoğlu, 2015).

In 1963, the Ankara Agreement signed between the European Economic Community (EEC) and Türkiye envisaged economic migration from Türkiye in line with the development processes of European countries after World War II. However, this immigration process slowed down after the 1973 Oil Crisis. In this period, Türkiye generally played the role of a migration donor and transit country. At first, Türkiye implemented policies that supported labor migration to European countries during a period of economic problems, and legal regulations were also made. However, in the following years, due to the economic crisis in Europe and the decrease in the number of workers demanded, as well as economic and political problems and security concerns in Türkiye, migration policies to Europe were restricted (Sevimli and Reçber, 2014). These restrictions on sending migrants paved the way for phenomena such as illegal migration policies of the European Union (EU) matured within the community and Türkiye started to integrate into these policies from the early 1990s. Especially since 1994, Türkiye has endeavored to implement legal regulations in line with the EU's international migration policy established after the 1970s. In this way, step by step, the western-centered liberal understanding of migration based on the individual has been further adopted by Türkiye, and legal regulations and policies have been implemented in accordance with this understanding (Koçak and Gündüz, 2016). Following the end of World War II, international migration movements in Türkiye underwent significant changes. The post-war period encompassed years of intense demand for foreign workers and economic development in Europe. The 1963 Ankara Agreement was signed with the aim of "the gradual realization of a free flow of workers" and with this agreement, hundreds of thousands of workers started to migrate from Türkiye to many European countries, especially Germany (Dedeoğlu and Gökmen, 2011). Since 1961, Turkish citizens have enjoyed the freedom to travel as a constitutional right. In 1960, while 2,700 workers were working abroad in order to obtain better wage opportunities, this number increased to 6,700 a year later (Abadan-Unat, 2017).

In the 1960s, within the framework of agreements signed between Türkiye and EU countries such as Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Austria, France, Sweden, Switzerland, Switzerland, the UK and Denmark, there was a huge wave of migration from Türkiye to find work in these countries. Germany, in particular, witnessed the first influx of workers in 1961 and between 1961 and 1973, around 775,000 Turkish citizens migrated to this country in search of work. In 1980, this number reached one and a half million in Germany, exceeded one and a half million in 1990, and reached two million in 2000 (Yıldırımoglu, 2005). European countries did not impose any specific restrictions on immigration until the Oil Crisis in 1973. However, this crisis led to a decrease in the need for labor force and caused European countries to impose restrictions on migration (Karaşahin, 2012). During this period, migration from Türkiye to European countries started with guest worker status in the 1960s and became permanent through family reunification (Dedeoğlu and Gökmen, 2011).

Between 1980 and 1995, approximately 350,000 people migrated from Türkiye to Western European countries using the right to political asylum. During this period, from the late 80s to the early 90s, one out of every five people leaving Türkiye entered European countries as political refugees. Statistics between 1983-1994 show that the number of Turkish immigrants in the migration movement to Western European countries has increased steadily in countries such as Denmark, Belgium, Norway, Switzerland and Germany, while countries such as the Netherlands, Austria, England and Sweden have experienced fluctuations in the number of immigrants (İçduygu and Sirkeci, 1999). The increase in the tendency to emigrate from Türkiye since the early 1980s is attributed to important events such as the 1980 military coup in Türkiye. In fact, when we look at earlier periods, it is stated that the difficult periods Türkiye was in, such as the 1971 Memorandum, were also effective in this migration trend (İçduygu, 2004).

İçduygu and other researchers (2014) have attributed the phenomenon of irregular migration in Türkiye since the 1970s and the country's position as a recipient of international migration to various reasons. These reasons include the Russian invasion of Afghanistan, regime change in Iran, Saddam Hussein's destabilizing policies in the Middle East, the globalization process, the collapse of communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Researchers have also categorized migration in Türkiye as refugees, asylum seekers, illegal migrants, transit migrants and irregular migrants, pointing to the coexistence of complex human movements in the country. In addition, Iran-Iraq relations deteriorated rapidly after the overthrow of the Shah in Iran in February 1979 and the beginning of the Khomeini regime. In particular, those of the Shiite sect, which constitutes the majority in Iraq, focused on Khomeini's policy of influencing Shiites outside Iran. In this process, Iraq under Saddam Hussein abrogated the Iran-Iraq border agreement on September 17, 1980 and attacked Iran on September 22, 1980 (Kaynak et al., 1992).

Following the Iranian Revolution in 1979, approximately one million migrants sought refuge in Türkiye (Directorate General of Migration Management, 2017). In addition, around 5,000 civilians lost their lives when Iraq carried out a chemical weapons attack on the city of Halabja in 1988 before ending its war with Iran, and many people left their homes and sought refuge in Türkiye (Kaynak et al., 1992). During this period, with the Asylum Regulation No. 6169, which entered into force in 1994, Türkiye recognized and admitted asylum seekers under the status of "temporary asylum seeker", even though they did not fully comply with the Geneva Convention due to geographical restrictions. In this way, even though Türkiye actually characterized the migrants as "temporary asylum seekers", it implemented an "open door policy" towards mass migrants coming from regions where it had subjects dating back to the Ottoman Empire. Researcher Kirişçi (1999) noted that Türkiye pursued a flexible policy during the 1980s, when Iranian Kurds, Baha'is, Jews and regime opponents passed through Türkiye to seek asylum or emigrate to the West. A member of the Turkish Parliament also estimated that the number of people who crossed from Iran to Türkiye between 1980 and 1991 was around 1.5 million, but stated that precise statistics were not available. In addition, as a result of the assimilation policies initiated towards the Turks living in Bulgaria towards the end of 1984, 311,862 immigrants migrated to Türkiye in 1989 (Kamil, 2016). Türkiye has also implemented an "open door policy" towards these cognate migrants, whom it considers as former Ottoman subjects.

As can be seen, an "open door policy" was also adopted in the migrant flows to Türkiye after 1979 and 1990. However, during this period, except for the migrants from Bulgaria, Türkiye generally accepted other migrants as temporary asylum seekers. In addition, Türkiye also assisted migrants from Iran in their passage to European countries as a transit country. In other words, after the Khomeini regime came to power in Iran in 1978, Türkiye was seen as an intermediary for the passage of asylum seekers to other countries in the 1980s (Şen, 2014). However, during this period, the European Union (EU) initiated the idea of common borders with the Schengen Agreement and continued its efforts with the signing of the European Single Act (ESA) in 1986. The ECS basically envisaged single market integration for the EU. However, taking into account the risk that the ECS posed to the competences of the member states in the control of their external borders, countries added a declaration to the Treaty. This declaration states that migration policies may limit their competences at the national level, even though they agreed to act together for the reception, residence and movement of third-country nationals. In short, although the EU implemented policies to establish and protect a common border during this period, it did not aim to prevent member states from determining and implementing national migration policies (Erkiral-Tavas, 2015).

The 1989 Revolutions and the collapse of the Eastern Bloc raised concerns of massive migration flows within the Community and increased security concerns. Signed in 1990, the Dublin Convention was adopted as an intergovernmental agreement dealing with asylum applications. It stipulated that asylum applicants would be assessed in the Member States where they first entered and requested asylum (Şirin, 2016). Furthermore, Article 30 of the Schengen Convention also points to the responsibility to examine asylum applications, although the Schengen Convention has not been signed by all member states (Erkiral-Tavas, 2015).

In this context, it is seen that protectionist policies have been established and regulations have been made within the EU since the 1970s against migrants seeking asylum for political reasons, especially due to the political developments in the nearby regions. This process has also affected Türkiye, which, on the one hand, has been confronted with irregular migrants who leave their countries for political reasons and use Türkiye as a transit point to cross to Europe, and on the other hand, Türkiye has started to experience problems with the EU as an immigration country due to its own internal political problems (Polat, 2021).

İçduygu (2004) states that during what he calls the growth period of international migration between 1988 and 1993, two different main migration flows stood out in Türkiye. The first of these flows includes refugees from countries such as Iraq and Bulgaria, while the second includes movements of asylum seekers and migrants from the Eastern Bloc for economic purposes. While most of the Iraqi Kurdish refugees left Türkiye during this period, a large number of Bulgarian refugees of Turkish nationality did not leave the country and settled in Türkiye. Most of the migrants from the Eastern Bloc stayed in Türkiye for a short period of time and then continued their activities by moving back and forth between their home countries for economic and other purposes. In this period, along with national and international economic and political transformations, the foundations of Türkiye's foreign student policies were laid. After 1980, under the influence of liberal opening policies, Türkiye made legal arrangements for foreign students. In this framework, first the Law No. 2922 on Foreign Students Studying in Türkiye was enacted in 1983 and then the Regulation on Foreign Students Studying in Türkiye was put into effect on April 15, 1985 with the Council of Ministers Decree No. 85/9380 (Gün & Yüksel, 2021). Although the relevant regulation was repealed by Article 1 of the Regulation No. 2011/162 on the Repeal of the Regulation on Foreign Students Studying in Türkiye, it has been a pioneer in taking basic steps to increase the number of foreign students studying at universities in Türkiye with the liberal policies implemented after 2010. In addition, Türkiye has introduced a new migration approach in order to attract qualified migration to the country and started to make legal arrangements in this context (Çelik, 2018).

Since the early 1990s, when Türkiye was both forced to adopt regulations on international migration control as part of the EU harmonization process and was exposed to intense waves of migration due to its geopolitical position, it became inevitable that legal regulations and institutionalization efforts on international migration were inevitable. İçduygu (2004) evaluates the period between 1994-2001 as the period of preparation and maturation of Türkiye's legislation on asylum and refuge issues. At the same time, he emphasized the period between 2001-2004 as the period when smuggling and the effects of illegal migration on the labor market in countries were among the frequently discussed issues at national and international level and Türkiye started to make efforts to make comprehensive regulations in order to prevent illegal migration.

The Maastricht Treaty, which entered into force in November 1993, aimed to create a European community with the abolition of internal borders by promoting political, monetary and economic union. This treaty laid the foundations of the European Union (EU) and introduced a structure based on three main pillars. These pillars are "European Communities" as the first pillar, "Common Foreign Security and Defense Policy" as the second pillar and

"Justice and Home Affairs", which includes migration and asylum, as the third pillar. The three-pillar structure established by the Maastricht Treaty included the efforts of the member states to develop measures to address illegal migration as a common issue. However, these efforts on illegal migration lacked an effective binding commitment (Yazan, 2016).

The 1997 Treaty of Amsterdam is an important document that directly addresses migration and refugee issues in the European Union. The Treaty recognized that migration and refugee issues are matters that the Union should address as a matter of priority and introduced binding provisions that also affect the member states of the Union. The Treaty gave the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Court of Justice wide powers to take decisions and implement them on migration. Furthermore, the Treaty stipulates that the provisions of the Schengen Agreement, in particular on external borders, must be implemented whether or not they have been signed by the member states of the Union. Although the EU has made many regulations on migration flows, it has struggled to prevent member states from considering migration as their sovereign territory. Therefore, countries' approaches to migration go beyond the principle of unity (Koca, 2002). However, although the EU wants to establish a common migration management against the increasing refugee flows and illegal migration problems, member states have difficulties in establishing a common policy due to limitations and possible violations in their jurisdictions. In this process, Türkiye has initiated a new era in its international migration policy in order to put asylum and asylum issues into a more clear framework. The migration policy of this new era was shaped by irregular migration movements and the legal regulations implemented in Europe, as well as the mass migration to Türkiye as a result of the war in Iraq. In this context, the Asylum Regulation No. 6169 entered into force in 1994 (Polat, 2021).

Although the Asylum Regulation No. 6169 seemingly accepts the definitions of refugee and asylum seeker in line with the UN and EU regulations, it is observed that foreigners from outside Europe are not recognized as refugees. In this way, it is observed that with the Asylum Regulation, the distinction between refugees and asylum-seekers between European and non-European countries has been regulated for the first time in Türkiye. The fact that Türkiye became a party to the 1951 Geneva Convention in 1961 by limiting its application to events occurring in Europe necessitated the preparation of this Regulation. The Regulation aims to determine the procedures and principles to be applied to foreigners seeking asylum or refuge in Türkiye and to determine the duties of the relevant institutions. From 1994 onwards, as part of international regulations, Türkiye incorporated into its domestic law for the first time not only the status of migrants, but also their resettlement, cultural, political and some social rights; however, in practice, limitations on the mass resettlement of migrants continued (Dost, 2014).

EU harmonization efforts, migration management, regulation of foreign workers and the fight against illegal migration have been reflected in Türkiye's development plans since 1996. The Seventh Development Plan, which covers the period between 1996 and 2000, stands out as the first plan of Türkiye to address the issue of migration. While previous development plans generally addressed the issue of migration in the context of internal migration, the Seventh Five-Year Development Plan of the Ministry of Development of the Republic of Türkiye states that since the early 1990s, Türkiye has been subjected to a massive influx of international migration, asylum seekers and illegal workers, thus becoming not only a sending country but also a receiving country. However, it was emphasized that having insufficient statistical data to determine the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of incoming migrants makes it difficult to develop economic and social policies and it was envisaged that this issue should be addressed within a system (Tepealtı, 2020).

Under the heading of increasing employment and efficiency in the labour market, it was emphasized that the labour market is insufficient according to the changing conditions of the

labour market and the main reason for this is that the legislation on foreigners working for wages and salaries or providing services on a freelance basis in the country is "scattered and complexly regulated". In order to find a solution to this problem, it was stated that issues such as monitoring and supervision of foreign nationals working in Türkiye should be taken into consideration, and in this framework, it was suggested that the legislation on the work of foreigners in Türkiye should be revised and regulated. It was also noted that the Law on Settlement should be revised to accommodate migrants from abroad in line with changing conditions (Aktel ve Kaygısız, 2018). This development plan reveals that in the early 2000s Türkiye was still unable to formulate a comprehensive migration policy. Moreover, it is seen that the legislative, economic and settlement dimensions of migrants were addressed. However, it is understood that the integration problems of migrants were ignored and downplayed during this period.

In the period between 2001-2004, illegal migration, smuggling and their effects on the labor market became important issues at both national and international level. During this period, Türkiye started to revise its policies, stating that more effective and stringent policies should be implemented against illegal migration. In this period, the state's approach and actions have changed and a new phase has begun, but illegal migration has also changed its shape and become more institutionalized (İçduygu, 2004). In 2001, Türkiye signed the Accession Partnership Document as part of its accession process to the EU. The document aims to strengthen the fight against illegal migration in the short term and to negotiate a readmission agreement with the European Commission; in the medium term, to adopt and implement the EU acquis and practices, to ensure harmonization in the field of asylum, to remove the geographical restriction based on the 1951 Geneva Convention, to evaluate asylum applications and to provide accommodation centers and social support for refugees and asylum seekers (Polat, 2021). Three main points can be clearly seen in this document. First, with the "Turkish National Action Plan for the Adoption of the European Union Acquis in the Field of Asylum and Migration" dated 25.03.2005, the issues of asylum and illegal migration were brought to the forefront and it is seen that Türkiye started to formulate a migration policy in these areas in the early 2000s. In this period, Europe faced intense illegal migration and asylum problems in the pre-2000 period and turned towards finding solutions to these problems. In this process, Türkiye has also encountered illegal immigrants from Iran and Iraq since the late 1970s.

Secondly, the issue of lifting the geographical restriction based on the 1951 Geneva Convention was revisited. Türkiye has faced an intense international migration problem both as a transit country to Europe and as a destination country for migrants. In this situation, as a developing country, it is left alone to tackle the migration problem and is expected to bear the socio-economic burden alone. Finally, in the context of refugees and asylum seekers in Türkiye, the process of establishing migration legislation and institutionalization of migration has continued under the guidance of the UN and the EU. With the impact of the Implementation Action Plan, the approach to the problem of international migrants in Türkiye began to emphasize the issue of social cohesion for the first time. In this context, the Plan laid the foundation for an important transformation in Türkiye's migration policy (Parlak, 2015).

In 2004, the EU announced the Hague Program with the aim of promoting regular migration and strengthening Europe's knowledge-based economy, increasing the level of economic growth and leaving other countries behind by creating an advanced knowledge-based economy. In this framework, the Hague Program stands out as an important document that brings measures to prevent irregular migration movements to the international level. In other words, issues such as limiting irregular migration, implementing migration management effectively, and increasing border controls have been the priority focus points of the EU (Şen, 2014). The 2012 memorandum of understanding with Frontex, the EU agency responsible for

controlling the EU's external borders, has ensured solidarity in the fight against irregular migration. As part of the EU's scope of work, a Frontex liaison officer was assigned to Türkiye in 2016. The principles of returning people to their country of citizenship or origin in order to ensure that irregular migration is carried out in a controlled manner and in accordance with human dignity are regulated by the Agreement between the Republic of Türkiye and the European Union on the Readmission of Persons Residing in Türkiye without Authorization (IDA) No. 6652, which entered into force in 2014. In total, 15 countries have signed the GKA. This agreement shows that the EU has had a significant influence on the formation of Türkiye's international migration legislation and policy. In addition, the EU has placed responsibility on Türkiye to protect its borders against irregular migrants and expected Türkiye to bear the economic and social burden on its own (Bayram and İzol, 2022).

In 2004, during the preparation of the National Action Plan, the Ministry of Interior, General Directorate of Security launched the "Training Project for the Development of Police Capacity in Refugee/Asylum Seekers Related Areas" aiming to improve the capacity of personnel in the field of refugees and asylum seekers in line with international standards. This project was followed in 2005 by the "Country of Origin and Asylum Information System Project", which aims to identify the training needs of personnel on asylum, develop training programs, develop strategies on refugee law, organize seminars and strengthen the information database on the countries of origin of refugees and asylum seekers. Based on the results of these projects, "Türkiye's National Action Plan for the Adoption of the European Union Acquis in the Field of Asylum and Migration," entered into force on 25.03.2005 (Polat, 2021). This action plan on asylum in Türkiye aimed to draw a roadmap for harmonization with the EU acquis and for the reception of asylum seekers, with a view to strengthening institutionalization on the one hand and integration (harmonization) on the other. According to this action plan, it was proposed that persons with the status of refugee, asylum seeker or temporary asylum seeker should have the right to choose their place of residence in order to fully integrate into Turkish society, provided that they successfully complete their integration program. This proposal, reflecting Europe's liberal individualist approach, shows that both the understanding of migrants' adaptation to society as individuals is adopted and the condition of completing integration programs is presented as a prerequisite for choosing a place of residence (Güner, 2007).

This action plan emphasized that integration projects for refugees and asylum-seekers in Türkiye should be carried out by national and international organizations such as UNHCR, IOM and TRC, as well as non-governmental organizations (NGOs) within the framework of legislation. In this context, it is stated that UN and EU norms are the main guidelines for the integration of refugees and asylum seekers. In the action plan, it was noted that there is no harmonization system for other foreigners. At the same time, it is stated that NGOs and local administrations, especially municipalities, are the main implementers of integration. The 2006 Law No. 5543 on Settlement abolished the old Settlement Law of 1934. With the impact of Türkiye's extensive international migration and the EU harmonization process, the 2006 Law on Settlement addressed the migration issue in a broader perspective and regulated the rights and obligations of those resettled. Although the 2005 Asylum Action Plan addressed the issue of integration of migrants within a framework limited to refugees and asylum seekers, the 2006 Law on Settlement still regulates international migration regulations in terms of resettlement, rights and obligations (Kantas Yılmaz and Ergül, 2021).

Although the Ninth Development Plan covers the years 2007-2013, it naturally does not include the issue of migration and its effects since the plan was adopted in 2006, despite the fact that it covers the years in which there was an intense wave of migration from Syria to Türkiye in 2011. The Plan emphasizes the development of a culture of competitiveness, with a

focus on enhancing Türkiye's economic growth and efficiency, and emphasizes the continuity of these efforts. In general, until 2011, when the mass Syrian migration took place, the issue of international migration was not comprehensively addressed in planning processes in Türkiye and policies were not formulated to address it (Aktel and Kaygısız, 2018).

Türkiye has adopted an open-door policy towards former Ottoman subjects who forcibly migrated from Syria to Türkiye. This is a re-implementation of a policy previously adopted in the 1930s, 1950s, 1980s and 1990s for mass migrants from the former Ottoman sphere of influence. Beginning in April 2011 and constituting the latest wave of mass migration, the Syrian migration has been a major impetus for Türkiye to establish an institutionalized management system and legislation for international migrants. This has emerged as a decisive factor in shaping Türkiye's international migration policy (Mollaalıođlu, 2020). The problem of Syrian refugees who were forced to flee their country and seek asylum in Türkiye was initially treated as a disaster. Therefore, with the Regulation on Disaster and Emergency Management Centers published in the Official Gazette dated 19 February 2011 and numbered 2011/1377, asylum and population movements were recognized as disasters and emergencies. In this case, the Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD) is authorized for response and coordination at national level. Furthermore, the Temporary Protection Regulation No. 29153 also assigned AFAD the responsibility for the provision of services to foreigners sheltering in camps. However, over time, it has become clear that Türkiye lacks a comprehensive migration management system and institutional structure (Polat, 2021). In this context, with the enactment of the Law on Foreigners and International Protection No. 6458 dated April 4, 2013, the Directorate General of Migration Management was established as a first step. Subsequently, firstly in 2015, the procedures related to foreigners were carried out by the Security Directorate, and then in 2018, the Syrian migrant camps under the responsibility of AFAD were transferred to the Directorate General of Migration Management (DGMM). These steps aimed to create the necessary administrative structure for an effective migration and asylum management system (Yılmaz, 2006).

The enactment of Law No. 6458, Türkiye's first comprehensive international migration law, has set the legal framework for the rights of migrants who are "registered" in Türkiye, despite the lifting of the "European" restriction in the Geneva Convention, and has been recognized as an important step towards establishing an established international migration policy (Özer, 2015). This law has also been an important achievement in terms of preventing the arbitrary return of foreigners. In addition, the rights of individuals seeking international protection have been legally protected by this law. In other words, the rights of migrants and refugees have been put into a legal framework in line with international standards. The Temporary Protection Regulation also defined the status of "temporary protection" in addition to "refugee" and "asylum-seeker" statuses, and in this context, Syrian migrants were placed under "temporary protection" status (Aktel & Kaygısız, 2018).

The Directorate General of Migration Management has assumed a major role in determining Türkiye's international migration policy. In this context, the Migration Policies Board, which aims to formulate Türkiye's migration policies and strategies and monitor their implementation, was established within the Directorate General of Migration Management. Thanks to this step, Türkiye has adopted an approach that addresses the problem of international migrants not only as a matter of settlement (shelter), but also as a multifaceted issue such as education, health, security, legal support, harmonization, etc. within an institutional framework and has started to formulate policies in these areas. In particular, socio-cultural cohesion is considered as one of the priority areas by the Directorate General of Migration Management (Parlak, 2015). In this way, Türkiye is adopting a more comprehensive and coordinated

approach in the field of international migration management and trying to create a policy framework in line with international standards.

The Tenth Five-Year Development Plan of the Ministry of Development of the Republic of Türkiye, covering the period 2014-2018, states that Türkiye's structure on migration has been strengthened by the country's opening up policies and economic developments. During this period, issues such as monitoring and tracking foreign migrants arriving in Türkiye, illegal migrants arriving illegally and migrants in transit were addressed. The Plan identified that due to both internal and external migration, cities have experienced population accumulation, which has led to problems in areas such as infrastructure, income distribution and public order. Therefore, it is proposed to focus on the renewal of existing structures in urban areas and legal regulations in areas such as spatial planning and urban transformation. This approach aimed to address the migrant problem in the context of urbanization in addition to its social, cultural, economic and security dimensions. Moreover, the issue of integration was addressed not only to the needs of migrants but also to the needs of individuals from different strata such as children, youth and women. In this way, the scope of the international migrant problem has expanded and the policy-making process has become more multidimensional and layered (Polat, 2021).

RESULTS

Türkiye has seen urban areas become the main settlement areas for migrants, especially with the wave of mass Syrian migration. At first, the Syrian population rapidly increased in Kilis, Gaziantep, Mardin, Hatay, and Gaziantep, which are located close to the Syrian border and inhabited by local Arab populations. According to 2021 data, especially in cities such as Gaziantep and Kilis, the proportion of the Syrian population relative to the local population is estimated at 21.78% and 20.32%, respectively, making them the third and fourth provinces with the highest Syrian migrant populations in Türkiye. Research shows that urban problems such as housing and infrastructure are particularly acute in metropolitan areas such as Gaziantep and Şanlıurfa. In these regions, the international migrant problem tends to intertwine with pre-existing urban problems to create an urbanization crisis. As these cities are close to border areas, the problem of international migrants adds to the existing urban problems and these problems turn into urbanization problems over time. Migrants in these cities also tend to gravitate towards larger cities such as Antakya, Mersin, Antalya, Izmir and Istanbul, where job opportunities are more plentiful and living costs are lower. In medium-sized cities, the number of Syrian migrants is generally lower. This may lead to a concentration of migrant populations in metropolitan cities, and the integration problems caused by migration may be felt more acutely in metropolitan cities. Therefore, in the medium and long term, it is necessary to develop policies that approach the adaptation problems of Syrian migrants in a more comprehensive manner and in which local and civilian stakeholders assume responsibility alongside the central government (Kayan, 2013).

In 2011 and beyond, Türkiye took the first steps towards establishing an institutional structure for international migrants. In this period, legal arrangements were put in place to establish not only resettlement but also more comprehensive policies such as education, health, employment, security and civic participation to ensure social cohesion. This process addressed an area not covered by international migration policies dating back to the 1920s, namely the harmonization of migrants, put it into a legal framework, and addressed it with an approach to manage it by involving stakeholders under the leadership of the Directorate General of Migration Management. In line with this approach, projects have been implemented at local, national and international levels in cooperation with the public and civil society. In particular, work has been carried out on the economic, socio-cultural and political adaptation of Syrian migrants. In this context, international migration policies for Syrians under temporary

protection have included important regulations and practices in areas such as education, health, employment, shelter, settlement and socio-cultural cohesion. Thanks to these policies, important steps have been taken for the integration and social cohesion of migrants and a multidimensional approach has been adopted (Polat, 2021).

REFERENCES

- Abadan-Unat, N. (2002). Bitmeyen göç: Konuk işçilikten ulus-ötesi yurttaşlığa (Vol. 1). İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Ağanoğlu, H. Y. (2017). Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Balkanların Makus Talihi: Göç. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık.
- Aktel, M. ve Kaygısız, Ü. (2018). Türkiye'de Göç Yönetimi. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 23(2): 579-604.
- Arslan, Z. (Ed.) (2022). 19. Yüzyıldan Günümüze Türkiye'ye Yapılan Göçler, Göçmenlik ve Sosyal Uyum. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Başkanlığı Yayınları.
- Baklacioğlu, N. Ö. (2010). Dış Politika ve Göç, Yugoslavya'dan Türkiye'ye Göçlerde Arnavutlar (1920-1990). İstanbul: Derin Yayınları, ISBN: 978-9944-250-89-4.
- Baklacioğlu, N. Ö. (2015). Yugoslavya'dan Türkiye'ye Göçlerde Sayılar, Koşullar ve Tartışmalar. Türkiye'nin Göç Tarihi: 14. Yüzyıldan 21. Yüzyıla Türkiye'ye Göçler. (Der. M.M. Erdoğan ve A. Kaya). İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, Yayın No: 507.
- Barkın, E. (2004). 1951 Tarihli Mülteciliğin Önlenmesi Sözleşmesi. Ankara Barosu Dergisi, (1), 331-360.
- Bayram, M. H. ve İzol, R. (2022). Avrupa Birliği'nin Dış Sınırlarının Yönetiminde Üçüncü Ülkelerle İş Birliği: Türkiye Örneği. Akdeniz Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi, XII(I), 15-37.
- Bozbeyoğlu, E. (2015). Mülteciler ve İnsan Hakları. Hacettepe Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Kültürel Çalışmalar Dergisi, 2(1), 60-80.
- Cengizkan, A. (2004). Mübadele Konut ve Yerleşimleri. Ankara: Arkadaş Yayıncılık.
- Çelik, Y. (2018). Türkiye'de Suriyeli Çocuklara Yönelik Uygulanan Eğitim Politikalarının İncelenmesi: Tespitler, Sorunlar ve Öneriler, (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Çiçekli, B. (2016). Yabancılar ve Mülteciler Hukuku. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Danış, A. D. (2004). Yeni Göç Hareketleri ve Türkiye. Birikim Dergisi. Sayı: 184-185, 216-224.
- Dedeoğlu, S. ve Gökmen, Ç. E. (2011). Göç ve Sosyal Dışlanma Türkiye'de Yabancı Göçmen Kadınlar. Ankara: Efil Yayınevi.
- Dost, S. (2014). Ulusal ve Uluslararası Mevzuat Çerçevesinde Ülkemizdeki Suriye'li Sığınmacıların Hukuki Durumu. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi, 4(1), 27-69.
- Erdil, B. (2019). Göç ve Mülteci Hareketlerinin Türkiye'nin Göç Politikalarına Etkileri. Bilge Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 4(2), 71-86.

- Ergüven, N. S. ve Özturanlı, B. (2013). Uluslararası Mülteci Hukuku ve Türkiye. Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi, 62(4), 1007-1061.
- Erkiral-Tavas, O. (2015). Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'ne Tam Üyelik Sürecinde Uluslararası Göç Stratejisi Yönetimi: Bir Model Önerisi. (Doktora Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- GİGM: Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü (2017). Göç İstatistikleri: Geçici Koruma, http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik3/gecici-koruma_363_378_4713
- Gün, M. ve Yüksel, S. (2021). Dünyada Göçmen Eğitimi Politikaları Bağlamında Türkiye'nin Göçmen Eğitimi Sürecinin Değerlendirilmesi ve Çözüm Önerileri. Milli Eğitim Dergisi, (Türkiye'de ve Dünyada Göçmen Eğitimi Özel sayısı), 1031-1053. <https://doi.org/10.37669/milliegitim.960056>
- Güner, C. (2007). İltica Konusunda Türkiye'nin Yol Haritası: Ulusal Eylem Plânı. AÜHFİD, 56(04), 81-109.
- İçduygu, A. (2004). Türkiye'de Kaçak Göç. İstanbul: İstanbul Ticaret Odası Yayınları.
- İçduygu, A. ve Sirkeci, İ. (1999). Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye'sinde Göç Hareketleri 75 Yılda Köylerden Şehirlere Bilanço 98. İstanbul, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları ve Tarih Vakfı Ortak Yayını.
- İçduygu, A., Erder, S. ve Gençkaya, Ö. F. (2014). Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Göç Politikası 1923-2023: Ulus Devlet Oluşumlarından Ulus Ötesi Dönüşümlere Araştırma Raporu. Koç Üniversitesi Göç Araştırmalar Merkezi.
- Kâmil, İ. (2016). Bulgaristan'dan Türkiye'ye Gerçekleşen 1950-1951 Göçünün Nedenleri. Balkan Araştırma Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2(5), 31-65.
- Kantas Yılmaz, F. ve Ergül, S. (2021). Sağlık Politikası Analizi: Göçmen Sağlığı Kapsamında Suriyeli Sığınmacılar. Sağlık ve Sosyal Refah Araştırmaları Dergisi, 3(2), 119-128.
- Karavaşin, M. (2012). Avrupa Birliği'nde Ortak Göç Politikası Oluşturma Çabaları ve Ulusal Farklılıklar Sorunu. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Karpat, K. H. ve Sönmez, A. (2003). Türkiye'de Toplumsal Dönüşüm: Kırsal Göç, Gecekondu ve Kentleşme. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Karpat, K.H. (2017). Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Etnik Yapılanma ve Göçler. Çeviren B. Tırnakçı. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 3. Baskı.
- Kayan, A. (2013). GAP Bölgesinde Kentleşmeden Doğan Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerileri. Dicle Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 2(3), 24-43.
- Kaynak, M., Yınanç, R. ve Şahin, C. (1992) Iraklı Sığınmacılar ve Türkiye. Ankara: Tanmak Yayınları.
- Kirişçi, K. (1999). Türkiye'ye Yönelik Göç Hareketlerinin Değerlendirilmesi: Bilanço: 1923-1998 Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin 75 Yılına Toplu Bakış. İstanbul: Tarih Vakıfları Yayını. 1(1), 111-121.
- Kirişçi, K. ve Karaca, S. (2015). Hoşgörü ve Çelişkiler: 1989, 1991 ve 2011'de Türkiye'ye Yönelen Kitleli Mülteci Akımları. Türkiye'nin Göç Tarihi: 14. Yüzyıldan 21. Yüzyıla Türkiye'ye Göçler. (Der. M.M. Erdoğan ve A. Kaya). İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

- Koca, M. (2002). AB Ülkelerine Göç, Mülteci ve Yabancı Uyrukluların İstihdamı. *Türk İdare Dergisi*, 97-133.
- Koçak, O. ve Gündüz, R. (2016). Avrupa Birliği Göç Politikaları ve Göçmenlerin Sosyal Olarak İçerilmelerine Etkisi. *Yalova Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(12), 66-91.
- Macar, E. (2015). Yunanistan'dan Anadolu'ya Göç: Nüfus Mübadelesi. *Türkiye'nin Göç Tarihi: 14. Yüzyıldan 21. Yüzyıla Türkiye'ye Göçler.* (Der. M.M. Erdoğan ve A. Kaya). İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, Yayın No: 507.
- Mollaalioğlu, F. N. (2020). Türkiye'den Suriye'ye Gerçekleşen Göçlerin Tarihsel Boyutu. *Çekmece İZÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(17), 1-24.
- Öksüz, H. (2000) İkili İlişkiler Çerçevesinde Balkan Ülkelerinden Türkiye'ye Göçler ve Göç Sonrası İskân Meselesi: 1923-1938. *Atatürk Dergisi*, 3(1), 169-188.
- Özdemir, G. (2023). Türkiye'de Stratejik Göç Yönetimi. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü.
- Özer, Y. (2015). Uluslararası Göç ve Yabancı Düşmanlığı. İstanbul: Derin Yayınları.
- Parlak, B. (2015). Türkiye İltica ve Göç Mevzuatının Coğrafi Kısıtlama Uygulaması Yönünden Analizi. *TESAM Akademi Dergisi*, 2(2), 65-79.
- Polat, Y. (2021). Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Göç Politikasına Tarihsel Bir Bakış. *Journal of Awareness*, 6(2), 145-160.
- Sarı, M. (2011). Atatürk Dönemi'nin İskân Politikasında İç İskâna Yönelik Çalışmalar (1923-1938). *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Cumhuriyet Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi (CTAD)*, 14, 87-113.
- Sevimli, K. A. ve Reçber, S. (2014). Avrupa Birliği'nde İşçilerin Serbest Dolaşımı ve Türk İşçilerinin Serbest Dolaşım Hakkı. *Journal of Istanbul University Law Faculty*, 72(2), 391-440.
- Şakacı, B. K. (2020). Türkiye'nin Göç ve İskân Politikaları: 1934 Tarihli 2510 Sayılı İskân Kanunu İncelemesi. *Kamu Yönetimi ve Politikaları Dergisi*, 1(3), 36-57.
- Şen Y.F. ve G. Özkurul. (2016). Türkiye – Avrupa Birliği İlişkilerinde Yeni Bir Eşik: Sığınmacı Krizi Bağlamında Bir Değerlendirme. *Göç Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(2), 86-119.
- Şen, M. (2014). Türkiye'de İç Göçlerin Neden ve Sonuç Kapsamında İncelenmesi. *Çalışma ve Toplum Ekonomi ve Hukuk Dergisi*, 1(40), 231-256.
- Şirin, N. A. (2016). Çabalar Sonuç Verecek mi? Avrupa Birliği'nin Ortak Bir Göç ve Sığınma Politikası Oluşturma Girişimleri. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 3. Baskı.
- Taneri, G. (2012). Uluslararası Hukukta Mülteci ve Sığınmacıların Geri Gönderilmemesi. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Tepealtı, F. (2019). Avrupa Birliği'ne Yönelik Türkiye Geçişli (Transit) Göç Hareketleri ve Türkiye'nin Düzensiz Göçle Mücadelesi. *Doğu Coğrafya Dergisi*, 24(41), 125-140.
- Tepealtı, F. (2020). Avrupa Birliği'nin Göç Politikaları ve Türkiye. (Doktora Tezi), İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Yazan, Y. (2016). Avrupa Birliği'nin Yasadışı Göç Politikası Türkiye Örneği Çerçevesinde İnsan Hakları Sorunsalı. *Milenyum Yayınları*.
- Yılmaz, H. (2006). Türkiye'de Mülteci Hukuku ve Uygulaması: Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerisi. *Uluslararası Göç Sempozyumu Bildirileri*. İstanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediye Başkanlığı.