



“An Assessment Of the EU-Turkey Agreement”

Sara Leming

M.A. in Political Science
with a Concentration in European Union Policy Studies
James Madison University

Abstract

Since its origin the European Union has championed refugee law and has been a supporter of human rights throughout the world. However, the EU-Turkey Agreement addressing the European migration crisis has sparked a debate with respect to whether the European Union is upholding its commitment to human rights, or symbolically neglecting its responsibility through its 2016 Agreement with Turkey. The migration crisis has undoubtedly torn at the heart of the members of the European Union and has created hostile tensions among member states that question future freedom of movement between states and, on a larger spectrum, the future of the European Union itself. This paper addresses whether or not the EU-Turkey Agreement is an ethical agreement on behalf of the European Union and assesses whether the European Union should reevaluate the Agreement in order to uphold its commitment to human rights. It concludes, based on the Asylum Procedures Directive of the United Nations Refugee Agency, that Turkey cannot be considered a safe third country and the European Union should rethink its partnership in the migration crisis with Turkey.

Presented at the Transatlantic Students' Conference
Addressing Diplomatic, Economic, and Migration Challenges in Southeastern Europe
James Madison University
Florence, 23-27 April 2018

Introduction

Since its origin, the European Union has championed refugee law and has been a supporter of human rights throughout the world. However, the EU-Turkey Agreement addressing the European migration crisis has sparked a controversial debate with respect to whether the European Union is upholding its commitment to human rights, or symbolically neglecting its responsibility through its recent 2016 Agreement with Turkey. In addition to the dangerous situation for asylum seekers, the migration crisis has undoubtedly torn at the heart of the members of the European Union and has created hostile tensions among member states that question future freedom of movement between states and, on a larger spectrum, the future of the European Union itself. This paper will address whether or not the EU-Turkey Agreement is an ethical agreement on behalf of the European Union and will assess whether the European Union should reevaluate the Agreement in order to uphold its commitment to human rights.

Background

On March 18, 2016, the European Union and Turkey decided to officially terminate irregular migration from Turkey to the borders of the European Union through a formal agreement. In essence, the agreement was intended to decrease the flow of asylum seekers attempting to cross into the European Union borders by way of Turkey. The massive influx of asylum seekers arriving in Greece through Turkey created an unmanageable situation for the Greek government, due to the immense number of applications for asylum and the financial burden of providing adequate food and shelter for the asylum seekers. At the same time, Greece was dealing with its own economic crisis and was charged with several human rights violations based on alleged insufficient retention centers. One asylum seeker living in a retention center in

Greece stated, “I sleep on a mattress on the floor in a cell with five other people. I have been here for six months, yet I have nothing to read in my own language nor have I been given a clean blanket since my arrest” (Amnesty International 2017). In response to the allegations, Greece pleaded for further assistance from the European Union. Additionally, it became evident that asylum seekers were entering the borders of the European Union illegally through the help of smugglers. Based on these two factors, the European Union decided it needed to implement a plan of further action which ultimately resulted in the EU-Turkey Agreement.

In a press release regarding the announcement of the EU-Turkey Agreement, the European Commission stated, “New irregular migrants who arrive in Greece after the date of March 20, 2016 will immediately be sent back to Turkey. This will target the smuggler's business model and remove incentives to seek irregular routes into the EU” (European Commission 2016). In the Agreement the European Commission generously pledged that EU member states will accept one Syrian asylum seeker from Turkey for every asylum seeker sent back, re-energize the accession process for Turkey’s EU candidacy, speed up European Union visa liberalization for Turks, and provide an initial allocation of three billion euros for the facility of asylum seeker in Turkey with the possibility of an additional three billion more euros if a need arose for further funding by 2018 (European Commission 2016). Through this incentive, the Turkish government was motivated by multiple factors, both financial and in relation to securing its European Union candidacy.

In the EU-Turkey Agreement the European Commission also addressed the legal basis under which asylum seekers would be returned from the Greek islands to Turkey: “People who do not have a right to international protection or asylum will be immediately returned to Turkey. There are two legal possibilities in declaring asylum 1) the person will stay in the

country where they are first recognized as an asylum seeker and enjoy sufficient protection there

2) if the person has not already received protection in the third country but the third country can guarantee effective access to protection to the readmitted person” (European Commission 2016). This statement has been viewed as highly controversial and as a possible infringement on the European Union’s commitment to uphold human rights. The controversy has been sparked by the critics of the EU-Turkey Agreement that have expressed their views that the European Commission is dodging its ethical duty to asylum seekers that have already arrived in the European Union. Instead, the European Commission is choosing to pawn off the handling of the asylum seekers to the Turkish government, which has been questioned for its stability in terms of human rights. “The EU-Turkey agreement has set a dangerous precedent by putting at risk the very principle of the right to seek refuge. Combined with the closure of the Western Balkan route to EU countries, it has contributed to severe overcrowding in substandard and unsafe detention centers and camps on the Greek islands. The absence of clear policy to mitigate the dramatic impact of the deal on the asylum seekers warehoused in Greece has caused immense suffering for asylum seekers” (Human Rights Watch 2016).

When asked about the EU-Turkey agreement before it was put into action, European Commission President Jean Claude Juncker stated, “The EU-Turkey deal respects international norms, and the plan is starting to work Europe should not hard on Turkey about its record on human rights. Turkey is needed to solve the migration crisis despite its shortcomings in the past on human rights and press freedom. We face two possibilities and these are the options We can say that European Union and the European Institutions have outstanding issues with Turkey on human rights, press freedoms or so on or we can work together to ensure that no more asylum seekers come from Turkey in our initiatives into the European Union” (Juncker 2016). From

President Juncker's quote, he appears to be aware of the negative view that the European Union member states have towards Turkey, yet appears to still believe that the help of Turkey is necessary in solving the migration crisis. According to President Juncker's statement, it is in the best interest of the European Union to put aside all differences and work with Turkey.

Since the launch of the EU-Turkey Agreement there has been a steady decrease in the number of asylum seekers arriving in Greece. According to the European Commission, the effects of the EU-Turkey Agreement were immediate and the deal was a "political game changer" dropping the arrival of asylum seekers in Greece from 988,703 in March 2015 to 27,7111 in 2017. In terms of smuggling, there has been a drop of 97% from October 2015 to March 2017. Despite these dramatic changes the European Union has received significant criticism from human rights group, such as Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, that believe this agreement violates international law and is not legal. Their argument is based on the fact that the EU-Turkey Agreement recognizes Turkey as a safe country of origin, however, many stakeholders and political actors disagree with this claim and believe that Turkey is not a suitable or safe location for asylum seekers seeking protection.

In March 2017, the European Commission evaluated the success of the EU-Turkey Agreement. The European Commission perceives the EU-Turkey Agreement to be highly successful and believes that it has met major goals of The European Agenda of Migration, "The EU-Turkey Agreement has successfully 1) saved lives at sea and granted protection to those in need through resettlement 2) tackled the root causes of irregular migration and helping the most vulnerable with funding and direct support on the ground 3) ensured that the external borders of the European Union are protected and that irregular migration can be stemmed, and that those not in need of protection are returned in full respect of international and human rights"

(European Commission 2017). The Commission is pleased with the results of the EU-Turkey Agreement thus far and does not believe there is any basis for re-evaluation. In his 2017 State of the Union address President Jean Claude Juncker used a sailboat metaphor to address the current challenges of the European Union including migration. President Juncker stated, “Although migration remains on our radar. We have managed to make real progress. Today we protect the external frontier in a more efficient manner and have slowed down the regular flow migrants. Overall there has been a significant reduction of the number of irregular arrivals and the number of human lives lost in the Mediterranean. Those that have no right to stay in Europe need to go back to their country of origin” (Juncker 2017). Based on President Juncker's statement, as well as the evaluation of the EU-Turkey Agreement published by the European Commission, it can be inferred that the European Commission views the Agreement as a successful operation thus far.

Although the Commission views the EU-Turkey Agreement as highly successful, there are many opposing views including that of Europe’s leading human rights body, the Council of Europe. In April 2016, the Council of Europe, which includes Turkey as a member, issued an indictment of the EU-Turkey Agreement that stated, “At best strains and at worst exceeds the limits of what is permissible under European and international law. Even on paper it raises many serious questions of compatibility with basic norms on refugees’ rights” (Rankin 2016). There has been additional criticism of the EU-Turkey Agreement voiced by European Union political actors such as José Manuel García-Margallo, the Foreign Minister of Spain. García-Margallo stated, “Spain will only accept an agreement that is coherent, compatible to the international law, and that is extraordinarily respectful towards the human rights of the persons that need to flee from their home country” (García-Margallo 2016). García-Margallo and other outspoken EU

politicians openly oppose this Agreement due to their belief that it does not adhere to the standards of the European Union regarding human rights.

Human rights groups that have been extremely outspoken about their discontent with the EU-Turkey Agreement, such as Caritas Europe, Human Rights Watch, and Amnesty International, have criticized the European Commission for only looking at the impact of the Agreement from a statistical perspective and not from an ethical lens. “In a progress report on the implementation of the EU-Turkey agreement, published on September 28, the European Commission claimed that the deal is delivering results: arrivals from Turkey to Greece across the Aegean are down, millions of Euros have been disbursed to improve access to education and healthcare in Turkey, and returns and resettlement have been undertaken. In reality, the EU-Turkey agreement has set a dangerous precedent by putting at risk the very principle of the right to seek refuge. Combined with the closure of the Western Balkan route to EU countries, it has contributed to severe overcrowding in substandard and unsafe detention centers and camps on the Greek islands” (Human Rights Watch 2016). From the perspective of these human rights groups, the European Commission is just focused on reducing the number of asylum seekers arriving and not the negative implications of the Agreement in terms of putting asylum seekers in danger.

Additionally, the European Parliament vocalized its concerns about Turkey’s ability to uphold these standards as reflected in a statement that emphasizes the importance of Turkey’s commitment to improving the conditions of the retention camps in its 2015 report, “The European Parliament stresses that the EUR 3 billion, and additional funding, of the Refugee Facility for asylum seekers in Turkey will have to be properly utilized in order to swiftly and directly benefit asylum seekers and their host communities through the implementation of

projects meeting immediate food, healthcare, sanitation and education needs while underlining the need to pay special attention to vulnerable groups such as women and children, particularly orphans” (European Parliament 2015). The European Union Parliament recently voted to suspend Turkey’s accession negotiation talks due to its concerns about Turkey’s rule of law and human rights. “The actions of the Turkish government are further diverting Turkey from its European path” (European Parliament 2016)., The vote was 479 in favor, 37 against, and 107 abstentions. Although this decision is ultimately in the hands of member state governments and the European Commission, it was considered a symbolic condemnation of the EU-Turkey Agreement that had the power to jeopardize the fragile deal reached with Turkey just right months prior to this vote. The European Parliament is evidently hesitant that the Turkish government can adhere to the European Union’s standards for human rights as shown by Turkey’s inability to provide the necessary care for the asylum seekers.

Literature Review

The history of the EU-Turkey relationship has always been a bit rocky. Turkey’s first application to join the then predecessor of the European Union was in April 1987. The negotiations for full membership were started in October 2005. However, out of the 35 necessary chapters to complete the negotiation process and fill the Copenhagen Criteria, only 16 had been fully met by May 2016. Although Turkey is a fellow member of the North Atlantic Treaty Agreement (NATO), as well as The Council of Europe, there has been a recent increase in tension between Turkey and the European Union. According to the think tank the German Marshall Fund, there are negative and hostile attitudes that have been circulating around European member states due to the deterioration of human rights and Turkish democracy. German Marshall Fund researcher Galip Dalay conducted a research analysis on the EU and

Turkey titled “Turkey-EU Relations: Dysfunctional Framework, Status Anxiety.” In his findings, Galip states that Turkey’s political decisions are arguably motivated by other factors such as its search for a new geopolitical identity” (Galip 2018).

Although the European Commission has deemed the EU-Turkey Agreement thus far a success, “The sharp decrease in the number of irregular refugees and asylum seekers crossing from Turkey into Greece is proof that of the effectiveness of the agreement, the smugglers business model has been broken” (European Commission 2016), based on statistical research conducted by the University of Oxford Faculty Of Law these claims are evidently not correct. “If there were a casual relation between the EU-Turkey Agreement and the number of refugees and the asylum seeker deaths, one would expect a decrease of both numbers after the agreement entered into effect. However, the number of arrivals does not indicate that the decreasing trend is intensified after March 2016” (Spijkerboer 2016). This study indicates that the Commission was concentrating only on the decrease in the number of irregular refugees and not the decrease in asylum seeker deaths. It is imperative that multiple factors are taken into consideration in order to properly assess the success of the Agreement rather than solely looking at raw data and, perhaps, misinterpreting such data.

Additionally, the European Commission applauded the EU-Turkey Agreement for keeping down the predicted rise of asylum seeker arrivals during the summer of 2016. However, as the University of Oxford Faculty Of Law study infers, the prediction for the increase during the summer of 2016 was simply assumed based on the previous year’s data, which was an all time high. “It seems more plausible to consider other factors such as summer 2015 was an exceptional situation. If there were any effect, it seems to have merely postponed the return to the usual number of arrivals. Another factor could be that bodies are not being found and many

people die without being reported to the authorities or the media” (Spijkerboer 2016). Although this is a terrible factor to consider, refugees have likely begun to seek more dangerous routes, such as Libya, in response to the EU-Turkey Agreement. As the University of Oxford Faculty of Law points out, the European Commission must conduct a much more intensive analysis of all credible factors before deeming the EU-Turkey Agreement a success.

A major critique of the EU-Turkey Agreement stems from the debate of what is considered a safe third country. Many human rights groups argue that Turkey does not meet the standards of a safe third country, including the Norwegian Refugee Council. In 2016, the Norwegian Refugee Council assessed whether Turkey should be considered a safe third country based on the outlined definition established by the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR). “The term ‘safe country’ has been applied to countries that can be considered either as being non-refugee-producing or as being countries in which people fleeing persecution can enjoy asylum” (UNHCR 1991: para. 3). The Norwegian Refugee Council also noted in its assessment that in 2014 Turkey had a record high violation of human rights according to Human Rights Watch. The assessment concluded that Turkey cannot guarantee that the rights of all asylum seekers will be safeguarded in accordance with the Refugee Convention of 1951. Turkey has only partially adopted the agreement, promising to abide with it regarding European refugees only (Christophersen 2016). Therefore, the Norwegian Refugee Council believes that Turkey should not be trusted to uphold the European Union standards for human rights. In reply to these claims of not holding up their agreement with the European Union, Turkish EU Minister Ömer Çelik stated in an interview with CNN, “Turkey is doing its part in the deal with the EU. In fact Turkey has rescued the European Union” (Çelik 2016).

The Dutch Council on Refugees recently released research on the readmission of asylum seekers that have been relocated to Turkey. Researcher Hemea Battjes found an interesting conclusion that readmitted non-Syrian migrants are provided with no information about their situation and rights and are often denied access to UNHCR representatives and NGOs, as well as to their lawyers who could advise them of their rights. Furthermore, staff of the Turkish detention centers regularly provide misinformation to the asylum seekers; since this would increase their stay in the detention center or that they were not allowed to apply for international protection in Turkey because they were readmitted from Greece. Migrants are forced to sign documents which they don't know the content or not even in their languages" (Battjes 2017). The research ultimately found that applying for international protection while in Turkish retention centers is nearly impossible. Migrants are not given pen or paper and verbal requests are often ignored by officials. Additionally, asylum seekers are not allowed to see lawyers while in the retention centers. This information shows a different angle from the statement from the European Commission report that indicates that 1,798 non-Syrian migrants were readmitted between April 2016 and June 2017, and only 56 of them (3%) applied for international protection in Turkey (European Commission, 2017b). According to a Turkish lawyer, applying for international protection from a detention center is "*based on pure luck*" (Battjes 2017). There are clearly two different perspectives that this scenario is presented from, which is quite concerning and indicate that the European Commission may be not be reporting the realistic facts.

Methodology

In order to address whether or not the EU-Turkey Agreement is an ethical arrangement consistent with the stated objectives of the European Union, this paper will utilize two case

studies. The first case study focuses on whether Turkey can be legitimately considered a “safe country of origin” based on the legal standards set in the Asylum Procedures Directive of the United Nations Refugee Agency. The second case study will investigate the obligations set forth by the 1951 Refugee Convention, which was ratified by Turkey as well as European Union member states. The second case study will then assess whether Turkey is following its commitment and if it can be deemed a legitimate partnership. Following the case studies, the results will be presented through a recommendation on whether or not the EU should reevaluate the Agreement with Turkey in order to uphold its commitment to human rights.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this paper is that the EU-Turkey Agreement is a legal infringement on fundamental human rights based on the European Union's standards; 1) Turkey will likely not qualify as a “safe country of origin” based on its previous record of committing human rights violations; 2) Turkey and the European Union do not have the same obligations set forth by the 1951 Refugee Convention.

Case Study A.

In 2015, the European Commission presented a proposal to the European Council that introduced a list of countries in Europe considered “safe” under EU standards and included Turkey on the list. However, it is a highly debated claim, especially given that no European member states include Turkey on their “safe list.” According to State Watch, the concept of “safe country of origin” has several meanings under European law. It first appears in the Procedures Directive of UNHCR, which establishes the common legal standards and guarantees how to apply for asylum in EU member states (Roman 1). Article 36 of the Procedures Directive states,

“As such, third countries can be considered safe countries of origin if there is evidence that there is generally and consistently no persecution, no torture, no inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and no threat by reason of indiscriminate violence in situations of international or internal armed conflict” (Procedures Directive). According to the refugee agency Human Rights Watch, Turkey is directly infringing on Article 36 by its inhuman treatment and threat of indiscriminate violence, “In mid-April 2016, Human Rights Watch interviewed four victims, five witnesses, and six local Syrian residents who described seven occasions in March and April in which Turkish border guards shot or assaulted 17 Syrian asylum seekers and two smugglers” (Human Rights Watch 2016). Although the European Commission included Turkey on its list of “safe” countries within Europe, Turkey has had a clear history of direct violations of human rights. Amnesty International, a leading human rights agency, quoted a Syrian asylum seeker currently being hosted in Turkey, “I sleep on the mattress on the floor in a cell with five other people” (Gogou 2017). From this description of the unsanitary and cramped living conditions, it can be determined that Turkey is engaging in inhumane treatment of asylum seekers.

The European definition of “acts of persecution” includes physical and mental violence as violations of human rights (Qualification Directive) The senior Turkish researcher for Human Rights Watch, Emma Sinclair-Webb, stated “In 2015 human rights and the rule of law in Turkey are the worst level I have seen them. Turkey is at risk for more prolonged internal conflict due to ongoing clashes, increasing social and political tensions, and the recent attempt at a government coup in 2016” (Webb 2015). After the 2016 attempt at a coup the Turkish government called for a state of emergency, yet is still viewed by the European Union as a “safe country of origin,” which is responsible for and capable of protecting asylum seekers. Additionally, in 2015 there were reports from international journalists covering the political situation in Turkey who were

jailed and forcibly deported by Turkish forces. This type of aggression by Turkish forces toward journalists can be itself viewed as physical and mental persecution.

Case Study B

The 1951 Refugee Convention took place in Geneva Switzerland and established a key legal document of universal human rights. It was ratified by 146 states parties and defines the term “refugee” as well as outlines the rights of the displaced, as well as the legal obligations to protect them” (UNHCR 2018). This document uses the term refugee but in this day and age the proper term used is asylum seeker. It defines an “asylum seeker” as, “A person who as a result of events occurring in European countries and owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his citizenship and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it, shall be granted refugee status upon completion of the refugee status determination process (Library of Congress 2018). The main principal is “non refoulement,” which asserts that a refugee should not be returned to their home country if they face serious threats to their life or freedom.

Ten years later, in August 1961, Turkey ratified the “Status of Refugees” under Turkish Law 359. However, there was a geographic limitation that states that Turkey is only legally obliged to follow this criteria for European refugees, “1b, limiting the scope of the Convention’s application in Turkey only to persons who have become refugees as a result of events occurring in Europe. Turkey grants non-European refugees limited protection under one of several types of temporary status “conditional refugee status, humanitarian residence permit, or temporary

protection allowing them to stay in the country until a long-term place of settlement outside Turkey is found for them” (Turkish Law 359). Amnesty International Turkey explained in its statement, "Turkey can provide refugee status to citizens of member states of the Council of Europe only. Turkey recognizes 'temporary asylum' for people coming from countries that are not members of the Council of Europe" (Amnesty International 2016). Under this criterion, a refugee can be considered a person seeking asylum and according to Turkish Law 359 they are limited and only benefit from a temporary protection regime in Turkey, which allows them to live there but does not grant them the convention's full protection. This can create many obstacles such as limited access to education, employment, and healthcare.

Analysis

Based on the legal standards set in the Asylum Procedures Directive of the United Nations Refugee Agency, Turkey does not qualify as a safe country of origin due to its specific violations of persecution, inhuman or degrading treatment, and threat by reason of indiscriminate violence in situations of international and internal armed conflict. As the case study discusses, within the past two years there have been multiple cited cases of violence inflicted by Turkish guards on asylum seekers. Some of these situations where violence has been inflicted have ended in the confirmed death of innocent asylum seekers. The asylum seekers sought to escape persecution and violence in their home countries, yet remain trapped in another perilous situation in Turkey. There is not a legitimate basis for the Turkish guards to use violence toward the asylum seekers and these conditions should be deemed unacceptable by the European Union.

A second example of a direct infringement is the inhumane and degrading treatment of asylum seekers taking place in Turkey As the case study states there are refugees in Turkey currently living in improper and unsanitary conditions, such as the case of the asylum seekers

sharing a mattress in a cell with five other people. These conditions are unacceptable and as the EU Parliament noted the Turkish government needs to quickly utilize the allocated EU funds in order to improve the living conditions of the asylum seekers. The unsanitary cells and overcrowding will immediately lead to the spread of sickness and disease within the Turkish detention centers. At a minimum the Turkish government should be closely monitored and placed under EU supervision with respect to its spending of allocated funds. Additionally, the harshness of the living conditions can lead directly to an increase in depression and anxiety of the asylum seekers. Clearly, Turkey has failed to provide for safe and humane treatment of asylum seekers necessary for Turkey to be considered a safe country of origin.

Although many European leaders have portrayed the EU-Turkey Agreement as a success, the only factor that seems to have been taken into consideration is the decrease of irregular arrivals into Europe. The European Union has apparently turned a blind eye to the direct violations of human rights taking place in Turkey. Additionally, the European Union has decided to disregard the fact that Turkey denies full refugee status to non-Europeans and the conditions in Turkey have shown that it is unable to provide substantial protection in order to qualify as a safe third country.

Based on the lack of initiative and action taken by the European Union, it is evident that the EU-Turkey Agreement has failed to effectively solve the migration crisis and it appears that a primary objective of the Agreement is to “sell” the migration problem to Turkey through a bribe that favors Turkey’s relationship with the European Union. The European Union political leaders who have agreed to the EU-Turkey Agreement are likely more concerned about the effect of the crisis on their own domestic political features and not the European Union’s commitment to uphold human rights. This can be demonstrated by the populist movements supported by anti-

migration parties that have developed in many member states as a result of the migration crisis. European citizens generally do not want to share the burden of taking in asylum seekers and have made their position clear politically.

Due to the differences between Turkey and the European Union in regards to their obligations to all asylum seekers no matter their origin versus only European asylum seekers the EU should not rely on Turkey as a legitimate partner due to the fundamental differences in the two actor's obligations to protect human rights. Under the 1951 Refugee Convention Turkey has no formal obligation to treat not European asylum seekers under the same standards as the European Union.

Although Turkey has demonstrated progress in this area by announcing in January 2016 that Syrians are legally permitted to obtain work permits while living in Turkey it is not enough not to mention this does not apply to asylum seekers from countries other than Syria. This shows positive change but it does not alter the clear fact that the two actors have different obligations when it comes to the treatment of asylum seekers. This is not the first time that Turkey has been criticized over this geographic limitation. Multiple European Union member states have voiced their concerns about Turkey joining the EU due to the differences in asylum policies. Turkey has stated that they want to become a member of the European Union yet Turkey has not formally changed its geographic limitation. This can be attributed to lack of overall political will and responsibility of Turkey to commit to the protection of universal human rights.

Conclusion

The European Union is not currently acting as the champion of human rights that it once advocated and needs to immediately reevaluate the renewal and future of the EU-Turkey Agreement. The Agreement has not produced a successful partnership due to Turkey's direct infringement on and violation of human rights, as well as the false designation of Turkey as a safe country of origin. If the European Union wants to retain its status as a human rights advocate, it must reassert responsibility and act on its core principles and commitments. While pawning the burden of asylum seekers on Turkey may be an expedient solution, it has actually created a much more critical need for additional European Union intervention. Solving the crisis will not be an easy process, but it is essential that the crisis be solved in a manner that upholds respect for human rights.

Work Cited

1. Battjes, Hemme. (2017) *Situation of Readmission of Refugees from Greece in the EU-Turkey Statement* RIJE University Amsterdam.
2. Chrsitophersen, Erik (2016) *What is a safe country?* Norwegian Refugee Council.
3. Collett, Elizabeth (2016) *The Paradox of the EU-Turkey Refugee Deal*. European Migration Policy Institute.
4. Dalay, Galip. (2018). *Turkey-EU relations: Dysfunctional Framework, Status Anxiety*. The German Marshall Fund.
5. European Commission (2017) *EU-Turkey Statement One Year On*. Available at https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/background-information/eu_turkey_statement_17032017_en.pdf(Accessed on December 8, 2017).
6. European Commission (2017) *EU-Turkey Statement: Questions and Answers*. Available at http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-16-963_en.htm(Accessed on December 11, 2017).
7. European Parliament (2016)*European Parliament Resolution of 14 April 2016 on the 2015 Report of Turkey*. Available at <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P8-TA-2016-0133+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>(Accessed on December 8, 2017).
8. Gogou, Kondylia (2017) *The EU-Turkey Deal: Europe's Year of Shame*. Amnesty International.
9. Humans Rights Watch (2016) *EU-Turkey Deal Threatens Mass Rights*.
10. Kanter, James. (2016) *European Parliament Votes to Suspend Talks with Turkey on E.U. Membership*. The New York Times.
11. Norwegian Refugee Council (2016) *Five Reasons why the EU Turkey Deal Still Is Not A Good Idea*.

12. Oliveira, Ivo. (2016) *Spain Slams “unacceptable” EU-Turkey Deal*. Politico.
13. Rankin, Jennifer. (2016) *Council of Europe condemns EU’s refugee deal with Turkey*. The Guardian
14. Roman, Emanuela (2016) *Why Turkey is not a “Safe Country”* Safe Watch.
15. Spijkerboer, Thomas (2016) *Fact Check: Did the EU-Turkey Deal Bring Down the Number of Migrants and of Border Deaths?* University of Oxford Faculty of Law.
16. United Nations Refugee Agency (2005) *The Asylum Procedures Directive*.