Conclusion

“What Exists is Possible”¹: A Hopeful Thinking for Common Life in the Age of Migration

The normative question driving this thesis is a challenging one, and is of major significance for the 21st century: how should a political community respond to immigrants in search of protection when their protection-seeking migration causes insecurity for parts of that community? This question has been approached through the security dilemma theory and illustrations from illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers into Europe. It has been suggested that answers can be found in cosmopolitan trust-building and Kantian hospitality.

In Europe’s immigration security dilemma, the fatalism-driven choice is to build barriers, dispatch warships, and construct camps to stop illegal immigrants. The transcender-driven choice is to understand the insecurities of protection-seekers and why they use illegal methods of entry, create legal channels of migration, and build bonds between protection-seekers and the members of the receiving societies; to build cosmopolitan trust between two groups of individuals. Europe’s immigration security dilemma in relation to illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers is basically between these two choices. Each perspective endeavours to generate security for EU citizens. The former feeds into mistrust, fear, and suspicion towards illegal protection-seekers. The second choice transcends the security dilemma through building a common we-feeling between EU citizens and sub-Saharan protection-seekers. The difference between the two choices lies in the fact that each choice relies on a very different conception of what security means and how it can be achieved. This analysis has made an explicit normative case in favour of transcender logic because the policies of Kantian hospitality as cosmopolitan trust can construct emancipatory political structures in which both EU citizens and illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers enjoy human rights together.

I. Towards a New Thinking about the Problem of Illegal Protection-Seeking: Cosmopolitan Consciousness

The world today is in the age of migration where hundreds of millions of people are continuously moving across borders. A considerable part of this group is in search for a better life, in “the pursuit of bread, knowledge, and freedom”. As Sita Bali put it, “until the world is free of repression, conflict, political instability and economic inequality, it is certain that population movements will continue”. Given this, we, as the members of a potential global community of humankind and as students of IR, should consider the words of Father Joseph Cassar from the Jesuit Refugee Service which offers hospitality to illegal African immigrants in Malta, when thinking about immigration. He told The Guardian:

What is being forgotten here is that these people come from terrible places and are running from the extremes of human behaviour – and deep poverty. It cannot be right to treat them with contempt, detain or house them in horrible conditions, in Europe.

However, many individuals in the receiving societies in the EU have paid little attention to such words. Thousands of sub-Saharan risk their lives every year to achieve protection in the EU. Human catastrophes in and around the Mediterranean Sea are a small, but a serious, representation of world insecurity in the age of migration which victimizes many immigrants and members of the receiving communities by feeling fear, mistrust and insecurity towards immigrants. How has the hope of some immigrants to achieve security become such a source of insecurity for others? This thesis has primarily problematized the ideas which have constructed world insecurity in the age of migration. ‘These world constructing ideas’, according to Booth,

have created an imperfect present and a future tense with danger. Poverty, oppression, war, misery, death and disease are the everyday realities of life swathes of humanity; then add fear, and stir. Debilitating and determining insecurity seem
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2 For Booth, the pursuit of bread, knowledge and freedom is the basic meaning of emancipation, see Ken Booth, Theory of World Security (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 100.
to be in permanent season, and you and I, him and her, and us and them will never be what we might become as long as human society, globally, is imprisoned by the regressive ideas that sustain world insecurity.\(^5\)

The regressive ideas can be replaced by others if students of IR open their minds to new possibilities in thinking and in practice. By combining the literatures of security dilemma theorizing, cosmopolitanism, emancipatory security theory, and trust-building, this thesis has sought to construct a perspective through which an illegal sub-Saharan protection-seeker and an EU citizen can share a common identity. It has analyzed a variety of practices with the perspective of finding those which can give a hope for a better world for individuals. And it has found a variety of ideas and practices on which such hope can be built: after all, “what exists is possible”.

This thesis has adopted an explicitly normative position for a type of world politics in which both illegal protection-seekers and members of receiving societies enjoy security together. By adopting an explicitly normative perspective, it may risk opening itself to criticisms of being too idealistic and naïve. Even legal immigrants can be identified by decision-makers and citizens as threats to societal identities and welfare systems. In this political atmosphere, it might be considered wishful thinking, utopian, or naive to talk about the possibility of trust towards illegal immigrants. It is not wishful thinking, but hopeful thinking based on rational ideas and empirical realities. This project hopes for a better world by looking at and being based on existing ideas and practices. It also hopes to provoke the readers to re-think about their choices in relation to what kind of world they want to live in. As stated in the Introduction, the thesis does not chase utopias, but looks to construct a more cosmopolitan world security in the age of migration. The thesis has aimed to provide a perspective for those who choose to think and to act in order to construct a new type of world politics. Is this construction a certainty? No, but, as the thesis has showed, it is a possibility.

The normative perspective developed and promoted in this analysis has been based on the idea that in order to solve the problem of illegal immigration, the choices of decision-makers of the receiving communities should ensure extensive
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5 Booth, Theory of World Security, pp. 11-12.
freedom of choice for illegal protection-seekers and citizens alike. This perspective is underlined by *cosmopolitan consciousness*. Cosmopolitan consciousness is individual-oriented. Individuals are entitled to enjoy extensive freedom of choice not as members of national communities or cultural groups. They have moral value as members of the global community of humankind. Political communities in the wider community of humankind should consider how their choices affect the individuals outside the communities. By virtue of this principle, cosmopolitan consciousness does not only shape several security ideas and practices in world politics (emancipatory security theory), but also contributes to conceptualizing the type of trust to transcend security dilemmas (cosmopolitan trust).

II. *Cosmopolitan Consciousness in Security Thinking and Practice: Emancipatory Security Theory*

The analysis of how a political community should respond to illegal protection-seekers concerns a key concept in world politics: security. The analysis in this project is derived from a wider question in world politics: how can decision-makers generate security for the community’s members without causing insecurity for the non-members? Emancipatory security theory built upon cosmopolitan consciousness offers an answer to this question by making assertions about how security should be understood and how it should be pursued. As this thesis has argued, emancipatory security theory is not wishful thinking; cosmopolitan consciousness is not to take a moral high ground in such a politically challenging issue. Rather, it offers a security thinking which involves ideas that can potentially construct a different world politics for both illegal protection-seekers and the members of the receiving communities. Emancipation as a process in world politics in the age of migration is possible.

Such an emancipatory perspective on security does not appeal to a type of post-modernist/structuralist thinking which sees any political action to change the existing systems as futile. According to some post-structuralist writers, political struggle for change inevitably gives birth to an exclusionary system similar to the
one that it was meant to replace, hence it is better to do nothing. As Kenan Malik has put it, “unable to transform society, postmodern critics accommodate to, and even celebrate, oppression”. Those who are oppressed by the existing political structures, such as the sub-Saharan filling smugglers’ boats, hardly agree with this idea. Neither do the students of emancipatory security theory. Pacifism and political inactivism are not the characteristics of emancipatory security theory. As Booth and Wheeler argued, “humans created a world politics of suspicion and division, but a more harmonious way was always an option. Humanity could have done much better in the past, and could do so in the future”. The security-as-emancipation approach investigates how individuals can enjoy security together not as members of particular national communities or cultural groups but as members of the potential cosmopolitan community of humankind. Change is possible because the achievements of humanity today make change possible, although humanity could have done much better in the past.

The intention of the analysis derived from emancipatory security theory is not to prioritize the security of one group over another. The insecurity for the receiving societies starts with the violation of borders by illegal immigrants; continues with the presence of individuals who violate the immigration laws of the country in the society; and gains an economic dimension through the underground economy fed by unregistered workers. Insecurity caused by illegal protection-seeking for the receiving communities is as real, serious, and important as the insecurity of illegal protection-seekers in the camps in North Africa. Far from neglecting the insecurity of the EU, Kantian hospitality practices discussed in Chapter Eight have aimed to provide a perspective which can solve both insecurities. For example, if North African countries can be transformed into political communities where sub-Saharan protection-seekers can obtain protection, further illegal protection-seeking migration towards the EU can be prevented. A regularization mechanism can help to register all immigrants who arrived in the EU borders
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illegally. This potentially not only solves the problem of border violation, but can also prevent unregistered lives within societies.

What is problematized in this thesis is the counterproductive way the issue of illegal protection-seeking has been approached by the EU: by creating more insecurity for illegal protection-seekers, the EU has contributed to the insecurity of EU citizens. Far from taking a moral high ground, policies derived from cosmopolitan consciousness are more realistic and potentially effective than building detention camps in North Africa or sending warships across the Mediterranean. These policies have so far hardly stopped illegal sub-Saharan immigration. As the political, social, and economic structures keep victimizing many individuals in sub-Saharan Africa, and as the legal channels of migration to the EU are extremely limited and expensive, illegal protection-seeking is likely to continue (as the statistical figures suggest). Putting worst-case forecasting and ethnocentrism aside, EU decision-makers and citizens should consider alternative ideas and practices to solve this problem. This is the objective of emancipatory security theory.

One of the fundamental objectives of this project has been to operationalize emancipatory security theory. This objective was pursued in two ways. The first way was to problematize particular security ideas and practices, specifically the fatalist and mitigator logics of the security dilemma. It was showed that neither ethnocentric security thinking nor the security-as-order understanding can generate security because they re-construct oppressive structures for individuals.

The second way of operationalizing emancipatory security thinking was to bring particular practices into the discussion in the form of transcender logic. In Chapter Eight, it was illustrated what emancipatory security theory would look like in practice. The relevant practices do not prioritize the security of one group of individuals over that of another. They specifically target the phenomenon of illegal immigration, rather than the illegal immigrants. Through a set of global and intergovernmental activities, illegal protection-seekers can be increasingly decriminalized. In addition, the de-criminalization of illegal protection-seekers can be supported by practices at the societal level in order to eradicate the fears and
insecurity of citizens towards protection-seekers. Emancipatory practices connect the two groups, rather than separating them. The emancipatory political structures can eventually be constructed as the connection between illegal protection-seekers and citizens becomes stronger.

III. Studying Security through the Logics: The Security Dilemma

Through the framework of the three logics, the security dilemma can become a new theoretical framework for the students of security studies to analyze different ideas and practices of security in relation to identity. The security dilemma in this project was conceptualized between fatalist and transcender logics. The insecurity imposed on others because of ethnocentric security policies is predictable and acceptable for the fatalist logic. As Chapter Seven illustrated, EU decision-makers adopting fatalist logic interpret illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers as ‘risks’ and assume the worst about their intentions. Fatalist interpretation of illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers has replicated the identity of the EU citizen (the referent of security policies) and the illegal protection-seeker (the target of security policies) dichotomy. As keep-protection-seekers-out policies are implemented in North Africa, the insecurity imposed on protection-seekers has not been a priority.

A second choice in Europe’s immigration security dilemma is underlined by the transcender logic. Although Booth and Wheeler did not associate emancipatory security theory with transcender logic, the analysis attempted to show the role that the former can make in constructing transcending practices. Decision-makers adopting emancipatory security thinking can acknowledge that they are not obliged to act in accordance with fatalist principles. They can realize that there are always choices in world politics beyond ‘assume the worst’. In addition, emancipatory security built upon cosmopolitan consciousness encourages decision-makers to consider the effects of their choices over other individuals. Through operationalizing emancipatory security, individuals are put at the centre of security policies.
One of the contributions of this research is to link emancipatory security theory with transcender logic. This theoretical move does not only strengthen transcender logic, but also operationalizes emancipatory security theory. As illustrated in Chapter Eight, in Europe’s immigration security dilemma the transcending practices are individual-oriented across all four levels: global, intergovernmental, EU, and societal. Through transcending the security dilemma, exclusionary and oppressive political structures can evolve into the emancipatory ones through which both sub-Saharan protection-seekers and EU citizens will enjoy human rights together by moving towards a shared or common identity as the members of the potential community of humankind as well as keeping their local identities. Cosmopolitan trust was introduced as a key concept serving this process of emancipation.

Trust itself is a challenging concept for students of security studies. It could be one of the concepts which could replace the regressive ideas that create world insecurity. However, trust involves risks. This thesis acknowledges the possibility of misplaced trust and its consequences. It also acknowledges that trust does not provide “an escape from risk and uncertainty”, but it does offer an alternative path to security for those who are troubled by world politics characterized by fear, mistrust, and insecurity.9 Trust is neither easy nor straightforward. Trust-building relationships can be fragile and need constant attention by both parties. Emancipatory security theory does not impose ‘cosmopolitan trust’ (or any type of choice) as ‘the choice’, but reveals choices, and therefore, provides alternative paths for individuals to think about and practice their security. Instead of rejecting it as ‘utopian’ or ‘naive’, trust deserves academic analysis. As the thesis has aimed to show, based on the existing practices, cosmopolitan trust can be a choice in world politics where security dilemmas continuously emerge.

Cosmopolitan trust (as part of transcender logic) served as a tool to operationalize emancipatory security theory. Kantian hospitality was conceptualized as the manifestation of cosmopolitan trust in Europe’s immigration security dilemma. In *Towards Perpetual Peace*, Kant defined hospitality as a condition of
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cosmopolitan justice. It was argued that republican societies and political relations between republics are necessary for perpetual peace. Perpetual peace also requires hospitality. Hospitality for Kant is not only morally right, but also practical. It serves as a tool of perpetual peace. As in Kantian political philosophy, this project conceptualized hospitality as a security policy which can create emancipatory structures for individuals.

One of the most important arguments in earlier chapters was that hospitality does not begin at the borders. Hospitality can be offered to illegal protection-seekers at global, inter-state and societal levels. All levels of hospitality should be practiced together. This is crucial for hospitality practices to construct emancipatory political structures. As discussed in Chapter Four, hospitality does not assume positive and constructive relationships between citizens and illegal protection-seekers. Rather, it aims to create the conditions within which both groups can interact. Whether this relationship can construct a common we-feeling depends on the character of the relationship. The societal level activities in Chapter Eight exemplify how hospitality can generate positive results for both protection-seekers and citizens. If global institutions like the UNHCR, the EU, and states support these activities, hospitality can contribute to constructing emancipatory structures.

Kantian hospitality does not mean ‘open the borders and let everybody in’. ‘Let them come’ and ‘let them enter’ are two different arguments based on different rationalities. Who can be allowed to enter is a decision which, under the current political structures, belongs to the states. It is also a matter of immigration law, which is not in the scope of this analysis. The thesis has not argued that EU decision-makers should open the borders and let everybody in. This can increase the insecurity of the receiving societies and fuel extreme-right parties. However, the thesis has argued that the EU should let everybody come and make their case. Hospitality aims to give an opportunity for illegal protection-seekers to explain why they need protection in the EU. Existing ethnocentric security policies of the EU almost destroy this opportunity because they are ‘illegal’. This is not only a violation of Article 31 of the Refugee Convention, but it also makes legal immigration impossible for protection-seekers.
What then does Kantian hospitality look like in practice? At the global level, the concept of ‘protection-seeker’ could be accepted as a third legal category along with asylum-seeker and refugee, through a new convention or a protocol which can be annexed to the 1951 Convention. This move could protect the rights of protection-seekers and help to decrease illegal immigration. At the EU border, protection-seeking offices can be established. These offices, under the supervision of the UNHCR, could act as the offices of regularization mechanism. On a case-by-case basis, illegal protection-seekers would be able to make their case to the protection-seeking officers. Inside the EU, the most urgent practice is to spread the City of Sanctuary movement to all Member States. The EU could play a key role in this process. Information campaigns could be organized through state-civil society cooperation in order to clarify to the public the conceptual confusions about ‘asylum-seeker’, ‘protection-seeker’, ‘refugee’, and ‘illegal immigrant’. These choices might be seen as too naive in such a politicized environment. However, based on what has been achieved so far discussed in Chapter Eight, it can be argued that there is hope for the realization of these practices. Surely the practical implications of hospitality (or the logistics of it) require further research. One question could be whether it will be too costly for the EU to establish, say, protection-seeking offices on the borders. A possible answer could be whether accommodating illegal protection-seekers who want to make their case would be more costly than keeping warships in the Mediterranean during most of the year.

Among those possible practical implications above, the institutionalization of the ‘protection-seeker’ is crucial. The concept of ‘asylum’ is one of the greatest achievements of the global protection regime. It has become a fundamental human right, but also very practical as the concept has been helping millions of individuals escaping from political persecution. However, as discussed in Chapter Two, contemporary human rights understanding involves more than political and civil rights; and, the reasons of contemporary forced migration is not as straightforward as state-induced political persecution. The world needs new concepts like ‘protection-seeker’ to address the realities of contemporary forced migration. Protection-seekers can surely become asylum-seekers by applying for refugee status. However, the likelihood of obtaining refugee status for many of them is considerably low. This does not mean that these immigrants do not need
protection, but they need a type of protection which is different from the one covered by the 1951 Convention. If alternative schemes of protection, like the legal institution of ‘protection-seeking’, could not be formulated in the global protection regime, illegal immigration will likely continue in huge numbers. The legalization of the concept of ‘protection-seeker’ is one of the issues which need further research, as it is one of the essential elements of transcending Europe’s immigration security dilemma.

In addition to fatalist and transcender logics, the research also operationalized the mitigator logic. Although Booth and Wheeler’s operationalization of the mitigator logic was state-centric, which made it difficult to apply to a non-state security dilemma, mitigator logic is important to show how the English School’s order can result in the replication of oppressive structures. As in the fatalist logic, the security understanding of the mitigator logic can fail to create security for individuals. Ironically, the political structures which have been identified as the main reason for instability in North Africa in many EU documents have been reinforced through mitigating practices. As in the fatalist logic, the EU has not achieved the democratic transformation it has desired, while individual rights and freedoms continue to be violated without any serious challenge from the EU. Moreover, it was discovered that the EMP order has made the implementation of the fatalist illegal immigration policies in North Africa possible. In other words, the mitigator logic has produced negative results directly for North African individuals and illegal sub-Saharan protection-seekers, and indirectly for EU citizens.

**IV. Towards More Emancipatory Security**

The arguments developed in this research highlight problems in the securitization approach to the study of migration. The securitization approach assumes that there is only one understanding of security and decision-makers monolithically adopt the same security perspective, which is more or less similar to the fatalist logic. However, as the research has attempted to show, fatalist and transcending choices co-exist in the politics of migration. Institutions in a political structure can adopt alternative logics. As discussed in Chapter Seven, the Commission and the
Council of the EU have different perspectives about illegal immigration and how to solve this insecurity for the EU. Beyond the decision-making structures, civil society actors can have different ideas about how the insecurity of citizens in relation to protection-seekers can be solved. In other words, the politics of security is more complex than the securitization approach assumes. The security dilemma framework has enabled the analysis of this complexity.

In addition to the problems about the study of security, the identity conceptualization of the securitization approach is also problematic. According to the securitization approach, the relationship between security and identity with reference to migration is one-sided: because immigrants have a different identity than the receiving society, they are presented as a security threat to the societal identity of the receiving society. This is true but incomplete: insecurity can also result in the construction of dichotomist identities between immigrants and the receiving communities. Unlike the securitization approach, this analysis did not accept societal identities as given and fixed and as the reason for insecurity. Instead, they are continuously re-constructed. This project analyzed how an understanding of security and the policies to generate security affect the construction of identities. Some security policies replicate the dichotomist identities; some of them construct common identities. The security dilemma framework enabled this type of analysis that would not be possible through the securitization approach.

Moving beyond the elite decision-making level of analysis explicitly prioritized by the securitization approach of the Copenhagen School, this thesis analyzed civil society actors in the area of migration. The activities of City of Sanctuary, Time Together, and Monitor and Befriending System as exemplars of transcender logic demonstrate that the politics of migration is not restricted to decision-making circles and their ideas and practices. The politics of migration is not solely about fear, exclusion, and mistrust. At the societal level, there is fear and mistrust; there are also activities which connect protection-seekers and citizens under the supervision of civil society actors. Through empowering protection-seekers, they do not only help protection-seekers to integrate into the community in which protection is sought, but also encourage citizens to transcend their stereotypes and
fears about protection-seekers. In other words, the activities of progressive civil society, through building cosmopolitan trust, are crucial to constructing emancipatory political structures. Their activities, however, have been largely neglected by students of security studies analyzing migration. The security dilemma framework, along with emancipatory security theory, has identified progressive civil society activities as potentially emancipatory security policies.

In conclusion, this thesis offers the outline of an approach to answering the question of how we might live together in the age of migration. While offering a new theoretical perspective to the security implications of migration on immigrants and the receiving communities, the analysis has aimed to provoke questions as well. These include: how to ensure wider society participation to the societal level hospitality practices? What are the legal obstacles for the construction of an emancipatory political structure (for example, how to de-criminalize rescue at sea)? How might hospitality work in EU Member States other than the UK? In a theoretical sense, although this project is a beginning, the immigration security dilemma framework might be operationalized in relation to different types of migration in order to see if it is useful in other circumstances.

A better world is possible. It depends to what extent individuals can and want to explore the possibilities of human potential to live together. It also depends on the ability of IR scholars to problematize the regressive ideas which have replicated world insecurity. In a world where human mobility from developing countries to the more developed regions has increased for a variety of reasons, scholars should work more on the global conditions of common life. The issue has acquired new urgency as insecurity imposed on both immigrants and the receiving communities has increased. The sub-Saharan bodies found in the sea and on the shores of Mediterranean countries are a manifestation of our diminished humanity. This thesis has been an attempt to discuss how the members of global community of humankind can restore our diminished humanity together. It has explored the possibilities of hope to enable us to answer positively the question posed at the very start of the thesis by the captain of the ship Francisco y Catalina: No, we as the members of the potential community of humankind should not let them drown.