

MIGRATION-DEVELOPMENT-SECURITY NEXUS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE EXTERNAL DIMENSIONS OF THE EU POLICIES

Ayşen ÜSTÜBİCİ*
Kübra ERGÜN**
Araştırma Makalesi

Abstract

This paper questions how migration-development nexus has been conceptualized on the EU policymaking agenda since the early 2000s. To explore this question, this paper focuses on documents laying out Union's strategy for the external dimensions of the EU migration policy. The empirical evidence is gathered from the content analysis of Council Conclusions, Commission's Communications and Reports, and the secondary literature on external dimensions of the EU migration policy. Our study finds that the already existing securitized approach to migration-development nexus prevailed after 2015, hollowing out the relation between migration and development with an increasingly narrower focus on development and the new narrative of 'saving lives'. We conclude that the securitization of migration underpins the current ambivalent approach to the migration-development nexus in the EU policy-making context.

Keywords: *European Union, External Dimension of Migration Policy, Development, Securitization*

* Assist. Prof., Koç University, Department of International Relations / Department of Sociology, E-posta: austubici@ku.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1498-0025

** MA Student, Koç University, Graduate School of Social Sciences & Humanities, Department of International Relations, E-posta: kergun19@ku.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9365-5150.

Makalenin Gönderilme Tarihi: 25/07/2020 Kabul Edilme Tarihi: 18/11/2020

AB Politikalarının Dış Boyutları Bağlamında Göç-Kalkınma-Güvenlik İlişkisi

Öz

Bu çalışma, göç-kalkınma ilişkisinin 2000'li yılların başından bu yana Avrupa Birliği (AB) politikalarında nasıl kurulduğunu sorgulamaktadır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda bu makale, AB göç politikasının dış boyutları stratejisini ortaya koyan belgelere odaklanmaktadır. Ampirik veriler; Avrupa Konseyi sonuçları, AB Komisyonunun tebliğ ve raporlarının içerik analizinden ve AB göç politikasının dış boyutları hakkındaki ikincil literatürden elde edilmiştir. Çalışmamız, göç-kalkınma ilişkisine dair 2015 öncesi de var olan güvenikleştirilmiş yaklaşımın 2015 sonrası, dar bir kalkınma anlayışı ve bu dönemde ortaya çıkan 'hayat kurtarma' anlatısı ile birlikte, daha çok öne çıktığını ortaya koyar. Göçün güvenikleştirilmesinin, AB politika oluşturma bağlamında göç-kalkınma ilişkisine yönelik mevcut ikircikli yaklaşımın temelini oluşturduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Avrupa Birliği, Göç Politikasının Dış Boyutu, Kalkınma, Güvenikleştirme*

Introduction

Recent debates on the international migration in Europe have a double-edge character: On the one hand, there are persistent concerns to keep the restrictive measures on immigration as it is still seen as a disturbing factor for the labor market and social cohesion in the receiving countries.¹ On the other hand, an emerging interest exists to have a more liberal, concerned with the human rights policy towards “well-managed” immigration as it is also viewed as a remedy for the shrinking of the population in the continent.² What is more debatable, however is that not only those restrictive approaches on immigration still keep their strong positions, but they are also reflected in the external dimensions of the EU migration policy, which constitutes the main dilemma addressed in this paper. In other words, since 1999 Tampere Conclusions, the external dimensions of the EU migration

¹ Christina Boswell, “Migration in Europe - International Organization for Migration,” accessed July 17, 2020, [\(https://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/policy_and_research/gcim/rs/RS4.pdf\)](https://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/policy_and_research/gcim/rs/RS4.pdf).(2005), 1-28.

² Patrick Weil, “Towards a Coherent Policy of Co-Development,” *International Migration* 40, no. 3 (2002): pp. 41-55, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2435.00196>; Martin, Philip L., Susan Forbes Martin, and Patrick Weil. *Managing migration: The promise of cooperation*. (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006).

policy are highly dominated by the idea of co-operation and burden-sharing with third countries in the realm of asylum and irregular migration. However, the securitization approach to migration is so dominant in the EU policy-making that the revival of discussions on development-migration nexus in the form of co-development in the 1990s³ is subordinated to security-based approaches to co-ordination with the third countries. Particularly since the 2015 migration ‘crisis’, the relationship between migration and development has been further hollowed out with the subordination of development cooperation to humanitarian causes in order to curb irregular migration flows.

Acknowledging the dominance of the coercive approaches to migration characterized by strict admission policies, tight border control and forced return policies, the paper questions the status of the non-securitized, namely co-development based approaches within the external dimensions of the EU’s migration policy. To this end, the paper makes an analytical distinction between preventive approaches and co-development as different aspects of the migration-development nexus. While the former focuses on development assistance to developing and migrant-sending countries to improve incentives so as to address the root causes of migration⁴, the latter emphasizes the potential played by immigration in the development of sending regions.⁵ More specifically, co-development refers to deepening cooperation where host and home countries co-manage migratory flows to maximize economic and social gain from migration and undertake projects in migrants’ countries of origin.⁶ The underlying assumption of this approach is that migration would directly contribute to the development of sending countries –through remittances, migrants’ investments- and indirectly –through relief on unemployment, education and skills of return migrants acquired in the host country-.⁷

³ Jonathan Chaloff. *Co-development-a myth or a workable policy approach*. (Rome, Centro Studi di Politica Internazionale, 2005); Paul Verhaeghe, “Coherence between Migration and Development Policies,” in *European Social Watch Report 2009: Migrants in Europe as Development Actors Between Hope and Vulnerability*, ed. Simon Stocker (Brussels: Eurostep, 2009), pp. 8-10; Hein de Haas, “Migration and Development: A Theoretical Perspective,” *International Migration Review* 44, no. 1 (2010): pp. 227-264, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2009.00804.x>.

⁴ Christina Boswell, “The ‘External Dimension’ of EU Immigration and Asylum Policy,” *International Affairs* 79, no. 3 (2003): pp. 619-638, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.00326>.

⁵ Chaloff. *Co-development-a myth*

⁶ Meng-Hsuan Chou, “EU and the Migration-Development Nexus: What Prospects for EUWide Policies?” (Working paper, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, 2006), 4.

⁷ Chaloff. *Co-development-a myth*

Although manipulating development assistance is presented as a more humanitarian way of stopping migration than repressive methods⁸, the problem with preventive approach lies in its lack of credibility. There is evidence that some degree of development would enhance economic migration as suggested by the migration hump theory.⁹ Furthermore, the curtailing of migration is not in the best interest of the EU (although political discourse sounds like it is). It is widely suggested that the demographic features of the EU require the continuous recruitment of migrant labor.¹⁰

The aim of this paper is threefold. One main purpose is to situate the current discussion on the migration-development nexus within the changing paradigms of international migration and development throughout the second half of the 20th century. Secondly, the paper draws attention to the revival of discussions on development-migration nexus but this time, within a dominant securitization discourse. After an overview of the changes occurred in migration policies of the EU, the article provides a detailed discussion on the diverging approaches particularly concerning the inclusion of development approach within the discussions of the EU common migration policy since 1999. Thirdly, the paper underscores the conflicting nature of these diverging discourses on international migration within the EU which are apparent in the implementation of the EU policy tools in its neighboring context, such as the European Union Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, the Turkey -EU Statement of March 2016 followed by the EU Facility for Refugees in Turkey. Acknowledging that the co-development approach today widely differs from the developmentalist paradigm of the 1950s, we argue that the recent ambivalent approach to the migration-development nexus in the EU policy-making underpinned the ongoing securitization of migration.

Methodologically, we use content analysis to examine key policy documents regarding the external dimensions of the EU migration policy and the migration-development nexus.¹¹ More specifically, we utilize thematic analysis by identifying the prevalent patterns of themes in the selected policy documents. The analyses in this paper focus on policy documents, mainly the conclusions of Council Summits since 1999 and Communications by the European Commission (EC) following these summits. In our analysis, the

⁸ Christina Boswell, *European Migration Policies in Flux: Changing Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 106.

⁹ Boswell, *European Migration Policies*, 113-114; de Haas, "Migration and Development", 239.

¹⁰ Boswell, "Migration in Europe"

¹¹ See Appendix.

emphasis is deliberately put on the EC over the Parliament because it is suggested that the EC has become the main institution to develop a nuanced and comprehensive approach to the management of migration, free from the electoral concerns of the political parties.¹² Hence, we purposefully leave out the Parliament or Member State level documents.

I. Migration-Development-Security in the EU Context: A Paradigmatic Discussion

In the 1950s and 1960s, Western European countries welcomed international migration as immigrants were contributing to their boosting post-war economies, with bilateral labor agreements resulting in the arrival of millions of guest workers. As Boswell suggests, in the late 1950s and 1960s, a technocratic approach to migration prevailed, migration was mainly perceived as the economic decision to respond to structural demographic and labor market needs.¹³ In the 1960s, the developmentalist paradigm was dominating the international politics; the migration-development nexus in the academic circles and a genuine policy of cooperation in the policy circles were almost unquestionably embraced.¹⁴ Accordingly, migrant schemes of the European countries envisaged short-term recruitment programs where individual workers would turn back to their countries having gained skills and monetary resources.¹⁵ At that time, a win-win approach was the underlying logic of the bilateral labor agreements. Even though states attempted to regulate the situation of migrants, the “illegal”¹⁶ status of some migrants was not a major political concern, as it is today.¹⁷

In the 1970s, the influx of labor migrants into Western Europe began to decline due to economic stagnation caused by the oil crisis of 1973 and rising public dissent over immigration.¹⁸ However, although labor migration receiving countries stopped their recruitment policies, throughout the 1970s,

¹² Boswell, *European Migration Policies*, 117.

¹³ Boswell, *European Migration Policies*, 9-10.

¹⁴ de Haas, “Migration and Development”, 227; Papagianni, Georgia. *Institutional and Policy Dynamics of E.U. Migration Law*. (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2006), 21.

¹⁵ Ahmet İçduygu, *Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri Bağlamında Uluslararası Göç Tartışmaları*, TÜSİAD Yayınları, No. 427, İstanbul, 2006.

¹⁶ “Illegal migration” is a terminology used in the EU documents. We use it in quotation marks to signal that it is the terminology as used by the EU documents rather than preferred by the authors.

¹⁷ Jef Huysmans. *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*. London: Routledge, 2006, 65.

¹⁸ Boswell, *European Migration Policies*.

the immigration into Western Europe continued in the form of family reunifications and through the asylum-seeking track.¹⁹ This period coincided with the decline of the developmentalist paradigm and the increase in the migration around the world, and the diversification of the migration and asylum movements towards Europe. Given the increasing integration of the EU countries towards the internal market, with the establishment of the Single Market in 1986, the protection of the EU borders became a highly addressed topic on the EU agenda, implying securitization of the international migration and increasing conceptualizations of migrants in the EU countries as existential threats.²⁰

More than one single factor contributed to the further securitization of the migration in the context of the EU. Securitization of migration at the EU level cannot be separated from the previous position of member states whereby from the 1980s immigration was increasingly perceived as a public concern in Germany, France, UK, Italy.²¹ Plus, the decline of the welfare state provisions after the 1980s, the fear of asylum influx in the European countries with the end of the Cold War, terrorist attacks in New York in 2001 and Madrid in 2004 contributed to this securitization process. Most recently, the 2015 migration ‘crisis’ and the rise of far-right parties using anti-immigrant rhetoric in member states are among the factors fueling the already existing securitized approach.²² In 2015, not only the number of asylum applications reached its historical record in the EU but also the number of deaths during attempts to enter the EU territories skyrocketed.²³ This was initially perceived as a wakeup call to save lives and to stop deaths during dangerous migrant journeys. However, most of the precautions proposed was focused on stricter border controls and on regulating relations with third country around this logic.

¹⁹ Henrik Olesen, “Migration, Return, and Development: An Institutional Perspective,” *International Migration* 40, no. 5 (2002): pp. 125-150, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2435.00214>, 127.

²⁰ Huysmans, *The Politics of Insecurity*

²¹ In the UK, immigration was a popular concern from the outset because of the UK's sensible relations with its colonies and Commonwealth; Boswell, *European Migration Policies*, 13.

²² i.e. Susana Ferreira. "From Narratives to Perceptions in the Securitisation of the Migratory Crisis in Europe." *E-International Relations* (2018); Gabriella Lazaridis and Dimitris Skleparis. "Securitization of migration and the far right: the case of Greek security professionals." *International Migration* 54, no.2 (2016): pp. 176-192.

²³ IOM. (2016), ‘Dangerous journeys - international migration increasingly unsafe in 2016’, (Geneva).

As Huysmans rightly argues, the securitization of the internal market is highly connected to securitization of migration and the identity building process in the EU.²⁴ These policy implications are also apparent in the EU policy discussions, especially after the 1990s. The difficulty of stopping irregular migration, on the one hand led to proposals towards further securitization of the external borders of the EU. This area of cooperation with third countries is known as External Dimensions of Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) in the EU. Boswell distinguishes two different approaches: (1) externalization of traditional tools of migration control and (2) preventive approach to change determinants of migration.²⁵ The debates concerning addressing the root causes of migration gained currency within the EU and international bodies in the early-1990s.²⁶ In the eyes of human rights and refugee rights advocates, addressing the root causes is conceptualized as a more humanitarian way of managing international migration.²⁷ Such policies entail channeling development assistance to migrant-sending countries to improve incentives such as employment opportunities for people to stay in their country of origin.

According to Scipioni, the emergence of the 2015 migration ‘crisis’ was an integral part of the European integration that has been evolving through incomplete agreements.²⁸ The Schengen Convention of 1990 had concretized EU’s ‘external borders’ by abolishing internal border controls and laying down measures such as “a common visa policy, the creation of databases systems, and rules for asylum applications”.²⁹ Since any person who cross the Schengen borders is free to move any other Schengen country, the absence of internal border controls also created the need of cooperation for and strengthening of external borders (i.e. the Schengen Information System, the Visa Information System, or Frontex, operating since 2005 to coordinate member states’ external border controls).³⁰ However, as Scipioni rightly

²⁴ Huysmans, *The Politics of Insecurity*

²⁵ Boswell, “The ‘External Dimension’,” 619.

²⁶ Jørgen Carling and Cathrine Talleraas. “Root causes and drivers of migration.” *Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO)* (2016): pp. 1-44, 6; Boswell, *European Migration Policies*, 112.

²⁷ Boswell, *European Migration Policies*, 113.

²⁸ Marco Scipioni. “Failing forward in EU migration policy? EU integration after the 2015 asylum and migration crisis”, *Journal of European Public Policy* 25, no.9 (2018): pp. 1357-1375, DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2017.1325920

²⁹ Lena Karamanidou and Bernd Kasperek. "Border Management and Migration Control in the European Union." *Working Paper*. (2018),

³⁰ James Hampshire. European migration governance since the Lisbon treaty: introduction to the special issue, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42, no.4 (2016): pp. 537-553, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2015.1103033, 538-9

argues, the Union suffers from “a combination of weak monitoring, lack of policy harmonization, low solidarity, and absence of central institutions” in practice with regards to migration.³¹ The crisis was in fact brought about by these factors rather than the exponential increase in migration inflows.³² In any case, the 2015 migration ‘crisis’ undoubtedly deepened securitization of migration.

Despite the existence of alternative views on migration, the security concerns have been determining most of the migration policies including its external aspects concerning cooperation with the third countries. In this context, the role played by the development discourse in the EU policies has so far been only marginally discussed in the literature.³³ Therefore, the repercussions of the global revival of the migration for development nexus in the 1990s³⁴ in the EU context requires closer investigation not only because of the existence of diverging empirical evidence and theoretical positions to migration-development nexus³⁵, but also because today migration-development nexus, particularly in the EU context, overlaps with intensive securitization of migration. The discursive and policy outcomes of this ambivalent interaction in the EU policy making context are worth scrutinizing.

II. Development-Based Approaches to Migration in the EU since 1999

Focusing on key policy realms dealing with the migration in the EU context, namely external dimensions of the JHA, Development Policy and the European Neighborhood Policy³⁶, this section analyzes policy documents by the EU, to assess the developments in the external dimensions of the EU migration policy. We find that despite the revival of discussions on the migration-development nexus in the late 1990s, development-based approaches were subordinated to security concerns and did not go beyond the preventive tools to encompass a co-development approach. Furthermore, this securitized approach to migration-development nexus became much more pronounced after the 2015 migration crisis.

³¹ Scipioni, “Failing forward”, 1358.

³² Scipioni, “Failing forward”

³³ Boswell, “The ‘External Dimension’”; Chou, “EU and the Migration-Development”; Martin et al., *Managing migration*

³⁴ de Haas, “Migration and Development”; Martin et al., *Managing migration*

³⁵ Hein de Haas, “Turning the Tide? Why ‘Development Instead of Migration’ Policies Are Bound to Fail” (IMI Working Papers 2006, 2006); David Ellerman, “Labour Migration: A Developmental Path or a Low-Level Trap?,” *Development in Practice* 15, no. 5 (2005): pp. 617-630, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520500128646>.

³⁶ Papagianni, *Institutional and Policy Dynamics*, 186.

It was not until 1999 Tampere European Council Presidency Conclusions that the elements for a common EU immigration policy were embarked.³⁷ Tampere Conclusions set precise targets for instituting required agreements and legislation to inaugurate a common immigration policy, implying the ‘communitarisation’ of national immigration policies.³⁸ Regarding the external dimensions of migration policy, the need for further cooperation with the third countries and stronger external action characterized JHA policy suggestions.³⁹ A seemingly non-securitized, preventive approach to migration was for the first time put forward at the Council level with an emphasis on co-development without explaining what the latter would include:

“The European Union needs a comprehensive approach to migration addressing political, human rights and development issues in countries and regions of origin and transit. This requires combating poverty, improving living conditions and job opportunities, preventing conflicts and consolidating democratic states and ensuring respect for human rights, in particular rights of minorities, women and children. To that end, the Union as well as Member States are invited to contribute, within their respective competence under the Treaties, to a greater coherence of internal and external policies of the Union. Partnership with third countries concerned will also be a key element for the success of such a policy, with a view to promoting co-development.”⁴⁰

Despite progressive steps taken at Tampere, critical researchers were concerned that the above quote can be read as if the development aid and cooperation are made conditional upon the collaboration of countries of origin and transit in taking measures of controlling migration flows in line with the EU interest.⁴¹

As a continuation of earlier restrictive approaches, Tampere Conclusions had also drawn attention to the interest of the EU in stopping “illegal migration” ironically in the same sentence addressing asylum seekers as those in need of freedom. This double emphasis on protection on

³⁷ See *Tampere European Council 15 and 16 October 1999 - Presidency conclusions*, (October 16, 1999) [hereinafter Tampere Conclusions]

³⁸ Geddes, *The Politics of Migration*, 137.

³⁹ Papagianni, *Institutional and Policy Dynamics*, 180.

⁴⁰ Tampere Conclusions, supra note 31.

⁴¹ See for instance, Verhaeghe, “Coherence between Migration,” 8; Aderanti Adepoju, Femke Van Noorloos, and Annelies Zoomers, “Europe’s Migration Agreements with Migrant-Sending Countries in the Global South: A Critical Review,” *International Migration* 48, no. 3 (2009): pp. 42-75, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2009.00529.x>.

the one hand, stopping “illegal migration”, on the other hand, continued in the Commission Communication on migration in 2000 and one year later, the communication on illegal migration in 2001. These are among the first documents on the subject⁴² reminding the priority of combatting against illegal migration.⁴³ The former calls for dialogue amongst host, home, and sending countries for a comprehensive approach to migration.⁴⁴ However, it is implied that increasing means for legal migration can only be discussed after countries collaborate to fight “illegal migration”. Plus, rather than a vision of co-development, the Communication takes labor market needs of the EU as the priority, without referring to the needs and capabilities of third countries.

Gathered in the aftermath of 9/11, in Laeken the EC did not touch upon co-development but prioritized further protection of the EU borders.⁴⁵ More attention has been put to securing the external borders of the EU as a core instrument to fight terrorism and “illegal migration”.⁴⁶ The Conclusions also refers to African Development and the Council’s solidarity for the African development without mentioning the role attributed to migration in it.⁴⁷

Three years after Tampere, when the European leaders met in Seville, they were still enthusiastic about pursuing a common immigration policy through combating “illegal migration”, which was a move largely to summon their populist electoral breakthroughs in various European elections.⁴⁸ The Council in Seville Summit underlined that for any sort of cooperation and association between third countries and the EU or the EC;

⁴² Papagianni, *Institutional and Policy Dynamics*, 240

⁴³ It is important to note that 2001 Communication on “illegal migration” was one of the rare documents analyzed for this research, using the wording “irregular migration”. The latter is preferably by human rights activist and NGOs to refer to the fact the existence of humans cannot be “illegal” per se. See *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament “On a Community Policy on Illegal Migration”*, COM(2001) 672 final (November 15, 2001) [hereinafter COM(2001) 672]

⁴⁴ See *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament “On a Community Immigration Policy”*, COM(2000) 757 final, (November 22, 2000) [hereinafter COM(2000) 757], 11.

⁴⁵ See *European Council Presidency Conclusions, Laeken, 14-15 December 2001, Annex I: Laeken Declaration on the Future of the European Union*, (December 15, 2001) [hereinafter Laeken Conclusions]; Huysmans, *The Politics of Insecurity*, 68.

⁴⁶ Verhaeghe, “Coherence between Migration,” 8.

⁴⁷ Laeken Conclusions, supra note 39, 14.

⁴⁸ See *European Council Presidency Conclusions, Seville, 21-22 June 2002*, (June 22, 2002) [hereinafter Seville Conclusions]; Virginie Guiraudon, “The Constitution of a European Immigration Policy Domain: a Political Sociology Approach,” *Journal of European Public Policy* 10, no. 2 (2003): pp. 263-282, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350176032000059035>.

the willingness of the third country for joint management of migration is required.⁴⁹ Thus, agreements related to development and trade between the EU and third countries would depend on the third country's acceptance to share the EU's burden in managing the irregular migration. Seville conclusions stated that future agreement with third countries should include "a clause on joint management of migration flows and on compulsory readmission in the event of illegal immigration"⁵⁰

The Communication issued in 2002 on development and migration (the first attempt to address migration-development nexus) drew attention to driving forces behind migration. 2002 Communication identifies three common objectives of the Member States.⁵¹ These are forced and voluntary return policies, management of external borders and externalization of asylum and migration policies to third countries. The development is merely mentioned in these proposals while the proposed policy tools mainly referred to the realm of security. Reiterating the Conclusions in Seville, the Communication further suggests that association and cooperation agreements with third countries should include a clause on migration modeled after Article 13 of the Cotonou Agreement.⁵² In several articles, rather than a development concern, the Communication maintains a security concern recommending that technical and financial assistance to third countries should be used to share the burden of asylum and illegal migration with the EU.⁵³

Readmission agreements based on forced return of illegal migrants are identified in the Seville Summit and later in the Hague Programme as the main policy instrument in the externalization of the EU migration policy.⁵⁴ They constitute a securitized approach to migration *par excellence* emphasizing police cooperation and reinforced border control.⁵⁵ While the

⁴⁹ Boswell, *European Migration Policies*, 106.

⁵⁰ Seville Conclusions, *supra* note 42, 8

⁵¹ See *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament "Integrating Migration Issues in the European Union's Relations with Third Countries"*, COM(2002) 703 final, (December 3, 2002) [hereinafter COM(2002) 703]

⁵² COM(2002) 703, *supra* note 45, 25.

⁵³ COM(2002) 703, *supra* note 45, 33. It is important to note refugees are seen as "burden" rather than a responsibility stemming from the international law.

⁵⁴ See *The Hague Programme: strengthening freedom, security and justice in the European Union*, (March 3, 2005) [hereinafter Hague Programme]; Papagianni, *Institutional and Policy Dynamics*, 181.

⁵⁵ Chou, "EU and the Migration-Development"; Jean-Pierre Cassarino. "Informalising readmission agreements in the EU neighbourhood." *The International Spectator* 42, no.2 (2007): pp.179-96, 191.

EU differentiates technical aid for the implementation of the readmission from the development aid, there are cases where the emphasis on migration-development nexus is tied to the signing of the readmission agreement, particularly in the African context.⁵⁶ Bilateral agreements provide opportunities for labor migration with the condition that countries will coordinate in the management of borders and of migration in general. In the absence of membership prospect in the near future, less powerful countries signing readmission agreements may be given incentives such as “special trade concessions, the accession to a regional trading bloc, preferential entry quotas for economic migrants, technical cooperation, increased development aid and visa facilitations”.⁵⁷

In 2004, the Council launched the Hague Programme that sets the objectives for strengthening freedom, security, and justice in the EU for the period 2005-2010.⁵⁸ As the successor of Tampere, Hague Programme claims to endorse a comprehensive approach to migration.⁵⁹ However, the Conclusions mainly expect third countries to cooperate in the context of readmissions and border controls. In this sense, financial aids were directed to strengthening the borders and asylum practices of third countries rather than “addressing the root causes” or channeled to development projects.⁶⁰

In this context, a second communication on migration and development was released in 2005.⁶¹ In this communication, other aspects of international migration such as remittances, circular migration, and brain drain were addressed more thoroughly than 2002 Communication on migration and development.⁶² There, the highlighted policy tools for a well-managed international labor migration are measures to facilitate the transfer of migrants’ remittances, to turn brain drain into brain gain, to enhance the capacity of transnational migrant communities, to strengthen development aspects of south-south migration.⁶³

⁵⁶ Adepoju et al., *Europe’s Migration Agreements*

⁵⁷ Cassarino, “Informalising readmission agreements,” 183.

⁵⁸ Hague Programme, supra note 48.

⁵⁹ Hague Programme, supra note 48, 23.

⁶⁰ Verhaeghe, “Coherence between Migration,” 9; Hague Programme, supra note 48, 23.

⁶¹ See *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions “Migration and Development: Some concrete orientations”*, COM(2005) 390 final, (September 1, 2005) [hereinafter COM(2005) 390]

⁶² Chou, “EU and the Migration-Development”; Papagianni, *Institutional and Policy Dynamics*, 185; COM(2002) 703, supra note 45; COM(2005) 390, supra note 55.

⁶³ COM(2005) 390, supra note 55, 15.

However, the Communication on migration-development nexus put the emphasis on return migration. The discussions on circular and temporal migration were sidelined in order not to encourage migration from developing countries. For instance, in the case of skilled migration, rather than emphasizing the need for skilled migrant workers in the EU, the focus is put on the impact of the loss of skills for developing countries without mentioning the problem of surplus labor or underemployment in these countries.⁶⁴ Another suggestion is related to the recruitment of local skilled work in projects funded by the European Development Fund.⁶⁵ These instances show that a different perspective on co-development than it was the case in the mid-20th century is embraced by the EU today. In this sense, preventive approaches are very much in line with security-based approaches to migration.

2005 Green Paper framed the admission of economic migrants as the cornerstone of any immigration policy.⁶⁶ Another Communication launched at the end of 2005 is closer to embrace a co-development approach by referring to controlled labor migration as a response to reciprocal needs of member states and third countries.⁶⁷ The Communication has a more comprehensive approach linking “illegal migration” and the volume of informal sector in certain member states, and making explicit that the latter functions as “a clear ‘pull factor’ for illegal immigration” [emphasis in the original].⁶⁸

Unlike 2002 Communication on migration and development, 2005 Communication makes concrete legal proposals concerning the conditions of admissions of highly skilled and seasonal workers.⁶⁹ While the Directive on highly skilled workers (known as the Blue Card Directive) was issued in May 2009, a draft Directive on seasonal workers was proposed in October 2010.⁷⁰ Moreover, to curtail informal employment of migrants, another

⁶⁴ COM(2005) 390, supra note 55, 32-33.

⁶⁵ COM(2005) 390, supra note 55, 34.

⁶⁶ See Green Paper “On an EU approach to managing economic migration” (presented by the Commission), COM(2004) 811 final, (January 11, 2005) [hereinafter COM(2004) 811]

⁶⁷ See Communication from the Commission “Policy Plan on Legal Migration {SEC(2005)1680}”, COM(2005) 669 final, (December 21, 2005) [hereinafter COM(2005) 669], 10.

⁶⁸ COM(2005) 669, supra note 61, 4.

⁶⁹ COM(2005) 669, supra note 61, 7.

⁷⁰ Council Directive 2009/50/EC of 25 May 2009 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment [hereinafter Blue Card Directive]; Draft Directive on the conditions of entry and residence of third country nationals for the purposes of seasonal employment [hereinafter COM (2010) 379].

Directive envisaging sanctions against employers recruiting undocumented migrants was issued June 2009.⁷¹ Furthermore, the draft Directive on seasonal work envisages incentives such as facilitations for re-entry in order to ensure circular labor migration.⁷² Here, there is a contradiction between action plans for hiring “legal” seasonal work, as other measures are simultaneously taken to deport the existing workforce through readmission agreements. Why does the EU want to get rid of the existing workforce if it actually needs them? Here, we believe that the contradiction stems from the EU's preference (both Member States and the Commission) to refrain from any utterance which would be perceived as encouraging irregular migration. Although the Commission Communication 2007 adhered to the UN position on migration and development, EU's legislative tools on legal migration until recently remained limited to the realm of the circulation of students and scientists of the third countries.⁷³

2008 European Pact on Immigration and asylum represents the commitments of the EU member states for a common migration and asylum policy.⁷⁴ It also provided a ground for the Stockholm Programme promising solidarity in the control of borders, but also in the realm of legal migration.⁷⁵ Regarding the external dimensions, the document is committed that “[t]he EU will promote the synergies between migration and development, to make migration a positive factor for development.”⁷⁶

In the Stockholm Programme, the Council underscores the importance of increased coherence between migration policy, foreign and development policy,⁷⁷ highlights mobility partnership taking into account interests and needs of the third countries as an important policy instrument.⁷⁸ Unlike

⁷¹ Directive 2009/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009 providing for minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals

⁷² COM (2010) 379, supra note 64.

⁷³ See *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions “On circular migration and mobility partnerships between the European Union and third countries”* COM(2007) 248 final, (May 16, 2007) [hereinafter COM(2007) 248], 2; Chou, “EU and the Migration-Development,” 14.

⁷⁴ See *European Pact on Migration and Asylum (13189/08)*, (September 24, 2008) [hereinafter European Pact on Migration and Asylum]; Verhaeghe, “Coherence between Migration,” 9.

⁷⁵ European Pact on Migration and Asylum, supra note 69, 2.

⁷⁶ European Pact on Migration and Asylum, supra note 69, 2.

⁷⁷ See *The Stockholm Programme – An open and secure Europe serving and protecting the citizens*, (December 2, 2009) [hereinafter Stockholm Programme], 80.

⁷⁸ Stockholm Programme, supra note 72, 61-62.

previous Conclusions, Stockholm Programme is more explicit about the link between mobility and development. Given the demands of the EU market, the legal migration is treated independently from irregular migration and along with forced readmission, the voluntary return is acknowledged as the preferred solution to abate the illegality.⁷⁹ In a similar vein, the first annual report after the European Pact on Migration and Asylum underscored that the “balance between the three areas (legal migration, illegal migration, migration, and development) should be reinforced,” while reinforcing border control methods to fight with “illegal migration” at the same time.⁸⁰

Legal labor migration is in fact seen as a tool to redress labor market shortages in the EU. Parallel with the approach, the Commission Staff Working Paper on Migration and Development and Communication introducing the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility (GAMM) were published in November 2011.⁸¹ These documents were evidence of how the EU, prior to 2015, started to underscore the ways in which mobility can contribute to development as preventive approaches seemed to lose their credibility. Four pillars of the GAMM were defined as “(1) organising and facilitating legal migration and mobility; (2) preventing and reducing irregular migration and trafficking in human beings; (3) promoting international protection and enhancing the external dimension of asylum policy; (4) maximising the development impact of migration and mobility.”⁸²

Although these pillars were said to be equally important, and they hint a co-development vision emphasizing mutual benefits, the opportunities for legal migration were again linked to the cooperation in irregular migration and readmissions. The Communication suggests that “[d]ialogue and cooperation with non-EU countries should also place migration and mobility in the perspective of the need to maintain orderly movements. Without well-functioning border controls, lower levels of irregular migration, and effective return policy, it will not be possible for the EU to offer more opportunities for legal migration and mobility.”⁸³

⁷⁹ Stockholm Programme, supra note 72, 67.

⁸⁰ See *Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council “First Annual Report on Immigration and Asylum (2009) {SEC(2010) 535}”* COM(2010) 214 final, (May 6, 2010) [hereinafter COM(2010) 214], 8.

⁸¹ See *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions “The Global Approach to Migration and Mobility {SEC(2011) 1353 final}”*, COM(2011) 743 final, (November 18, 2011) [hereinafter COM(2011) 743]

⁸² COM(2011) 743, supra note 76, 7.

⁸³ COM(2011) 743, supra note 76, 5.

During this period, another important policy document was the 2013 Communication on Maximising the Development Impact of Migration.⁸⁴ Criticizing the focus on ‘traditional’ areas (such as remittances, diaspora, brain drain and circular migration, and migration to OECD countries), the Communication called for a more comprehensive approach by including the issues such as mobility, forced migration, and climate-induced migration in the context of migration within developing countries. Furthermore, the Commission also reiterated these points in their recommendations to post-2015 development framework with a particular framing of migration and mobility “as ‘enabling factors’ for development.”⁸⁵

III. Co-Development Fading Away

As the Stockholm Programme expired at the end of 2014, the European Council adopted a set of strategic ‘guidelines’ instead of ‘programmes’ in the area of freedom, security, and justice for the following five years.⁸⁶ Very much like the previous programmes, the Guidelines for 2014-2019 called for a comprehensive approach to migration by addressing irregular migration and managing external borders, while at the same time benefiting from legal migration.^{87 88}

Two important points concerning the migration-development nexus catch our attention. First, the co-development vision is kept out of the Guidelines. There is no single expression with regards to economic and social gains of countries of origin from migration, even in the parts where legal migration is discussed. The Guidelines prioritize the needs of the EU, without referring to reciprocal needs of and benefits for countries of origin and destination. Also, while the demographic needs of the Union due to its ageing populations are mentioned, the requirement to address irregular migration flows is also underlined in the same sentence in a way to refrain

⁸⁴ See *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions “Maximising the Development Impact of Migration The EU contribution for the UN High-level Dialogue and next steps towards broadening the development-migration nexus”, COM(2013) 292 final, (May 21, 2013) [hereinafter COM(2013) 292]*

⁸⁵ COM(2013) 292, *supra* note 79, 4-5.

⁸⁶ See *European Council 26/27 June 2014 Conclusions*, (June 27, 2014) [hereinafter 26/27 June 2014 Conclusions]

⁸⁷ 26/27 June 2014 Conclusions, *supra* note 81, 2.

⁸⁸ Although it is beyond the scope of this paper, we can interpret this language shift from ‘programmes’ to ‘guidelines’ as an indication that the EU is now assuming a more guiding role towards common EU migration policy instead of a more leading role.

from encouraging irregular migration.⁸⁹ Recognizing the potential opportunities provided by legal migration for the EU, the Guidelines set the objective to design strategies in a dialogue with business and social partners “to remain an attractive destination for talents and skills.”⁹⁰ In essence, however, the emphasis in the document is on legal migration and treats the race of skilled work strictly independent from irregular migration.

Second, as to irregular migration, a new narrative on addressing the root causes, which was emerged by 2014, was further reinforced after the 2015 migration crisis. The Guidelines attached a humanitarian cause to the combat against irregular migration. It was argued that “[a]ddressing the root causes of irregular migration flows is an essential part of EU migration policy. This, together with the prevention and tackling of irregular migration, will help to avoid the loss of lives of migrants undertaking hazardous journeys.”⁹¹ The lines following this linkage between the combat against irregular migration and ‘saving lives’ make the case that repressive tools such as border management come to the forefront and how migration-development nexus is informed by the security concerns of the EU:

“[a] sustainable solution can only be found by intensifying cooperation with countries of origin and transit, including through assistance to strengthen their migration and border management capacity. Migration policies must become a much stronger integral part of the Union's external and development policies, applying the “more for more” principle and building on the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility. The focus should be on the following elements: (i) strengthening and expanding Regional Protection Programmes, in particular close to regions of origin, in close collaboration with UNHCR; increase contributions to global resettlement efforts, notably in view of the current protracted crisis in Syria; (ii) addressing smuggling and trafficking in human beings more forcefully, with a focus on priority countries and routes; (iii) establishing an effective common return policy and enforcing readmission obligations in agreements with third countries; (iv) fully implementing the actions identified by the Task Force Mediterranean.”⁹²

Very much informed by this new narrative of saving lives by dismantling smuggling routes, “A European Agenda on Migration” was published in 2015 as a response to the deaths of migrants and refugees trying to cross the Mediterranean.⁹³ The Agenda established a political framework

⁸⁹ 26/27 June 2014 Conclusions, supra note 81, 14.

⁹⁰ 26/27 June 2014 Conclusions, supra note 81, 2

⁹¹ 26/27 June 2014 Conclusions, supra note 81, 3.

⁹² 26/27 June 2014 Conclusions, supra note 81, 3.

⁹³ See *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions* “A

for the EU's external migration policy. The European Agenda on Migration reiterated the long-term objectives of the GAMM, namely "(1) better organising of legal migration and fostering well-managed mobility; (2) preventing and combating irregular migration and eradicating trafficking in human beings; (3) maximising the development impacts of migration and mobility; and (4) promoting international protection."⁹⁴ While such a comprehensive and balanced vision was adopted on paper, Kipp and Koch argue that the main focus has been the prevention of irregular migration, reflecting how migration is understood as "primarily a problem, not an opportunity."⁹⁵

Alongside the redoubling efforts to externalize migration management, Kipp and Koch identify three other trends since 2015: "(1) a regional shift in migration cooperation from the direct European Neighbourhood area to more distant countries of origin and transit, with a focus on the countries neighbouring Syria and the African continent in particular; (2) an increasing instrumentalisation of EU development aid for migration policy purposes; (3) a gradual re-nationalisation of European development policy."⁹⁶ In the shadow of rising far right movements throughout Europe, these trends taken together show the strong link between migration-development nexus and security concerns of the Member States. As an example of the instrumentalization of development aid, reflecting the "more-for-more" understanding of development aid, the Communication remarks that stepping up for cooperation can bring a lot to the third countries.⁹⁷

Another key event on external migration policy took place in November 2015 in the Valletta Summit where African and European heads of states came together "in an effort to strengthen cooperation and address the current challenges but also the opportunities of migration."⁹⁸ The Summit concluded an action plan to "address the root causes of irregular migration and forced

European Agenda on Migration", COM(2015) 240 final, (May 13, 2015) [hereinafter COM(2015) 240]

⁹⁴ David Kipp and Anne Koch, "Looking for External Solutions: Instruments, Actors, and Strategies for European Migration Cooperation with African Countries," in *Profiteers of Migration? Authoritarian States in Africa and European Migration Management*, ed. Anne Koch, Annette Weber, and Isabelle Werenfels (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, 2018), 9.

⁹⁵ Kipp and Koch, "Looking for External Solutions," 10.

⁹⁶ Kipp and Koch, "Looking for External Solutions," 9.

⁹⁷ COM(2015) 240, *supra* note 87.

⁹⁸ "Valletta Summit on Migration, 11-12 November 2015." Consilium, (November 11, 2015), available at <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/international-summit/2015/11/11-12/>.

displacement, enhance cooperation on legal migration and mobility, reinforce the protection of migrants and asylum seekers, prevent and fight irregular migration, migrant smuggling and trafficking in human beings, and work more closely to improve cooperation on return, readmission and reintegration.”⁹⁹ As it is also evident from these conclusions, Kipp and Koch (2018) argue that “since the Valletta Summit [...] the aim of “reducing the causes of forced displacement” became the new narrative.”¹⁰⁰ Illustrative of this trend, the European Union Emergency Trust Fund for Africa (EUTF) was launched in Valletta to ensure stability and address the root causes of irregular migration and displaced persons in Africa. Kipp and Koch maintain that the EUTF for Africa has “an important discursive effect: It suggests that the “evil” of unregulated cross-border migration movements can be tackled at its roots. In practice, however, there is often a lack of distinction between structural and acute causes of forced displacement; voluntary and involuntary migration; and primary and secondary migration movements.”¹⁰¹ Remarking this distinction and conceptual uncertainty, they rightly warn against the risk of misuse of funds from development cooperation. We agree with Kipp and Koch that “longer-term structural measures are replaced with short-term measures to prevent migration” in the context of development cooperation.¹⁰² Furthermore, one should acknowledge another trend that understanding of development is also replaced with a narrower one that does not go much beyond cash aids to local and migrant population. For instance, initiated by the EU-Turkey statement of March 2016, Facility for Refugees in Turkey (FRiT), together with World Food Program fund Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN) is the largest humanitarian assistance program in the world where cash transfers are currently reaching nearly to more than 1,5 million refugees.¹⁰³ The underlining reasoning of this type of humanitarian program is to create incentives for refugees to stay in the third countries.

In June 2016, the Commission created the Migration Partnership Framework with third countries under the European Agenda on Migration.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁹ “Valletta Summit on Migration, 11-12 November 2015.” Consilium, (November 11, 2015), available at <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/international-summit/2015/11/11-12/>.

¹⁰⁰ Kipp and Koch, “Looking for External Solutions,” 17.

¹⁰¹ Kipp and Koch, “Looking for External Solutions,” 17.

¹⁰² Kipp and Koch, “Looking for External Solutions,” 17.

¹⁰³ “The Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN): Offering a lifeline to vulnerable refugees in Turkey”, European Commission (June 25, 2019), available at https://ec.europa.eu/echo/essn_en

¹⁰⁴ See *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council and the European Investment Bank “On establishing a new*

Again reacting to the increasing number of deaths in the Mediterranean, the Communication lists the goals as “to respond, to address the fate of migrants and refugees; to show its citizens that migration, including on the scale we see today, can be managed in a sustainable way.”¹⁰⁵ Let alone including development considerations, the goals reflect the political and popular pressures on the issue. Similarly, Kipp and Koch also draw attention to how the Communication neglects the need to provide legal migration channels in this set of objectives.¹⁰⁶ The Migration Partnership Framework endorses the more-for-more principle similar to the 2015 Agenda on Migration and previous mobility partnerships.¹⁰⁷ In principle, more cooperative behavior on readmissions or border and migration management would be rewarded with visa liberalization and facilitation of legal migration for the partner country. Yet, in practice, as the competences of the Commission are limited in managing legal migration, the more-for-more principle does not quite function. Furthermore, by a product of this, migration is becoming a foreign policy tool for third countries rather than a means for development.

The 2016 Communication introducing a new European External Investment Plan repeated the narrative of ‘saving lives’ in the context of partnerships with developing countries to foster growth and stability.¹⁰⁸ Referring to the new Partnership Framework, the Communication suggests that “[i]n order to address migration flows, compacts with partner countries are being developed to achieve the short-term objectives of saving lives at sea, increasing the rate of returns and enabling migrants and refugees to stay close to home.”¹⁰⁹

Most recently, on 29 June 2019, the European Council published the new agenda for the next five-year period.¹¹⁰ The Strategic Agenda established four priorities, one of which is “protecting citizens and

Partnership Framework with third countries under the European Agenda on Migration, COM(2016) 385 final, (June 7, 2016) [hereinafter COM(2016) 385]

¹⁰⁵ COM(2016) 385, supra note 97, 2.

¹⁰⁶ Kipp and Koch, “Looking for External Solutions,” 10.

¹⁰⁷ COM(2016) 385, supra note 97.

¹⁰⁸ See *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council and the European Investment Bank “Strengthening European Investments for jobs and growth: Towards a second phase of the European Fund for Strategic Investments and a new European External Investment Plan”*, COM(2016) 581, (September 9, 2016) [hereinafter COM(2016) 581].

¹⁰⁹ COM(2016) 581, supra note 101, 7.

¹¹⁰ See *A New Strategic Agenda (2019-2024)*, (June 20, 2019), available at <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/39914/a-new-strategic-agenda-2019-2024-en.pdf> [hereinafter *A New Strategic Agenda (2019-2024)*]

freedoms.” Strikingly, under this section, irregular migration is framed as one of the “existing and emerging threats” (to fundamental rights and freedoms) from which the European citizens should be protected.¹¹¹ Here, regarding the external dimensions of migration policy, the Council prioritizes the “cooperation with countries of origin and transit to fight illegal migration and human trafficking and to ensure effective returns.”¹¹² It is also important how the Council changed its language again from “irregular migration” (which was the term used in the Guidelines for 2014-2019) to “illegal migration” in 2019. Furthermore, let alone a non-securitized co-development vision on migration, diverging from the previous five-year agendas and programmes, the New Strategic Agenda does not even mention benefits that the EU would reap from migration. This strikingly reflects how the migration issue became more and more securitized over the last twenty years.

Conclusion

This paper has discussed how the migration-development nexus is dealt with at the EU policy-making level in the last two decades. Based on a content analysis since the 1999 Tampere Summit, our study shows that the EU has been facing a set of contrasting demands, notably its demographic and labor market need for skilled and unskilled labor force, Member States’ sensitivity to ensure border controls, and the development of the neighboring region. The article concludes that the EU has failed to bring together its diverse set of objectives in a coherent manner.

Despite the revival of the migration-development nexus within the development discourse at the dawn of the 2000s, we argued that the ways in which both preventive approaches and co-development are framed within the EU migration policies are very much tied to control over migratory movements, hence to restrictive policies. Conversely, the introduction of legal routes especially for temporary migration is acknowledged as a viable policy to curtail human rights violations that occur in the case of irregular migration. However, such proposals within the EU remained marginal without any legally binding policy implications and explicit efforts. While securitized approach to migration-development nexus already existed prior to the 2015 migration crisis, it became much more pronounced ever since as evidenced in the Section III. Although the Commission is relatively free of

¹¹¹ A New Strategic Agenda (2019-2024), *supra* note 103, 3.

¹¹² A New Strategic Agenda (2019-2024), *supra* note 103, 3.

popular and political pressures, the subordination of migration-development agenda to the security concerns is overwhelming.

The first section has focused on the gradual securitization of migration within the EU and underlined that policies towards “optimizing” migration-development nexus today are inherently different from the earlier developmentalist discourse back in the 1950s and 1960s and they cannot function without reference to the security discourse dominating migration policies. The empirical analysis in Section II and Section III, confirms that co-development as discourse was increasingly present in the EU documentation at the beginning of the 2000s.¹¹³ However, the content analysis of more recent policy documents in light of existing research indicates that development-oriented migration policies are likely to remain subordinated to security concerns of the EU. The informalization of readmission agreement on the forced return of irregular migrants coupled with economic initiatives provided to third countries reinforces the subordination migration-development nexus to security concerns. In sum, migration management approach, informed by security concerns, overbalances migration-development approach.

Although co-development has started to find a place in the EU documentation, given the little progress in terms of channels for legal entry and labor migration, the Commission has been more ambitious when compared to the Council and Member States.¹¹⁴ However, even in migration policies initiated by the Commission, it is visible that the security is usually the underlined assumption behind the recent rise of developmental approaches in the EU migration policies. Addressing migration-development nexus at the discursive level does not lead to concrete policy changes.¹¹⁵ Even when it does, development tools are tied to preventive approaches and work as an extension of security-based coercive approach or reduced to cash aid programs for refugees and local populations. Accordingly, Papagianni eloquently puts that: “Since the 1990s, cooperation has gradually become a tool of negotiation, or even blackmail, to ensure that third countries fall in line with the EU’s migration policy.”¹¹⁶

An optimistic reading of recent initiatives by the EU on mobility partnership with development suggests that it may be possible to de-

¹¹³ Chou, “EU and the Migration-Development”; Olesen, “Migration, Return, and Development,” 135.

¹¹⁴ Chou, “EU and the Migration-Development,” 12.

¹¹⁵ Chou, “EU and the Migration-Development”

¹¹⁶ Papagianni, *Institutional and Policy Dynamics*, 21.

securitize migration by moving from coercive tools to the enhancement of circular migration. However, the implementation of co-development approaches to migration in the form of preventive tools, labor quotas, or mobility is tied to security concerns. Such an emphasis on the return of migrants or strengthening of the readmission tools confirms the critiques that the dominant approach to migration contradicts with genuine co-development approach where migration is seen in a positive light contributing to development and that third countries can actually benefit from migratory flows. We had argued in Section III that conditioning channels for legal migration on zero tolerance to irregular migration further complicates the implementation. It is particularly the case for circular migration schemes seen more as –albeit inadequate– tool for stopping irregular migration, rather than a tool for co-development. As bilateral relations with the third countries are reduced to control and containment measures, since 2015 they also involve life-saving mantra underscoring the necessity to protect migrants from the dangers of the journey.

Given the scarcity of the empirical data on co-development, further comparative research in this realm is needed to define best practices. By doing that, scholars and practitioners should take into consideration that, unlike earlier, all these current discussions on migration-development nexus are indeed embedded in a dominant security discourse waiting for political action to be de-securitized.¹¹⁷ Also, as we deliberately focused on the Commission in order to put the EU as the locus of analysis, we acknowledge that one of the shortcomings of our methodology is that Member States' positions and bilateral agreement with third countries are mainly overlooked, so are internal developments such as the rise of far right shaping domestic politics. Further research can delve into such recent policy dialogues in order to examine to what extent migration-development nexus is securitized and could potentially be de-securitized.

¹¹⁷ Huysmans, *The Politics of Insecurity*, 126.

References

- Adepoju, Aderanti, Femke Van Noorloos, and Annelies Zoomers. "Europe's Migration Agreements with Migrant-Sending Countries in the Global South: A Critical Review." *International Migration* 48, no. 3 (2009): 42–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2009.00529.x>.
- Boswell, Christina. "Migration in Europe - International Organization for Migration." (2005) Accessed July 17, 2020. https://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/policy_and_research/gcim/rs/RS4.pdf.
- Boswell, Christina. "The 'External Dimension' of EU Immigration and Asylum Policy." *International Affairs* 79, no. 3 (2003): 619–38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.00326>.
- Boswell, Christina. *European Migration Policies in Flux: Changing Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
- Carling, Jørgen, and Cathrine Talleraas. "Root causes and drivers of migration." *Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO)* (2016): 1-44.
- Cassarino, Jean-Pierre. "Informalising readmission agreements in the EU neighbourhood." *The International Spectator* 42, no.2 (2007): 179-96.
- Castles, Stephen. "Understanding Global Migration: A Social Transformation Perspective." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 2010, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788112376.00007>.
- Chaloff, Jonathan. *Co-development-a myth or a workable policy approach*. Rome, Centro Studi di Politica Internazionale, 2005.
- Chou, Meng-Hsuan, and Marie Gibert. "From Cotonou to Circular Migration: The EU, Senegal and the "Agreement Duplicity"." *Migration: A World in Motion, Maastricht, the Netherlands* (2010): 18-20.
- Chou, Meng-Hsuan. *EU and the Migration-Development Nexus: What Prospects for EU Wide Policies?* Working paper, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, 2006.
- de Haas, Hein. "Migration and Development: A Theoretical Perspective." *International Migration Review* 44, no. 1 (2010): 227–64. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2009.00804.x>.
- de Haas, Hein. *Turning the Tide? Why 'Development Instead of Migration' Policies Are Bound to Fail*. IMI Working Papers 2006, 2006.
- Ellerman, David. "Labour Migration: A Developmental Path or a Low-Level Trap?" *Development in Practice* 15, no. 5 (2005): 617–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520500128646>.

- Ferreira, Susana. "From Narratives to Perceptions in the Securitisation of the Migratory Crisis in Europe." *E-International Relations*, (2018).
- Geddes, Andrew. *The Politics of Migration and Immigration in Europe*. London: Sage, 2003.
- Guiraudon, Virginie. "The Constitution of a European Immigration Policy Domain: a Political Sociology Approach." *Journal of European Public Policy* 10, no. 2 (2003): 263–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350176032000059035>.
- Hampshire, James. "European migration governance since the Lisbon treaty: introduction to the special issue." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42, no.4 (2016): 537-553, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2015.1103033, 538-9
- Huysmans, Jef. *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- IOM. (2016), 'Dangerous journeys - international migration increasingly unsafe in 2016', (Geneva).
- İçduygu, Ahmet. *Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği ilişkileri bağlamında uluslararası göç tartışmaları*. TÜSİAD Yayınları, no: TÜSİAD-T/2006-12/427, İstanbul, 2006.
- Karamanidou, Lena and Bernd Kasperek. "Border Management and Migration Control in the European Union." *Working Paper*. (2018),
- Kipp, David, and Anne Koch. "Looking for External Solutions: Instruments, Actors, and Strategies for European Migration Cooperation with African Countries." In *Profiteers of Migration? Authoritarian States in Africa and European Migration Management*, edited by Anne Koch, Annette Weber, and Isabelle Werenfels, 9-21. Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, 2018.
- Lazaridis, Gabriella and Dimitris Skleparis. "Securitization of migration and the far right: the case of Greek security professionals." *International Migration* 54, no.2 (2016): 176-192.
- Martin, Philip L., Susan Forbes Martin, and Patrick Weil. *Managing migration: The promise of cooperation*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006.
- Olesen, Henrik. "Migration, Return, and Development: An Institutional Perspective." *International Migration* 40, no. 5 (2002): 125–50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2435.00214>.
- Papagianni, Georgia. *Institutional and Policy Dynamics of E.U. Migration Law*, Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2006.
- Scipioni, Marco. "Failing forward in EU migration policy? EU integration after the 2015 asylum and migration crisis." *Journal of European Public Policy* 25, no.9 (2018): 1357-1375, DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2017.1325920

Verhaeghe, Paul. "Coherence between Migration and Development Policies." In *European Social Watch Report 2009: Migrants in Europe as Development Actors Between Hope and Vulnerability*, edited by Simon Stocker, 8–10. Brussels: Eurostep, 2009.

Weil, Patrick. "Towards a Coherent Policy of Co-Development." *International Migration* 40, no. 3 (2002): 41–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2435.00196>.

European Union Documents

Commission of the European Communities, *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament "On a Community Immigration Policy"*, COM(2000) 757 final, Brussels, 22 November 2000.

Commission of the European Communities, *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament "On a Community Policy on Illegal Migration"*, COM(2001) 672 final, Brussels, 15 November 2001.

Commission of the European Communities, *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament "Integrating Migration Issues in the European Union's Relations with Third Countries"*, COM(2002) 703 final, Brussels, December 3, 2002.

Commission of the European Communities, *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions "Migration and Development: Some concrete orientations"*, COM(2005) 390 final, Brussels, 1 September 2005.

Commission of the European Communities, *Communication from the Commission "Policy Plan on Legal Migration {SEC(2005)1680}"*, COM(2005) 669 final, Brussels, 21 December 2005.

Commission of the European Communities, *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament "The global approach to migration one year on: towards a comprehensive European migration policy"* COM(2006) 735 final, Brussels, 30 November 2006.

Commission of the European Communities, *Communication from the Commission to the Council "Contribution to the EU Position for the United Nations' High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development"*, COM(2006) 409 final, Brussels, 14 July 2006.

Commission of the European Communities, *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions "On circular migration and mobility partnerships between the European Union and third countries"* COM(2007) 248 final, Brussels, 16 May 2007.

- Commission of the European Communities, *Green Paper “On an EU approach to managing economic migration” (presented by the Commission)*, COM(2004) 811 final, Brussels, 11 January 2005.
- Council of the European Union, *A New Strategic Agenda (2019-2024)*, 20 June 2019, available at <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/39914/a-new-strategic-agenda-2019-2024-en.pdf>
- Council of the European Union, *Council Directive 2009/50/EC of 25 May 2009 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment*, Brussels, 25 May 2009.
- Council of the European Union, *European Council 26/27 June 2014 Conclusions*, Brussels, 27 June 2014.
- Council of the European Union, *European Council Presidency Conclusions, Laeken, 14-15 December 2001, Annex I: Laeken Declaration on the Future of the European Union*, Luxembourg, 15 December 2001.
- Council of the European Union, *European Pact on Migration and Asylum (13189/08)*, Brussels, 24 September 2008.
- Council of the European Union, *Tampere European Council 15 and 16 October 1999 - Presidency conclusions*, Brussels, 16 October 1999.
- Council of the European Union, *The Hague Programme: strengthening freedom, security and justice in the European Union*, Brussels, 3 March 2005.
- Council of the European Union, *The Stockholm Programme – An open and secure Europe serving and protecting the citizens*, Brussels, 2 December 2009.
- Council of the European Union, *Thessaloniki European Council 19 and 20 June 2003 Presidency conclusions*, Strasbourg, 20 June 2003.
- European Commission *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions “A European Agenda on Migration”*, COM(2015) 240 final, Brussels, 13 May 2015.
- European Commission, *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions “The Global Approach to Migration and Mobility {SEC(2011) 1353 final}”*, COM(2011) 743 final, Brussels, 18 November 2011.
- European Commission, *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions “Maximising the Development Impact of Migration The EU contribution for the UN High-level Dialogue and next steps towards broadening the development-migration nexus”*, COM(2013) 292 final, Brussels, 21 May 2013.

- European Commission, *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council and the European Investment Bank “On establishing a new Partnership Framework with third countries under the European Agenda on Migration”*, COM(2016) 385 final, Strasbourg, 7 June 2016.
- European Commission, *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council and the European Investment Bank “Strengthening European Investments for jobs and growth: Towards a second phase of the European Fund for Strategic Investments and a new European External Investment Plan”*, COM(2016) 581 final, Brussels, 9 September 2016.
- European Commission. *Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council “on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of seasonal employment”*, COM (2010) 379 final, Brussels, 13 July 2010.
- European Commission, *Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council “First Annual Report on Immigration and Asylum (2009) {SEC(2010) 535}”* COM(2010) 214 final, Brussels, 6 May 2010.
- European Council, *Valletta Summit, 11–12 November 2015*, 12 November 2015, available at <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/international-summit/2015/11/11-12/>
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union, *Directive 2009/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009 providing for minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals*, Brussels, 18 June 2009.

APPENDIX

Table 1: List of policy documents analyzed

Year	Document title	Type
1999	Presidency Conclusions, Tampere European Council, 15-16 October 1999	Presidency Conclusion
2000	COM(2000) 757 Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a Community Immigration Policy	Communication
2001	COM(2001) 672 Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a Common Policy on Illegal Immigration	Communication
2001	Presidency Conclusions, European Council Meeting in Laeken, 14-15 December 2001	Presidency Conclusion
2002	Presidency Conclusions, Seville European Council, 21-22 June 2002	Presidency Conclusion
2002	COM(2002) 703 Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on development and migration	Communication
2004	The Hague Programme: strengthening freedom, security and justice in the European Union	Communication
2004	COM(2004) 811 Green Paper on an EU Approach to Managing Economic Migration	Communication
2005	COM(2005) 390 Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Migration and Development: Some Concrete Orientations	Communication
2005	COM(2005) 672 Green Paper: Damages actions for breach of the EC antitrust rules	Communication
2005	COM(2005) 669 Communication from the Commission: Policy Plan on Legal Migration	Communication
2007	COM(2007) 248 Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on circular migration and mobility partnerships between the European Union and third countries	Communication
2008	European Pact on Immigration and Asylum	Pact
2009	The Stockholm Programme – An open and secure Europe serving and protecting the citizens.	Information
2010	COM(2010) 214 Report from the Commission to	Communication

	the European Parliament and the Council. First Annual Report on Immigration and Asylum (2009)	
2011	COM(2011) 743 Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: The Global Approach to Migration and Mobility	Communication
2013	COM(2013) 292 Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Maximising the Development Impact of Migration The EU contribution for the UN High-level Dialogue and next steps towards broadening the development-migration nexus	Communication
2014	Guidelines for 2014-2019 European Council Presidency Conclusion	Presidency Conclusion
2015	COM(2015) 240 Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: A European Agenda on Migration	Communication
2015	Valletta Summit, 11-12 November 2015	Action Plan and Political Declaration
2016	COM(2016) 385 Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council and the European Investment Bank on establishing a new Partnership Framework with third countries under the European Agenda on Migration	Communication
2016	COM(2016) 581 Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council and the European Investment Bank: Strengthening European Investments for jobs and growth: Towards a second phase of the European Fund for Strategic Investments and a new European External Investment Plan	Communication
2019	European Council: A New Strategic Agenda (2019-2024)	Presidency Conclusion