

UNDERSTANDING THE “HARMONIZATION” OF SYRIANS:
THE POLITICS OF IMPLEMENTATION AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

SEDEN GÜRLEK

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2020

UNDERSTANDING THE “HARMONIZATION” OF SYRIANS:
THE POLITICS OF IMPLEMENTATION AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Political Science and International Relations

by
Seden Gürlek

Boğaziçi University

2020

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Seden Gürlek, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date.....11.11.2020.....

ABSTRACT

Understanding the “Harmonization” of Syrians:

The Politics of Implementation at the Local Level

This thesis studies the implementation processes of Syrian refugee incorporation projects at the local level in Turkey. Recognizing the municipalities’ increased role in refugee incorporation due to being the first level of interaction with state authorities, this research focuses on the implementation practices at the municipal level held in collaboration with non-governmental organizations. The multi-level character of the issue of refugee incorporation brings about the necessary attention that should be paid to the international refugee regime structure in which the objectives, guidelines, and limits on refugee incorporation are set and identified. This thesis aims to explain two interlinked questions: first, to what extent local actors’ practices can associate with what is intended at the national and international level; second, how they carry out their projects in terms of maintaining their interactions with state and non-state actors and putting their projects in practice. As the study of the local level demonstrates, the local actors appropriate the principle of ‘harmonization’ according to the structural factors, i.e., limited nature of the status granted to Syrians, economic hardship in the country, and low level of interest of host communities in communication with Syrians. In addition, the interactions among state and non-state actors are politicized, which determines not only who can be an actor in refugee incorporation at the local level, but also what can be done on the ground regarding refugee incorporation.

ÖZET

Understanding the “Harmonization” of Syrians:

The Politics of Implementation at the Local Level

Bu tez, Suriyeli mülteci icerme projelerinin Türkiye'de yerel düzeydeki uygulama süreçlerini incelemektedir. Devlet yetkilileriyle ilk etkileşim düzeyi olması nedeniyle, belediyelerin mülteci katılımında artan rolüne taniyan bu araştırma, belediye düzeyinde sivil toplum kuruluşlarıyla işbirliği içinde gerçekleştirilen uygulamalara odaklanmaktadır. Mülteci katılımı konusunun çok düzeyli karakteri; mülteci katılımına ilişkin hedeflerin, yönergelerin ve sınırların açıklandığı ve belirlendiği uluslararası mülteci rejimi yapısına dikkat çekmektedir. Bu tez, birbiriyle bağlantılı iki soruyu açıklamayı amaçlamaktadır: birincisi, yerel aktörlerin uygulamalarının ulusal ve uluslararası düzeyde amaçlananla ne ölçüde ilişkilendirilebileceği; ikincisi, projelerini devlet ve devlet dışı aktörlerle etkileşimlerini sürdürmede ve projelerini hayata geçirirmedeki süreçleri nasıl yürüttükleridir. Yerel düzeydeki bu çalışmanın gösterdiği gibi, yerel aktörler, Suriyelilere tanınan statünün sınırlı niteliği, ülkedeki ekonomik zorluklar ve ev sahibi toplulukların Suriyelilerle iletişime düşük ilgisi gibi yapısal faktörler dolayısıyla ‘uyumu’ kendilerince uygulanabilir hale getirmektedirler. Buna ek olarak, devlet ve devlet dışı aktörler arasındaki etkileşimler siyasallaştırılmıştır; bu, yalnızca yerel düzeyde mülteci katılımında kimin aktör olabileceğini değil, aynı zamanda mülteci icerme konusunda sahada neler yapılabileceğini de belirlemektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Undertaking this master has been a truly life-changing experience for me and it would not have been possible without the support and guidance that I received from many people.

During my undergraduate and graduate years at Bogazici, I met excellent professors and had chances to work with some of them very closely. First, I am very thankful to my advisor, Prof. Mine Eder who provided full support in these two years and pushed me to think more deeply in my research. During the reading and research course of her, I buried the first seeds of this research. Then, thanks to her invaluable comments, I was able to single out the main focus of it. Her critiques, feedback, and the discussions on my research throughout the process led me to more interactively engage with my study.

Second, I would like to give my special thanks to Dr. Murat Akan, who encouraged me a lot to seek an M.A. Degree in Political Science when I was studying in Sociology at Bogazici University. His courses I took during my undergraduate and graduate years contributed to my intellectual knowledge in especially looking at 'what is the political' in dealing with the issues through the lenses of power, interest, structure, and agency. In all the courses I took from him he dedicated himself to improve our reading and writing capacity to single out our voice in argumentation. As a student of Dr. Akan for five years, I always felt his support not only through his courses and my research, but also through his advice on how to see a professional life both in academia and outside world. I am deeply indebted to Dr. Murat Akan for equipping me with all the knowledge and vision necessary to complete this journey and step into a professional career upon my graduation.

Besides, I want to thank Prof. Faruk Birtek for his mind-opening courses I took during my bachelor years in Sociology. Thanks to his courses, I developed a theoretical knowledge on the role of institutions in social change. These courses played a significant role in the formation of this thesis through prompting me to ask questions on the institutional processes of implementation of the refugee incorporation projects. I am also thankful to Dr. Zeynep Kadirbeyoglu and Dr. Didem Danis for taking part of my jury and making very important comments on my thesis.

I would like to give another special thanks to my twin sister, Sezen, without whom I could not have finished this thesis. Even if she is a businesswoman with a chemistry background she immensely put her effort in understanding my topic, my arguments, and research in general to the end so that she could give her support not only spiritually in the process, but intellectually. I always felt the support of my family during my masters. They believed in me by heart and encouraged me to realize my goals in life. I would like to thank to my friend, Korhan Polat, for his invaluable companion during my masters by staying by my side in all the good and bad times.

I am also grateful to the Arguden Governance Academy for providing me a research grant to undertake my research. It has lightened my financial burden and allowed me to focus more on my research. Lastly, I owe my thanks to the interviewees and to the team of WALD for their help and collaborations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Methodology	6
1.2 Case districts: Zeytinburnu and Sultanbeyli	12
1.3 Background information on the NGOs and international organizations.....	14
CHAPTER 2: INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE GOVERNANCE AND REFUGEE INCORPORATION	18
2.1 Governance	20
2.2 International refugee regime and governance	24
2.3 Refugee incorporation: Global ideas and local practices	29
CHAPTER 3: INTERNATIONAL AND TURKISH RESPONSE TO SYRIAN CRISIS	42
3.1 International response to Syrian refugees	43
3.2 Turkey’s policy on Syrians and the incorporation practices	48
CHAPTER 4: THE UNDERSTANDING OF “HARMONIZATION” AND ITS SCOPE AT THE LOCAL LEVEL	72
4.1 Harmonization: Bringing host communities and refugees together.....	74
4.2 The scope of harmonization: Struggles to carry out refugee incorporation projects	84
CHAPTER 5: INTERACTION WITH NGOs AND MUNICIPALITIES FOR IMPLEMENTING HARMONIZATION PROJECTS	92
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION.....	102
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW LISTS	109
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	1109

APPENDIX C: EXCERPTS IN THE ORIGINAL TURKISH	110
REFERENCES.....	116

ABBREVIATIONS

3RP	Regional Refugee Resilience Plan
4Rs	Repatriation, Reintegration, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction
AFAD	Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (<i>Afet ve Acil Durum Yönetim Başkanlığı</i>)
AKDEM	Support to Family and Women Center (<i>Aile Kadın Destekleme Merkezi</i>)
AKP	Justice and Development Party (<i>Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi</i>)
ASAM	Association of Asylum-Seekers and Migrants (<i>Sığınmacılar ve Göçmenlerle Dayanışma Derneği</i>)
CARE	Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere
CCTE	Conditional Cash Transfers for Education
CRRF	Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAR	Development Agenda for Resilience Programming
DGMM	Directorate General of Migration Management
DLI	Development through Local Integration
ECHO	European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
ESSN	Emergency Social Safety Net
EU	European Union
EYDAS	Electronic Aid Distribution System
FRIT	Facility for Refugees in Turkey Program
GCR	Global Compact on Refugees
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH
GONGO	Government organized non-governmental organizations
IBC	International Blue Crescent

ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IKGV	Human Resource Development Fund (<i>İnsan Kaynağını Geliştirme Vakfı</i>)
INGOs	International Non-Governmental Organizations
LFIP	Law on Foreigners and International Protection
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
PDMM	Provincial Directorate of Migration Management
SSC	Social Services Center
TEC	Temporary Education Centers
TPC	Temporary Protection Centers
TRC	Turkish Red Crescent (<i>Türk Kızılayı</i>)
UN	United Nations
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
VPMC	Violence Prevention and Monitoring Centers
WALD	World Academy for Local Governance and Democracy
WHH	World Hunger Aid (<i>Welthungerhilfe</i>)
ZEYKOM	Zeytinburnu Coordination Center for Local Development and European Union Relations (<i>Zeytinburnu Yerel Kalkınma ve AB İlişkileri Koordinasyon Merkezi</i>)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of the Syrian War in 2011, millions of Syrians have sought refuge in other countries accounting for 5,550,045¹. Given the mass migration from Syria, primarily neighboring countries have welcomed millions of Syrians but these countries also lacked the institutional and economic capacity to maintain their living. To support them, international bodies put their efforts in responding to the Syrian displacement and assisted these countries by funding the projects on refugee incorporation and improving their state capacities through a regional response plan called Regional Refugee Resilience Plan (3RP) by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). In this respect, the New York Declaration and Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) called for responsibility-sharing to better address the refugee question and refugee incorporation through funding, collaborations and experience sharing. The rationale of the response modality within these proposed interactions is specified as the self-reliance approach and the idea of local integration with social cohesion.² When we look at the equivalent basis of these ideas at the national level in Turkey to locate the Syrian case, we see that state authorities predicate their practices upon the principle of harmonization, defined in the Law on Foreigners and International Protection issued in 2013 that also promotes the same ideas of self-reliance and social cohesion. While these ideas and their

¹ Please see <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations>

² Certain international texts such as Global Compact for Refugees (adopted in 2018), The New York Declaration on Refugees and Migrants (adopted in 2016), UNHCR Policy on Refugees in Urban Areas (issued in 2009, but originating from the same document issued in 1997), and the Framework for Durable Solutions for Refugees and Persons of Concern (adopted in 2003) underpin the refugee incorporation ideas and will be discussed further in the Chapter 2 and 3 as well.

objectives are set in the paper at the international and national level, to what extent they are being implemented on the ground emerge as a question that needed empirical investigation.

With the aim of studying this empirical gap, I elucidated my research questions as the followings: 1) to what extent ideas and objectives regarding refugee incorporation defined at international and national level can be translated into practice at local level under limited conditions including limited nature of the temporary protection status granted to Syrians, the imprecise nature of the principle of harmonization, the ambiguities in the Municipal Law in Turkey, and economic hardship in the country, and 2) through which institutional processes the projects adopting these ideas are generated by the efforts of a web of local actors, specifically officers working at municipalities and non-governmental organizations they are in collaboration with. Due to proximity, local government bodies become a key point of interaction for refugees to receive services and communicate with state authorities (Ray, 2003; Jacobsen, 2006; Schiller & Caglar, 2009; Caglar, 2015; McCollum & Packwood, 2017; Zapata-Barrero, Caponia & Scholten, 2017). Hence, it prioritizes the local actors' trajectories, namely the municipal officers and the NGO officers in Istanbul, to crystallize what harmonization looks like from the perspective of its very practitioners. While an analysis of the first question will be instrumental to see the scope of harmonization in terms of what it is and what it is not, that of the second question will shed light on the nature of the interactions between state institutions, mainly the municipalities, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Turkey. Below, I will provide a brief information on the general legal and socio-political context in Turkey regarding Syrians and then will locate this research in the literature on Syrian refugee incorporation in Turkey.

As the Geneva Convention and the 1967 Protocol inform, Turkey cannot grant a refugee status to the Syrians. Rather, the temporary protection status is granted to them giving certain rights same with the Turkish citizens specifically access to free health and education in 2014 and work permit in 2016 (Law on Foreigners and International Protection no.6458) which can be given under certain conditions (Memisoglu, Ali, & Betts 2017). Yet, the temporality of the status with no indication of full citizenship opportunity prevented them from foreseeing a future in the country, which renders them another insecure position where they cannot claim their fundamental rights (Yildiz & Uzgoren, 2016). Thousands of Syrians, realizing their faith, wanted to reach Europe, for better living conditions such as better public services and rights, while risking their lives in the Mediterranean Sea and the river bordering the Greece lands of Turkey, resulting in a great death toll in 2015 (UNHCR, 2015). The European Union, upon this crisis, signed a deal with the Turkish government and offered financial funds to be used in the refugee incorporation projects in return of preventing their mobility towards Europe by tightening the control of the borders (Icduygu & Millet, 2016). Meanwhile, the number of Syrians heading towards the cities in search of better life conditions has increased, compared to the number of Syrians remaining in the camps where no future exists. Thus, as the number of refugees moving towards the city centers has surged, the incapacity of city authorities', especially municipalities', notably became visible due to their limited resources,³ which was also assessed by the 3RP programming through workshops held with municipalities (which will be discussed in Chapter 3 as well) (United Nations Development Programme, 2016).

³ State allocates the general budget to municipalities predominantly according to the size of the population where only citizens are counted. Therefore, municipalities hosting larger groups of refugees have financial difficulties in serving refugees because they are not counted as citizens in allocating the budget (Erdogan, 2017a).

Having said that while there is no clear statement on the duration of the Syrians' presence in the country, state authorities stress the use of the principle of "harmonization" propelled by the Law on Foreigners and International Protection (LFIP). Due to its connotation of assimilation, state authorities insist on the usage of the 'harmonization' rather than integration (Erdogan, 2017a) which is associated with relinquishing the cultural identity of the individuals. Whether this term encompasses the 'process' of service provision and refugee incorporation or only defines the activities that harmonize and bring different groups including foreigners, people under protection status and host societies together remain unanswered. Moreover, while harmonization law does not involve any official assignment for municipalities in this process, Turkish government discursively uttered a role to them by launching some conferences on the role of municipalities in terms of how local governments should react to new arrivals (Erdogan, 2017a). It also declared the year of 2019 as the year of harmonization ("Mecliste Mülteci," 2018) and pledged to open harmonization centers in cities. However, no official document elaborating on the context of the harmonization and regulation has been provided by the government. The imprecision on the principle of harmonization in terms of its implementation and objectives bring about practical difficulties for its practitioners. In this thesis, through semi-structured interviews and my participant observation, I will show that harmonization is appropriated by the local actors in that they define and channel their practices in the name of harmonization depending on the structural constraints such as the limited nature of the temporary protection status of Syrians, language barrier, economic hardship in the country, and lack of interest on the side of host society towards Syrians.

When we look at the literature on refugee incorporation processes in Turkey, we see different conceptualizations of the issue considering the legal regulations including granting rights for access to free healthcare, free education for children, and access to work permits. For example, Danis and Nazlı saw it as reception because of the temporariness of Syrians as opposed the permanent character of integration (Danis & Nazlı, 2018) and Icdyugu and Millet called pseudo-integration in the analysis of limited nature of the work-permits (Icdyugu & Millet, 2016) thinking the labor market integration is indispensable. In the analysis of the limits within the Syrian refugee incorporation practices, the literature drew attention to the structural factors based on the shortcomings of the work permit (Icdyugu & Millet, 2017), rising unemployment rate in the country (Kavak, 2016), the drawbacks of the temporary protection status given to Syrians (Baban, Ilcan, & Rygiel, 2016; Yıldız & Uzgoren, 2016), and the problem of social acceptance through xenophobia and discrimination (Ataç et al., 2017).

On the other hand, a few studies portrayed how some local governments operate their service provisions under these structural constraints pointing to: party politics (Elicin, 2018), the ambiguity between the Law on Foreigners and International Protection and the Municipal Law in terms of the municipal authorities' jurisdiction (Erdogan 2017a; Genc, 2018), and the instrumental use of *ensar* and *muhacir* discourse promoted by the government (Danis & Nazli, 2018). All these studies underline the importance of personal motivation, in terms of using the discretionary power local authorities may have, in serving refugees due to the absence of a clear legal framework. This study will also build up on this argument by showing that although structural constraints determine what can be done on the ground regarding refugee incorporation, the agency of local practitioners in terms of

personal motivation plays a crucial role in overcoming these constraints where possible during the implementation processes of the harmonization projects.

Furthermore, these studies demonstrated how much the government and its politics shape the field of Syrian refugee governance and their incorporation practices (Sunata & Tosun, 2018; Elicin, 2018; Danis & Nazlı, 2018). This study also hopefully aims to contribute to this argument through lensing out the interactions among local practitioners in the municipalities and NGOs in collaborations. Thus, it takes into account different actors' interests and the discretionary power bureaucrats may have (Lahav & Guiraudon, 2006, p. 214) due to the ambiguity of the law, budgetary constraints or emergency of solutions when these actors collaborate with each other and put a certain practice in refugee incorporation. By unraveling the implementation processes, this study explicates the formal and informal institutional properties that inform the implementation of the projects. Regarding to that, this thesis concludes that the interaction between these institutional actors are arbitrary and very much politicized. In this research, we will see not only the political proximity to the government, but also the level of aligning with government's terms such as staying conservative in using gender norms during the harmonization projects becomes a prerequisite to put a certain project in practice.

1.1 Methodology

This study arose out of field observations for a previous research in a neighborhood solidarity association in Okmeydani, Istanbul in the fall term of 2017. During that time, the members of the association were criticizing the lack of coordination among aid actors and insufficient help by the municipal authorities to the Syrians as well as host communities. Then, I started searching for the existing efforts of municipalities

in incorporating Syrians in their districts. First I studied what kind of work they do for refugees whilst recognizing that the term harmonization was circling around but I could not capture what it really means. If it was not still very clear for an outsider who skimmed through the relevant legislations, news, and the exemplary projects, what do its very practitioners on the ground understand from harmonization stood out as an interesting point for me. This led me to set up a research design investigating the implementation processes of what has been done under harmonization of Syrians. The focus of implementation, here, enable us to see not only the content of the practices under harmonization, but also the underlying conditions in bringing an action in this course.

To delineate the implementation processes of Syrian refugee incorporation, I focused on the local level implementation of refugee incorporation projects. Though actors at the local level in the field of refugee incorporation involve a plethora of state and non-state actors, I targeted the officers at municipalities as the local level state authorities and the NGOs that they are work with. The main reason behind this choice was the fact that thanks to the decentralized position of the municipalities from the government, municipalities can be more flexible in their collaborations with non-state actors compared to the district governorships tied directly to the central government. Thus, I did not intend to cover the trajectories of the officers working in Social Service Centers, state hospitals, Istanbul Provincial Directorate of Migration Management and other state institutions operating also at the local level. It was also not feasible due to the time frame.

Another limitation of this study is related with its focus on Syrian refugee incorporation. While the projects on harmonization and refugee incorporation can involve the efforts towards all refugee groups, I only looked at the incorporation

practices tailored for Syrians but not for other refugee groups such as Afghans, Somalis, or Kazakhs, due to a couple of reasons: the high number of Syrians living in Turkey, the international attention to the displacement of the Syrians, thereby, the funds coming to the local to be used in service provision to Syrians, as well as the plethora of the refugee incorporation projects by the efforts of the international and local actors.

This research is an in-depth qualitative research based on ethnographic fieldwork combining participant observation and semi-structured interviews in Istanbul with 13 people in two different time periods: from April to June 2018 and from May to September 2019. It also draws on a review of United Nations (UN) policy documents to show the formation of the self-reliance, social cohesion and its relation with harmonization framework; the relevant legislations in Turkey to identify the institutional structures and Turkish Law on Foreigners and International Protection; as well as the secondary data to highlight the domestic politics regarding migration and refugees.

Fieldwork included interviews with municipal officers of Zeytinburnu and Sultanbeyli District Municipalities, and representatives of international and domestic NGOs as well as my participant observation as an intern at the World Academy for Local Governance and Democracy (WALD) in the Social Protection Project partnered with UNHCR. The districts of Sultanbeyli and Zeytinburnu are selected as the local cases for three reasons: the proximity of the ratio of refugees to the district population, the prevalence of a common ruling party, Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (AKP - Justice and Development Party) in the district and the existence of a municipal body in direct link with the municipality which shows the concrete support of those municipalities to service provision to refugees. I will provide more

information about these main districts, municipalities along with their municipal bodies carrying out refugee incorporation projects below.

The NGOs and international organizations, I interviewed with were UNHCR, International Blue Crescent (IBC), Save the Children, Insan Kaynagini Gelistirme Vakfi (IKGV) (I will also provide information on these organizations below). The reason I chose these organizations as representative cases was their collaborations between Zeytinburnu and Sultanbeyli District Municipalities⁴ because this research aims to reveal the interactions among the local actors during the implementation of projects. In this way, I was able not only to provide a wider perspective on the understanding of local practitioners on harmonization and the works they generate on the ground, but also to see how state and non-state actors interact with one another. For this research, I interviewed with 6 officers working in those organizations and 7 officers working at Zeytinburnu and Sultanbeyli Municipalities in total. In all the interviews, I employed the note-taking method with the permission of the interviewees. While providing the findings from the interviews, I give the name of the institution that the interviewee works at but not the names of the interviewees for ethical concerns. In addition, for those officers working at the same institution, I indicate them as interview A and B along with the name of the institution. All the interviews, except the one with one of the officers from IKGV,⁵ were conducted in the working places of the interviewees and lasted approximately one hour and a half.

I would like to mention that doing this research was not very easy at the beginning because I experienced difficulties to arrange interviews with officers in the

⁴ Besides those NGOs, Mavi Kalem Association also had collaborations with Zeytinburnu Municipality, but I was rejected to do an interview with them a couple of times.

⁵ The officer suggested meeting in a cafe, suitable for both of us, due to the hectic and noisy atmosphere in Esenler Multi-Service Community Center which is one of the office locations of IKGV.

NGOs mentioned above. Once I prepared my research design and identified the NGOs, I called their offices and sent emails twice. However, after two weeks passed upon my trials ended up with no answers, I decided to visit the NGOs saying that I would like to introduce myself and my research and if they would be interested I want to make an interview with their focal points. I was gently dismissed by an NGO (Mavi Kalem Derneği), which has been also a partner of UNHCR, being informed that they will get back to me later. Then, after a couple of days, they apologized for not having an available person to interview with me. Another NGO (IKGV) kindly reminded me that they are only allowed to speak with people directed by the higher level authorities in IKGV. Having all these disappointments, I was frustrated and over exhausted by the closing doors. Even, I thought I might not be able to conduct this research because I cannot get in the field. Then, thanks to a couple of suggestions, I decided to ask a person who might have communications with those local practitioners for a favor of introducing me to a couple of focal points working in these NGOs, if possible. That person put me in contact with 4 different organizations working on Syrian refugees including IKGV. Then, my research could start its journey. During my fieldwork, I learned that since the field of migration has received a lot of attention from academia and related fields to get information on the ground, NGOs are overwhelmed by the demand of interviews. To note that, I did not experience any difficulty to arrange an interview with municipal officers by myself.

Once I was able to start doing interviews, I was trying to find ways to immerse myself in my research more deeply. To deepen my knowledge on daily processes of implementation of projects, I decided to be present in the sites of refugee incorporation. After doing an interview with UNHCR and learning about their partnership with WALD on the Social Protection, I sat down and tried to collect

more information via the Internet on the scope of the project as the project takes place at the municipal level and aims at the capacity development of municipalities by UNHCR's partner non-governmental organizations. The idea of doing an internship at WALD just came to my mind and in a short period of time I got the appointment for an internship interview. During the interview with the program director of WALD, I explained my personal and educational background as well as my research on the refugee incorporation projects being implemented on the local level. The director ended the discussion by saying that we can learn from you and you can learn from us in terms of how the things work in an NGO and how services are provided to refugees. To note that, I used no personal contact to get this internship.

My internship at WALD coincides with the second time period starting from June 20, 2019 to August 25, 2019. The project agreement is negotiated between UNHCR and WALD and written by UNHCR (UNHCR, personal communication, June, 19, 2019). The strong relationships of WALD with local municipal authorities enabled WALD to partner with UNHCR (WALD, internship field notes, July 2019). The project operates in 12 districts in Istanbul⁶ whose offices are provided by municipalities for free, which also shows the support given by those municipalities. The officers in each district consist of an Arabic interpreter, a social worker, a lawyer, and a psychologist. My role as an intern was to assist the general operations in the offices in these districts such as filling out the forms, helping the organization of harmonization activities in the districts as well the translations of the reports prepared for the UNHCR and WALD's annual reports. During my internship, I was able to visit and work in six different district municipality desks. These districts were

⁶ These districts are Beylikduzu, Kucukcekmece, Avcilar, Bagcilar, Sultangazi, Gaziosmanpasa, Kagithane, Sisli, Maltepe, Umraniye, Sancaktepe, and Pendik.

Kucukcekmece, Sultangazi, Avcilar, Pendik, Bagcilar, and Gaziosmanpasa. I did not choose these districts as my sites for internship but was assigned to work at those offices due to need for help in general. Yet, I should note that every four districts were in charge of an officer called team leader, thus in working at 6 offices I was also able to learn about the implementation processes in other districts during the daily talks with those officers during work as well.

1.2 Case districts: Zeytinburnu and Sultanbeyli

I will explain the above mentioned reasons of case selections in terms of districts.

First, Zeytinburnu has the highest ratio of refugees to its population while Sultanbeyli ranks fifth among 39 districts (Erdogan, 2017a, p.36). While, Sultanbeyli hosts the largest number of refugees in Anatolian side of the city with 20.192 people, in Zeytinburnu there are 25.000 refugees living in the district (Erdogan, 2017a, p.37). In terms of the ruling political party, the two districts belong to the Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (AKP - Justice and Development Party), the governing party of Turkey.

Sultanbeyli ranks 39th and Zeytinburnu ranks 25th in in terms of the quality of life index measured in 2016 (Erdogan, 2017a, p.39). In terms of the social-economic position of the districts, Zeytinburnu has received immigrants and refugees over the years from different countries, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Russia, Afghanistan, Iraq, and now Syria. Textile industry is the main economic sector in the district. Sultanbeyli did not have a noticeable amount of refugees or immigrants until the settlement of Syrians (Sultanbeyli Municipality Strategic Development Department, interviewee A, personal communication, April 19, 2018). Main

economic activities within the districts are the textile industry and construction sector.

Within 39 districts of Istanbul, Zeytinburnu and Sultanbeyli Municipalities have emerged as two municipalities which have followed a similar strategy in acting upon the issue of refugee incorporation within their districts: they organize their actions in this regard under a certain municipal unit – Kente Uyum Toplum Merkezi (Adaptation to The City Community Center) within the institutional body of Aile Kadın Destekleme Merkezi (AKDEM – Support to Family and Women Center) in Zeytinburnu Municipality and Multeciler Dernegi (Refugee Association) in Sultanbeyli Municipality.

Zeytinburnu Municipalities founded AKDEM even before the foundation of Ministry of Interior Directorate General of Migration Management established in 2013 and operationalized in 2014. In the beginning, AKDEM was formed as a project writing center and evolved into a large service center in a short period of time thanks to the positive feedback from the district municipality (AKDEM, personal communication July 24, 2018). Upon its foundation, to leverage operations of the international projects generated in collaboration with Zeytinburnu Municipality, Zeytinburnu Yerel Kalkınma ve AB İlişkileri Koordinasyon Merkezi (ZEYKOM-Zeytinburnu Coordination Center for Local Development and European Union Relations) was established (ZEYKOM, interview A, personal communication April 26, 2018). The center provides migrants, refugees, and host community a variety of services for free ranging from language education for both children and adults, psycho-social consultancy to Uyum Okulu (School of Harmonization) for children where they are supported with catch-up courses and socio-cultural activities. Since

the Syrian refugees have started to settle in the district, the center has provided the same services for Syrian refugees as well.

Sultanbeyli Municipality established the Multeciler Dernegi (Refugee Association) in 2014. Although the institution has the title of association, it operates in an organic relationship with the Sultanbeyli Municipality provided that the president of the association is the deputy mayor of Sultanbeyli Municipality and the Sultanbeyli Strategic Development Department works hand in hand with the Multeciler Dernegi in project writing process and finding international donors (Sultanbeyli Multeciler Dernegi, personal communication, April 19, 2018). The purpose of the center is to provide free support for refugees and asylum seekers in the areas of health, housing, education, culture, social consultancy, and translation services. It should be noted that, during the interviews, both municipalities underlined the limited budget they have, but, they did not share the amount of budget they have to operate their policies on refugees. Also, the level of interaction between those municipal units in these districts are not at the same level. That is to say, while ZEYKOM and AKDEM does not have a very strong relationship in terms of collaborations for projects in recent years, Sultanbeyli Strategic Development Department and Multeciler Dernegi have a strong one, as I assessed through my interviews. Yet both ZEYKOM and Sultanbeyli Strategic Development Department has interactions both at the national and international level within refugee incorporation projects in the districts.

1.3 Background information on the NGOs and international organizations

UNHCR Istanbul Office has operated since 2014. Currently, they have more than 10 domestic partners operating in the city such as IKGV, Siginmacilar ve Gocmenlerle

Dayanisma Dernegi (ASAM), Multeciler Dernegi, Yuva Dernegi, and Mavi Kalem Dernegi. They carry out the 3RP programming in response to the Syrian refugees in Turkey. In their response, they work not only with municipalities and domestic non-governmental organizations but also ministries as they endeavor to increase the state capacity in accommodating the refugees. While they acknowledge the sovereignty of Turkish state in formulating its own agenda in the field of migration, in their operations they are also informed by the ideas and guidelines provided through UN's policies, international conventions, and development agendas.

International Blue Crescent (IBC) started to operate in Sultanbeyli in 2016. Their project called Multi Sectoral Community Project was managed by the International Organization of Migration, and the International Blue Crescent operated the project in the field. The project was funded initially by the European Union based from Brussels, upon the end of the financial resources, the Bureau of Population and Migration of America started to fund the project. In their office, IBC offers psycho-social support to the refugees, social services such as case referrals, and women health seminars including the topics of conscious parenting, reproductive health, family attitudes training. Their interaction with the Multeciler Dernegi occurs through the Women Support Center in the office of Multeciler Dernegi. The project also has a harmonization unit which organizes activities in the areas of education, culture, sports, and site visits. These activities are listed as Children and Youth Club, conflict resolution activities, team-building practices in sport activities.

Save the Children, an international organization, started to operate in Zeytinburnu, within the body of AKDEM in September 2018. The project is negotiated between AKDEM and Save the Children and written according to the wishes of the donor organization. The project was aimed to fill out the areas that

AKDEM found itself insufficient. The main course of the project is the resilience of refugee boys and girls. As they share the physical space and operate under the same body, AKDEM, they interactively work together such as they share the profiles of the refugees registered to AKDEM to reach out to the refugees. Within their project, Save the Children operates a Children Reading Club where children read books together. They also organize museum visits and football activities for refugee and host communities.

Insan Kaynagini Gelistirme Vakfi (IKGV) is the first NGO that started providing legal counseling (since 2001) and psychological counseling (since 2002) to asylum seekers and refugees in Turkey. Since that time, IKGV worked with the Municipalities of Zeytinburnu, Esenler, Sisli, Maltepe, and Beyoglu, Esenyurt. They are partners with UNHCR, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ), Welthungerhilfe (WHH), European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO). Esenler Multi-Service Community Center was established in 2014 and funded by the Welthungerhilfe and GIZ. Apart from the case referrals, and the center mainly focuses on the raising awareness on child labor and children rights. The fund on harmonization is backed up by UNHCR within this body and the main course of activity is the choir generated by women coming from refugees and host communities. In 2017, IKGV wanted to get in touch with AKDEM but could not receive a positive return. In 2019, they are called by AKDEM for the implementation of any activity on psycho-social support of the refugee children. This collaboration came through in that year.

Lastly, I would like to touch upon a methodological concern for this research. As I mentioned before, it was very difficult to reach out to the NGOs and international organizations without having any personal contact with them at the

beginning of this research. When I was able to set a date for interview, the organizations who did not get back to my emails and phone calls or who kindly rejected my requests for doing interviews explained their reluctance to get in touch with researchers in two reasons: first, if they positively respond to the high number of such requests, they would not maintain their daily work; second, the higher amount of research related with their organization is done the more visibility they would gain in the eyes of the government who might arbitrarily suspend their activities related with refugees or permanently terminate without designating any proper reason. This situation also assured that the authoritarian grip and the strong centralist position of the government in Turkey affects not only the potential interactions between researchers and organizations serving refugees, but also, I believe that, it affects the kind of data we as researchers collect from the field even if we are able to connect with those organizations. Under these conditions, the intentions of researchers could seem, to the interviewees, as uncovering the organizations' works in the area of refugee incorporation and their opponent position vis-à-vis the government. Therefore, they might be censoring what they can and cannot say in answering my questions thinking that these researches might trouble the presence of the organization upon the public exposure of the research depending on what is written. Therefore, it is plausible that the level of trust to the interviewers might not be high. Within this context, researchers experience the struggle to sustain the scope and accountability of the analysis made out of their fieldwork as it was the case for this research as well. Hence, the reader should always keep in mind that the political polarization in Turkey might also have affected the way I see the implementation of refugee incorporation projects at the local level and the way I reflect upon the issue in my analyses.

CHAPTER 2
INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE GOVERNANCE
AND REFUGEE INCORPORATION

Millions of people are displaced around the world settling in mainly neighboring countries. The protracted situations in conflict zones have left millions of refugees in limbo incapable of seeing their future. Many international actors, the United Nations High Commissioner, and other UN agencies have endeavored to come up with certain solutions for the needs of both refugees and host states. On the other hand, neighboring countries put their efforts in providing assistance to the refugees and incorporating them into their national systems while making collaborations with the international body where relevant. Thus, refugee incorporation processes by nature have a multi-layered character, consisting of local, national, and international levels, in which each level appears as having its own jurisdictions, conditions, and interests in the case of refugee incorporation.

Looking at the specific case of Syrians in Turkey, this research tries to answer the question of how local actors, more specifically personnel from municipalities and domestic civil society organizations, implement refugee incorporation projects under given conditions while interacting with different actors such as international organizations, state authorities, and host and refugee community. The focus of the local level will also yield insight on how international ideas embodied in the international responses to Syrians is being reflected on the ground.

In order to explain the implementation processes of the refugee incorporation projects at local level as a solution for refugee questions, we should acknowledge the

regime's multi-layered nature and its proposed interactions to maintain the regime. To better grasp the importance of its multi-level character, this research adopts a governance approach in mapping the actors, interactions, and decision-making processes within this structure.

For this purpose, in this chapter, we will first focus on what governance entails. Then we move to understand its relation with the international refugee regime framework that informs both the operational and ideational grounds of the refugee incorporation projects. We will, at that point, particularly look at the structure including regulations, institutions, and ideas, which determines the mobility of refugees. It is crucial to bear the limits and regulations within the order of the international refugee regime in mind because in the Chapter 4 and 5 we will see that while the temporary protection status given to refugees instead of a full refugee status limits the realization of social cohesion and harmonization ideals, it also renders refugees in a position of being a means of politics in the hands of the government through the arrests and deportations coming right after the defeat of the Justice and Development Party in the mayoral election of Istanbul in June 2019 (Gall, 2019). In Chapter 4, we will see that these political developments eradicated all the efforts done in concretizing the harmonization of Syrians as the local practitioners indicated.

After that, I will introduce the international texts providing the trajectories of the refugee incorporation regarding the future of refugees. In this context, I will mainly focus on the durable solutions framework with its principles and guidelines in responding to the refugee situations today. These texts are important because the international response to the Syrian refugees is informed by these texts and frameworks as well. These discussions will also give us a map of how international

and national actors are positioned in dealing with the refugee problems and inform us about the guiding principles on refugee incorporation practices. Lastly, to grasp how these international ideas and frameworks are operationally reflected on the local, I will look at the literature on refugee and migrant incorporation at local level to underline the importance of the characteristics of localities, institutional practices and local actors' understanding of refugee incorporation.

After discussing them, in Chapter 3, we will closely examine the international principles, regarding refugee incorporation, in the case of Syrian refugees by looking at international responses through the Regional Refugee Resilience Plan (3RP), New York Declaration and Global Compact on Refugees and elaborate more on how these guidelines and principles at the international level materialized in the specific case of Syrian refugees while discussing Turkey's refugee incorporation practices.

2.1 Governance

Within the literature of governance studies, many scholars have defined it in one way or another (Pierre, 2000; Rhodes, 1996; Stoker, 1998; Koopman, 1999; Jessop, 1995); from all their definitions, we can discern the baseline of governance as the blurring boundaries between public and private sectors and the emerging necessity of the encompassing coordination to achieve a meaningful and collective action. The main characteristics of governance are its intention to steer attention to beyond the authority and rules of government and its incorporation of the non-state actors to the structure or the order. First, the definition reveals the emphasis of the interdependence of actors rather than the state as the mere actor, where the coordination among these actors and their influence upon each other play a defining role for the governance concept. Yet, these networks do not erode the role of the

state in public service provision; actors' playing field and their mission are still subjected to the government's control (Rosenau, 2005).

Second, thanks to this interdependence of organizations, the close link among actors enables them to mobilize the public, elites, knowledge, and power resources easily. In order to reach their objectives 'they have to exchange resources and negotiate common purposes and the outcome of exchange is determined not only by the resources of the participants but also by the rules of the game and the context of the exchange' (Stoker, 1998, p.22). In Chapter 3, in explaining the Syrian refugee incorporation projects operated at the local level, we will see the resources that the actors exchange during the implementation as knowledge, experience, funds, personnel, and logistics. In again Chapter 3, we will discuss delimiting elements in the context of the exchange of these resources in implementation by looking at the socio-political atmosphere, the Turkish Laws informing about the status of the Syrians in the country, the principle of harmonization and duties and mandates under the principle. Furthermore, in Chapter 4, we will see how those resources fed into the practices during implementation of harmonization projects.

Once actors create systemic coordination for the exchange based on a mutual understanding of the objectives and rules, self-governing networks might emerge to regulate the governance structure and order. The autonomy that the organizations enjoy through these self-governing networks can increase the availability of the information and reduce the transaction costs (Stoker, 1998, p.23) on the one hand; it might lead to problems of accountability especially under the authoritarian regimes who mostly see the non-state actors as a threat to the regime (Salamon, 2006), on the other.

In sum, dependence on the non-state actors and their interactions among non-state actors and between the public sector is the defining characteristic of governance studies. However, while the interdependence and complex relationship features of governance received attention, some scholars (Peters & Pierre, 2005; Jessop, 2005) warn us on the '(over)emphasis on the coordination and relationships in governance studies. Their critiques are worth mentioning since this thesis aims to speak to these gaps within the refugee governance analysis. These critiques rely on two interlinked grounds: its focus on problem-solving, second its neglect of the traditional institutional workings of the systems.

Jessop (2005) approached this issue by arguing that governance theories mostly concerned problem-solving and crisis management in a wide range of fields. For this cause, those theories focused on the decision-making or goal attainment issues to show the contribution of governance to the solution. However, Jessop (2005) argues that this approach overlooks 'governance failure, that is, the tendency for governance to fail to achieve its declared objectives; and *a fortiori*, neglect of the various responses of different agents or subjects of governance to such failures as they attempt to engage in different forms of meta-governance' (p. 61). If a governance study compares which objective is formally assigned to whom and through which networks it is dealt with, then, the question of what informs these rationales needs to be answered. Jessop's response to this question is that the new form of exchange of resources and interaction within the reflexive self-organization - which refers to the self-organizing networks in Stoker's term - co-existed or became complementary to the traditional institutional working of the state. Moreover, the existing institutional properties can speak not only to the governance structure in question but can inform us about other structures as well.

In a similar vein, Peters and Pierre (2005) uttered their concern by arguing that ‘the institutional grip on political processes within the state and between the domestic and supranational actors still play a defining role in governing let alone with it loosened’ (p. 75). Similarly, New Urban Governance scholars (Hohn & Neuer, 2006; Healey, 2006) emphasized the significance of institutional properties for studies of governance. They dealt with the multi-actor governance of the urban development processes through both informal and formal networks in hierarchical and horizontal structures and power balances (Hohn & Neuer, 2006). The theory proposes that institutions constitute the rules of the "game" named governance. Institutions structure roles and guide the interactions of the "players". They influence the outcomes arising from interactions of actors whose actions are embedded in social and cultural settings and they are confirmed or transformed by those interactions. Therefore, the institutional context of the governance and potential path dependencies shape the governance system. In chapter 5, in examining the kind of self-governing networks emerged in local refugee governance, we will study the both informal and formal institutional properties which stand as the underlying conditions in practicing the projects in the local governance structure.

As a result, in an interdependent system, how different players exercise authority within their jurisdictions and vis-a-vis the other actors is also contingent upon the nature of the institutional properties that determine the context of the exchange of resources and inform their relationships. Thus, in line with the critiques mentioned above, my qualification of the study of governance is to incorporate the institutional identities and relationships into the analysis of interactions among the actors. By relying on the institutional analysis of the governance structure, I will be able to lens out both formal and informal properties that direct the actors’ response as

showing the underlying mechanisms - *the rules of the game* - in the governance structure. Studying the characteristics of governance enabled us the tools to investigate the organizational processes of refugee incorporation projects in the following chapters. Now, we will look at how global networks in response to the refugee question are oriented within the international refugee regime.

2.2 International refugee regime and governance

International refugee governance is generated through a web of non-governmental, non-profit, and international institutions. In the aftermath of World War II, the regime was created in 1951 by the Geneva Convention on the Status of Refugees which established the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and assigned a leading role in its implementation. The refugee regime stands for the networks among these actors and the institutions that inform their actions in governing the mobility of people. Thus, international refugee regime governance projects the relations between these states and non-state actors in a realm where no unifying authority exists but the UNHCR is deemed as the guide in the implementation of the Convention. As the interdependence among institutions and states has increased driven by globalization, the issue of mobility has complicated interactions between different regimes and gained more visibility in the form of asylum and labor migrants.

According to the refugee regime, the Geneva Convention extensively defines the status of the displaced people and the state's role vis-a-vis those people. This regime defines a refugee as someone who has been forced to flee his or her country because of persecution, war, or violence and limited to protecting mainly European refugees in the aftermath of World War II. The 1967 Protocol expanded the scope of

the Convention by giving the states ratifying the Convention an option to lift the geographical restriction as the problem of displacement spread around the world. Only four countries, including Turkey, Republic of the Congo, Madagascar, and Monaco, chose to retain the restriction during the Protocol. However, today only Turkey retains the geographical limitation (Congo and Monaco lifted the restriction upon the 1967 Protocol and Madagascar did not ratify the Protocol) (UNHCR, 2014b). While the international law on asylum determines the status of persons of concern and the necessity to protect human lives through the Geneva Convention, the regulations on human mobility have had a much more complicated reality because they heavily rely on the intricate relations among different issue areas and institutions ranging from human rights, security, development, and peace-building (Betts, 2010).

Alexander Betts (2010) explains the entanglement in international refugee governance by using the term regime complexity. By this term, he refers to “the multiple nesting, parallel and overlapping regimes whose institutions may be complementary or contradictory in its implications for a given regime” (Betts, 2010, p.14). This complexity of the regime, he stresses, brings an opportunity for States, the Northern States, in particular, to use a cross-institutional strategy in which *regime shifting* becomes available for States in relocating problems to the area of another regime.

Studying, in particular, the overlap between refugee and travel regime, which regulates the ability of people to cross the border, Betts (2010) argues that States enjoys the opportunity to “address their concerns with spontaneous arrival asylum through the travel regime’s instruments such as border control, visas, and readmission agreements while bypassing the refugee regime without explicitly

violating the obligation stated in the Convention” (p.16). In other words, States restrict the access to spontaneous arrival asylum to territory without breaching the compliance with the *non-refoulement* principle (not forcing refugees to return to the country where they will be subjected to persecution) defined in the Convention. Therefore, the availability of this strategy, according to Betts, has allowed States to refrain from international cooperation in protecting refugees on their territory. This character of the travel-refugee regime complex takes a heavy toll on the provision of asylums and thereby likely leads to a decline in the role of States in responsibility and burden-sharing in international refugee governance.

The projection of the use of this strategy can also be read through the lens of migration-asylum nexus in which labor migrants and asylum seekers in the global South moved towards the global North, driven by the impacts of globalization and rising inequality in the South and de-industrialization and social transformations in the North. Nonetheless, States’ approach to ‘all entrants with suspicion and restrictiveness’ to distinguish the qualified laborers contradicts with their pledge to protect refugees from persecution (Castles, 2007) and advocate human rights. In sum, this western-centric character of the refugee regime limits the protection of displaced people from other parts of the world, mainly Africa and Asia, as refugees (Hathaway, 1990).

Furthermore, this restrictive nature of the regime also brings the question of how to ‘govern’ these displaced people in the country of arrival and settlement where their mobility towards the global North is restricted through strict border controls and regime shifting strategies and refugees are in a way constrained to stay in the global South. The creation of refugee camps depicts a vivid picture of the policy of containment so to say. Studying the government of Kenya and pointing to other

countries, Jacobsen (2006) shows through the control of the camps, governments limited the movement of refugees from camps or designated areas to cities and “allow only the mobility of those having permits due to health and special protection needs”; however, due to the non-strict surveillance of the camps, refugees could leave those areas” (p. 274). Obviously, not every country imposes such regulation given the countries without camps, such as South Africa, Egypt, and in many Western countries. Nonetheless, worldwide, refugees tend to leave camps in pursuit of creating a life in urban areas where they might have better resources and opportunities, noting that staying in the camps or living in urban areas does not matter in enjoying the rights specified in the Geneva Convention (Jacobsen, 2006). The refugee mobility towards urban areas has brought the need for infrastructure and functioning local service and thereby put forth the importance of local authorities in deciding on whether migration will be welcomed and new policies and projects regarding these issues will be tailored. As the focus of this study is what kind of action and how the local municipal authorities put a practice in the name of Syrian refugee incorporation, in Chapter 5, we will be dealing with their actions and interactions with non-governmental organizations in their endeavor of welcoming and incorporating Syrians in their districts.

On the other hand, Betts (2010) sees a positive side of this travel-refugee regime complex; he believes that this complexity could potentially increase cooperation on burden-sharing as well. He illustrates this point by arguing that the Northern States wants to securitize the movement of people from the South through border control, visas, and readmission agreement; and the Southern States can demand more burden-sharing due to their potential power in controlling the borders. For the actualization of the potential of the complex to breed a positive outcome,

there needs to be a rigorous commitment of States to responsibility-sharing. Yet, we see a low commitment of donor countries in providing money or resettlement to shoulder the responsibility today (Betts, 2018). Therefore, according to Betts (2018), this situation underlines the fact that although the international refugee regime clearly defined the law on asylum, it fell short of the institutionalization of the ‘responsibility sharing’ norm where “proximity and geography to crisis historically defined the state responsibility” (p. 623). As in the case of Syrian refugees, neighboring countries have taken the major part of the responsibility even they lack the institutional and financial capacity to maintain their lives.

To give a general picture of the international refugee governance, we studied the Geneva Convention and internationally promised but weakly defined responsibility-sharing point. We saw that the regime’s complexity limits the provision of asylum by the Northern States shifting the burden to the States hosting refugees. Refugee hosting countries’ response modalities are also defined by the regime to a certain extent. Accordingly, durable solutions and *self-reliance approach* - seen as supplementary to the durable solutions and undergirding a developmental perspective – are set out modalities in responding to the situation of refugees, specified by UNHCR. These durable solutions are voluntary repatriation, resettlement, and local integration. The next section explains what these solutions account for within the refugee governance and how the roles, responsibilities, and principles are defined in this regard. Understanding these solutions will provide a basis to interpret the refugee incorporation projects on the ground in the specific case of Syrian refugees in Turkey in the following chapters. After looking at these solutions and showing the principles to follow to implement such solutions at the international level, I will bring the literary discussion on how local actors take action

in response to the refugee question in their territories showing the constraints and enablers of such action.

2.3 Refugee incorporation: Global ideas and local practices

2.3.1 The durable solutions framework

The ideas on both durable solutions and development approach aim at better responding to the challenges in refugee governance. Provided by the Geneva Convention, durable solutions are voluntary repatriation to the country of origin, resettlement to a third country, and local integration in either country of asylum or country of origin as mentioned above. UNHCR cherishes a developmental perspective with a self-reliance approach which aims to safeguard the enjoyment of the productive capacities of refugees and strengthening the resilience of host communities. Therefore, by nature, the approach sees refugees as a person who can rely on his abilities to make their lives and contribute to the society they live in. In this part, I will first briefly introduce what these solutions are and then explain the self-reliance approach which dominates the international response to the refugee crisis, especially protracted refugee situations. In Chapter 3, we will see that the self-reliance approach is also adopted by Turkish law for the principle of harmonization which corresponds to the idea of social cohesion defined at the international level. Yet, in Chapter 4, I will demonstrate the limits of these ideals in translating into practice due to certain structural factors factoring into the implementation processes.

Voluntary repatriation stands out as a durable solution in which refugees and people of concern freely and consciously choose to return to their country of origin. This ideal could only generate if the circumstances in the country of origin enable a

safe and dignified life where they can reintegrate themselves into society. UNHCR supports the return and reintegration of displaced people through various means such as “evaluating living conditions in their country, organizing ‘go-and-see’ visits for refugees, generating peace-building activities, providing return assistance, and legal aid to returnees”.⁷

Resettlement is another solution that provides refugees protection and assistance in another country than in the country of asylum. It becomes an option only for a very small number of refugees each year who are considered as being at risk in their country of asylum and whose return to the country of origin is no longer likely. Refugees possess legal and physical protection enjoying similar rights granted to nationals of the Resettlement State.⁸ The process of identification of these cases varies depending on the country’s regulations but the final decision upon the resettlement is taken by the Resettlement countries, not by the sending country and UNHCR. For the focus of this thesis, below I explain the first two solutions briefly and elaborate more on the self-reliance approach at length below.

Lastly, specified in the ExCom Conclusion No.104 (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR], 2005a), local integration is considered as a “two-way process and consists of legal, economic, socio-cultural processes. Legal processes involve granting a range of entitlements and rights commensurate with those enjoyed by citizens including freedom of movement, access to education, and the labor market, access to social assistance including health facilities, and the capacity to travel with valid identity documents. Over time the process should lead to permanent residence rights and in some cases the acquisition of citizenship in the

⁷ Please see <https://www.unhcr.org/voluntary-repatriation-49c3646cfe.html>

⁸ Please see <https://www.unhcr.org/tr/en/resettlement>

country of asylum. In terms of economic processes, refugees attain a growing degree of self-reliance and become capable of pursuing sustainable livelihoods, thus contributing to the economic life of the host country. Social and cultural processes generate through the adaptation of refugees to host country as engaging actively with the social life of the receiving country and welcoming by receiving population without discrimination or exploitation” (UNHCR, 2005a).

The refugee regime was giving utmost priority to the solution of repatriation over the other two ideal solutions either through discouraging self-reliance approach or attaining limited or temporary forms of asylum to promote voluntary repatriation once it is safe to return to the country of origin (UNHCR, 2002). However, the view towards self-reliance had changed in time thanks to the international efforts formed in Global Consultation meetings held towards the millennium. The purpose of these meetings was eliciting a shared understanding of international protection challenges. As a result of these meetings, the need for new arrangements and tools (will be discussed below) was recognized by the Member States during the 53rd session of the Executive Committee in 2002 (UNHCR, 2003) and the Framework for Durable Solutions for Refugees and People of Concern was enacted upon the session in May 2003. Besides, the Geneva Convention and 1967 Protocol remained as the foundation for international protection of refugees, and the solutions specified in the Convention kept valid to apply to the refugee situations. The framework fundamentally aimed to better handle the global refugee problems while generating complementary tools for the better management of challenges of international protection framed by the Convention. The need for new arrangements was justified by the following reasons.

First, voluntary repatriation generates in a very long time and the protracted nature of the conflict in the homeland hinders the possibility of such a solution in many cases. Pending the durable solutions, refugees have been deprived of certain basic rights such as freedom of movement and education, and opportunities for generating income to maintain their lives until the conflict in their homeland gets resolved (UNHCR, 2002). The deprivation of the rights and opportunities negatively affects the realization of human capacity and most likely leads to the loss of their ability to involve in society either in the case of their re-integration to the country of origin, resettlement, or of asylum. Concomitantly, the incapability to such realization, especially in protracted refugee situations, put them in a position dependent heavily on humanitarian assistance and made them “burden” in the eyes of the public; and parallel to that, social segregation is highly likely to arise in the society. Lastly, it underlines that in the absence of sufficient assistance to the refugee situations in host countries, the mobility towards second countries would be likely in search of better living conditions.

Considering the adverse effects of the existing governance modalities in refugee response given above, as part of The Framework for Durable Solutions, UNHCR (2003) set out Development Assistance for Refugees (DAR), Repatriation, Reintegration, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (4Rs) and Development through Local Integration (DLI). These efforts within the Framework aimed to achieve building capacities to receive and protect refugees and an improved burden and responsibility sharing (UNHCR, 2003). While the former is deemed to generate through partnerships, the latter is considered to take place through the self-reliance approach and strengthening the capacity of host State institutions and infrastructure in order to ensure a better quality of life for both host communities and refugees. I

will explain these points further below. We will be also evaluating practices within the self-reliance approach and capacity developments of host states in Chapter 3 and its reflection on the ground while discussing the findings in Chapter 4 and 5.

As mentioned above, especially in protracted refugee situations and in pending durable solutions in general, the loss of human potential would be more likely; the proposed self-reliance approach targets the realization of human potential in maintaining lives by themselves while the skills and capacities of refugees and host society's institutional capacity and attitudes toward refugees substantially determine its realization. For this reason, the DAR programming suggests working on the facilitation of the self-reliance approach through preparing the conditions and enabling certain strategies. Some of these strategies can be listed as income-generation and micro-finance activities; job-oriented skills development programs, strengthening host communities' capacity to accommodate refugees by investing in infrastructure, and strengthening the capacity of host State institutions, local communities, and civil society. On the other hand, the Framework for Durable Solutions for Refugees and People of Concern underlined the necessity to incorporate the refugees and host community into the design of the development programs. Later, in 2005, UNHCR published *the Handbook of DAR* envisioned a community-based approach that ensures the participation of the people of concerns, host communities, and local stakeholders into decisions to better address the local needs and promote peaceful co-existence. These ideas and strategies were all injected into the programming of the Regional Refugee Response Plan (3RP) of UNHCR as the current refugee response modality to the Syrian crisis, and I will elaborate more on that in Chapter 3.

Employing these actions, the self-reliance approach is considered as “the precursor to all three durable solutions” since if a refugee has been better equipped with the necessary skills and experience, he/she would be able to live without depending on others either in the country of asylum, country of origin upon return or of resettlement (UNHCR, 2002, p.4). Moreover, the self-reliance framework suggests that the support to the development of the self-reliance approach overlaps with that of local integration in that both focus on improving existing institutions and conditions to help refugees live a decent and dignified life and to promote peaceful co-existence. Hence, the idea is that local integration processes can be enhanced by self-reliant refugees who actively interact with host society economically and socially. In this way, they contribute to local development as an asset rather than a burden.

On the ideational ground, the framework has been set clearly; yet, the refugee receiving countries mostly clusters in developing countries and countries in economic transition with limited resources. These countries have already had their own economic and developmental problems and, on top of that, had to absorb the movements of refugees. More specifically, as the world has undergone rapid urbanization, refugee and migrant mobility toward urban areas has posed a greater challenge to the urban governance in these countries and crystallized the lack of infrastructure bearing the settling refugees. For all these reasons, the significance - actually the necessity- of international cooperation on responsibility and burden-sharing for the realization of self-reliance approach has been reiterated on many occasions, most notably ExCom No.104. (UNHCR, 2005a), DAR Programs (UNHCR, 2005b), UNHCR Policy on Refugees and International Protection (UNHCR, 2009), The New York Declaration (UN General Assembly, 2016), and

Global Compact for Refugees (UNHCR, 2018). In all these efforts, UNHCR calls for partnerships with donor countries, financial institutions, United Nations and other development agencies; compels States affected by the refugee crises to act upon the issue acknowledging their primary role in decision-making in their territory; and gives special emphasis on the need to collaborate with local authorities as they know the needs and dynamics of the local better due to their long presence.

On operational grounds of the refugee incorporation projects, thereby, we see international organizations such as financial institutions and international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) along with state actors. Financial institutions such as the World Bank and European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) fund the projects to be implemented at the national and local levels through bilateral agreements. INGOs aim to bolster the realization of the UNHCR's missions by providing humanitarian and material aid and through their advocacy and capacity building works. Organizations such as Save the Children, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), OXFAM International, and Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE) have been some of the humanitarian actors taking part in refugee governance response modalities. Through their professionals, these organizations bring their expertise and competence in the area of humanitarian assistance and help the national decision-makers to identify problems and solutions.

Hence, these declared objectives and guiding principles within the question of how to govern refugees' lives determine the trajectories of what kind of practices and collaborations should be generated regarding refugee governance. In practical terms, these ideas and principles play an important role in writing the projects and getting funds from the donors and financial institutions. Considering the aim of self-

reliance and social cohesion approach, the focus is the enjoyment of human potential and creating a peaceful communication among communities. Thus a great role is attributed to the local level actors, specifically local government bodies and non-governmental organizations in the implementation of self-reliance approach and the social cohesion ideas due to being the first level of interaction (Çağlar, 2015). Local level actors, on the one hand, are informed by the international ideals and principles to be practiced on the ground through the project partnership, but on the other, their understanding of the rules, the subject matter are shaped by the society they govern (Magnusson, 2008) alongside the national regulations and terms. In other words, the implementation processes of the refugee incorporation projects are determined also by the local dynamics. Now, we will look at the literature studying how these dynamics impact the projection of these international ideals and interactions among the local actors in putting the refugee incorporation projects in practice.

2.3.2 Refugee incorporation at local level

The governance domain of refugee incorporation, including specifically the interactions, collaborations, negotiations on the potential collective actions, is controlled by the mode of governance in a country (Scholten, 2013) as the international body acknowledges the sovereignty of the nation-state in their domestic politics and interventions in refugee incorporation. While it is at the international level the mobility of refugees is determined, the national terms have been still relevant when the incorporation of refugees into the host community entails defining migrant and refugee rights which shape their claims directed towards political authorities (Koopman & Statham, 1999; Kastoryano, 2002). Although the rights of migrants are determined by the national government, it is the local government that

is ultimately responsible for providing services to migrants and ensuring their integration 'on the ground' (Kyambi, 2012; Rutter, 2013; McCollum & Packwood, 2017). Similarly, Alexander (2007) underlined 'ultimately national-level policies are tried, tested and articulated at the local level, in the school, and in the neighborhood, here local authority actions (or inactions) remain significant' (p. 6). This situation propels local and regional governments to respond to the irregular migrants' needs and problems due to their close contact, which were once on the shoulder of national governments (Schiller & Caglar, 2009). Scholars (Çağlar, 2005; Schiller & Caglar, 2009; McCollum & Packwood, 2017; Barrero et al., 2017) who acknowledge this shift in administration and governance of migrants called for "a local turn in migration governance" and began focusing on the playing fields of the local actors, their motivations in migration governance, and their interactions with other actors.

In this respect, relying on the multi-layered character of the migrant integration in Europe, scholars studied the motivations of the local governments to act upon the migrant incorporation and the extent of interaction among different levels in order to serve the common purpose. They have shown the divergences from the national framework at local governments, the differentiation of policies and practices among local governments, and the limitation of the implementation of national policies on migrant integration.

First, to explicate the dynamics that make local governments act upon the migrant integration, some scholars (Schiller, 2017; Hoekstra, 2017; Danis & Nazlı, 2018) discussed the ideational factors stemming from the actors' perceptions on migration and socio-spatial background of the localities. In this regard, studying the 'implementation gap' between formulated policies and associated practices within local administration bodies in Antwerp, Leeds, and Amsterdam, Schiller argues that

reframing and reshaping of national policies at the local level not only result from differing circumstances ‘on the ground’ but also reflect diverging ideas and norms among officials (Schiller, 2017). Similarly, Hoekstra (2017) put forth the argument that ‘differing circumstances ‘on the ground’ consisting of local historical and spatial context shape the urban imaginaries of local places and communities’ (p. 3) in terms of identifying problems and finding solutions.

Another point regarding the ideational factors revolves around the issues of policy legacies and path-dependencies because they might reinforce or inhibit the services needed at the new context (Hohn & Neuer, 2006) within the institutional management of migration. In this vein, Danis and Nazli (2018) studies the relationship between CSOs and Sultanbeyli Municipality during the reception of refugees. They argued that “managerial tradition and policy-making taken over from the right-wing parties and the cooperative nature of the CSOs and state in the age of neoliberal governance” enhances a ‘good’ example of refugee governance. Thus, they conclude that there is a faithful alliance among government bodies, state institutions, pro-government NGOs and the municipality of Sultanbeyli bounded by religious solidarity. In the same article Danis and Nazli (2018) suggests to investigate whether these kinds of alliances are prevalent in other municipalities and this study aims at looking at the nature of the interactions among municipal bodies and non-governmental organizations in other districts as well.

Furthermore, in terms of actions and interactions of local governments, when local governments cannot find a legal basis or have different ideas than their governments, they often act confidently and come up with distinct approaches to welcoming migrants and incorporating them to their system due to either emergency of social services or alleviating the tension in society (Jorgensen, 2012; Schiller,

2017; Scholten et al., 2016). For example, Poppelaars and Scholten (2008) and Uitermark (2012) underline the local governments' accommodative approach to migrant groups by showing the instrumental use of migrant organizations to mitigate tensions stemming from ethnic and cultural differences in the Netherlands. Bak Jorgensen (2012) depicts the pragmatic approach at local governance in terms of the officials' responses to everyday problems and political priority of the problems of integration among other policy areas within the body to find a temporary or immediate solution. In this respect, local governments in different countries – US, UK, Germany, the Netherlands, Finland, Italy, Spain, etc. are already responding to irregular migration. In many cases, they facilitate access to fundamental rights, provide basic services, emergency and pregnancy healthcare, access to education for children, and access to food banks, etc. (Scholten & Penninx, 2016).

In sum, the literature yielded knowledge on 'how and why' of the diverging practices at the local level from the higher-level authorities. It also shows that understanding of the local actors about the context can play a powerfully constitutive role in migration governance since they create categories and expressions in minds that inform their actions. In the case of Turkey where the national legal framework on the integration of the refugees is not clearly defined as we will see in Chapter 3, how refugee incorporation is understood by its local practitioners and how it is implemented on the ground stands out as two questions that need an empirical analysis and I will try to answer them in Chapter 4 and 5. In answering these questions, we need to analyze what defines the process of implementation, and what informs the practitioners' actions and understanding of the issue within their conditions. In order to do that, I directed the municipal officers and NGO officers the questions of how the local practitioners understand refugee incorporation and what

kind of practices they generate and what they cannot, and the difficulties and challenges they face in implementing their projects.

As a result, to see the rules of the game of urban refugee governance in Turkey in its relation to international level, I discussed the international refugee governance structure touching upon mainly the regime's complexity and the international frameworks deemed to govern the current refugee situations. As Betts pointed out, the intersectionality of issue areas especially between refugee, travel, and security regimes by itself should entail a better responsibility sharing in refugee governance. Responsibility-sharing among the countries has been needed both on the provision of asylum and progression towards durable solutions. While crafting the self-reliance approach with an understanding of development, UNHCR underlined the importance of the responsibility sharing norm in facilitating the implementation of such an approach on the ground and called for a concerted effort by international organizations, UN agencies, local stakeholders, host governments and so on. On the other hand, given the urbanization of migration today, the significance of local stakeholders in meeting the needs of the refugees, migrants, and local societies has become more visible. However, as the literature shows differentiation among local implementation practices emerge during the refugee incorporation practices stemming from the ambiguous laws, social and historical context of the localities, the path-dependencies within the local government bodies, and local actors' motivation. In Chapter 4 and 5, we will see that some of the factors influencing the refugee incorporation projects at local level are similar in the case of Syrian incorporation in Turkey.

In this chapter, through looking at the international texts, we saw that the self-reliance approach lays the ground for efforts for social cohesion and local

integration if relevant. Depicting the limits of human mobility and the international frameworks guiding the refugee incorporation processes was beneficial for us to look into the context of the implementation of refugee incorporation processes at both national and local levels. In the next chapter, I will study how the general framework of self-reliance approach and social cohesion is translated into practice in the specific case of Syrian refugees in Turkey and how Turkey has been dealing with the issue of refugee incorporation by looking at the practices of national and international stakeholders.

CHAPTER 3

INTERNATIONAL AND TURKISH RESPONSE TO SYRIAN CRISIS

Since the beginning of the Syrian refugee crisis, the international body has endeavored to generate a better response to forced displacement through Regional Resilience Response Plan (3RP) programming, New York Declaration, and Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) as discussed in the previous chapter. It has urged states to put their hands in finding better solutions for the millions of Syrian lives while trying to mobilize a bunch of stakeholders ranging from international organizations, financial institutions, member states to local governments, civil society organizations. Given that the end of the crisis is not foreseen, the 3RP in Response to the Syrian Crisis envisages “a paradigm shift in response to the crisis by combining humanitarian and development capacities, innovation, and resources” (UNHCR, 2014a). In the implementation of the 3RP program, UN agencies, state institutions, municipalities, and 3RP partner civil society organizations work in collaboration. In the first part of this chapter, I will show that in all efforts, the objectives of the projects are crafted to serve the ideals of the self-reliance of refugees and social cohesion that constitute the core of the international response today. However, local implementers face challenges in reaching these objectives during Syrian refugee incorporation projects due to certain structural factors such as the limited nature of the temporary protection status Syrians are granted, language barrier, economic hardship, and lack of interest on the side of host society as the findings of this research inform in Chapter 4 and 5.

Therefore, to analyze the implementation of refugee incorporation projects at the municipal level, we should first need to analyze the general context of exchange

that defines the processes of interaction among actors. In this respect, what the legal framework dictates regarding refugee incorporation in terms of addressing harmonization along with mandates, and the socio-political framework that shape the local actors' understanding of the principle of harmonization and their interactions with other actors. For this purpose, in the second part of this chapter, I will deal with the socio-political framework in Turkey, the legal basis of refugee management, existing organizational scheme of state institutions in refugee governance in terms of legal basis and practices, historically the position of civil society organizations vis-a-vis the state and CSOs role in Syrian refugee incorporation. I will highlight the interactions of international organizations such as UN entities with state authorities through the 3RP. In this chapter, I aim to show that the harmonization principle defined by Turkish law and referred by government authorities is already very vague and imprecise with no specific assignment on the side of the host community. I also aim to map existing actors and interactions within this multi-layered incorporation scheme in the case of Syrian refugees in Turkey just to have a background on refugee governance at local level.

3.1 International response to Syrian refugees

In March 2012, UNHCR came up with its first inter-agency regional response plan for Syrian refugees. The main driver of the plan was protecting the refugees from violence, preventing the deterioration of vulnerabilities, and providing humanitarian assistance. Then, the response plan has evolved into the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) framework due to the scale and protracted nature of the situation. The 3RP was launched in Ankara in December 2014 and aims to bring an inclusive, comprehensive, and coordinated response to the crisis (“The Regional

Refugee,” 2020). For this reason, UNHCR has taken the resilience-based development approach to the center to better enhance UN assistance in response to the Syrian crisis (UNHCR, 2014a) and the self-reliance approach is adopted to reduce dependency on third parties and enhance cost-effectiveness through better targeting the needs of the most vulnerable (UNHCR, 2014a). By adopting the resilience approach, it sets out national plans to better prevent ‘immediate vulnerabilities, strengthen social cohesion, foster resilience of refugees, host communities, and national systems’ (“The Regional Refugee,” 2020).

Hence, the 3RP is designed to provide guidelines for how to better address the crisis and initiate new actions feeding into the humanitarian and development nexus. In a similar vein, 3RP is meant to address the capacity gaps in local and national service delivery and to provide international support through the means of “technical expertise, policy advice, and administrative support” (UNHCR, 2014a). The Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) takes the priorities of the governments into account and designed its activities in line with the national plans. In this way, it also acknowledges the leading role of the national authorities on the matter of sustainability of responses to the crisis. For this reason, the plan prioritizes the strengthening of national and local institutions and the system's capacities to cope with increased demands and continue providing quality services (UNHCR, 2014a).

While UNHCR had tried to ensure the lives of refugees in host countries through 3RP programming, refugees were seeking to reach Europe for better living conditions. In 2015 and 2016, more than a million Syrian and other nationals arrived at the countries within the European Union (EU) mostly on foot (“The EU,” 2020). Strikingly, in 2015, the world witnessed the deaths of thousands of refugees in the Mediterranean Sea, including Syrians, Afghanis, Eritreans, and Somalis who are

mostly considered to qualify for refugee status (UNHCR, 2015). This humanitarian crisis made the prospect of the Syrian refugees a current issue for the United Nations Summit in September 2016 and led to the creation of the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants as a result of the summit. On the other hand, upon the crisis, the European Union decided to impede mobility towards Europe. In March 2016, the EU-Turkey Deal was signed and aimed the capacity building for border management to prevent mobility towards Europe, acceleration of visa liberalization for Turkish nationals, and offering financial support for protection and integration of Turkey's refugee population (Icduygu & Millet, 2016). By the time, after the deal, Turkey extensively prevented mobility toward Europe with its restrictions on the borders.

As said, to better address the responses to displacement worldwide, in September 2016, the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) adopted the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants. The Declaration adopts the principles and guidelines of the international humanitarian and refugee laws and the Sustainable Development Goal.⁹ It underlines the necessary protection of the refugees and migrants first and stresses the need for humanitarian-development nexus in envisaging the durable solutions (United Nations General Assembly, 2016). This approach requires strengthening the self-reliance and resilience of refugees and migrants to maintain a dignified life and to develop transferable skills either for their integration to host society, country of origin, or to the third country. Yet, given the entanglement of such tasks both at local and global level, the declaration recalled for responsibility-sharing and collaboration between UNHCR and UN entities,

⁹ Importantly, before the New York Declaration and the Global Compact on Refugees, United Nations General Assembly adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development which mainly aimed to end poverty and inequality. The aim of eradicating inequality is supported by the idea of development that leaves no one behind. This idea consists of eliminating all kinds of inequalities ranging from race and gender to access services (Winkler & Satterthwaite, 2017).

international organizations, international financial institutions such as World Bank, and civil society partners including faith-based organizations, diaspora organization, academia) private sectors, the media, and the refugees themselves.

After that, United Nations member states ratified the new Global Compact for Refugees (GCR) in December 2018 to improve ‘the responses to displacement worldwide’. The Compact rearticulated the need for better and equitable responsibility-sharing and, thus, endorsed the multi-stakeholder approach specified in the New York Declaration. Noteworthy, the compact underlines that GCR is not legally binding but is a product of political will that can be consolidated by the commitment of the international community. Four objectives of GCR are “easing pressure on host countries, enhancing refugee self-reliance, expanding access to third-country solutions, supporting conditions in countries of origin for return in safety and dignity” (UNHCR, 2018). GCR put forth that its four objectives, stressed in the New York Declaration as well, can only be achieved “through the mobilization of political will, a broadened base of support, and arrangements that facilitate more equitable, sustained and predictable contributions among States and other relevant stakeholders” (UNHCR, 2018). For the focus of this thesis, below we will be dealing with the first two objectives that undergird the refugee incorporation processes when we discuss the practices within 3RP in relation to Turkey’s national response to the refugee settlement in the country.

As part of the GCR, the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly outlines how this responsibility sharing framework can come to reality. Likewise, in the New York Declaration, it attributes roles to national authorities, the international community through cooperation by the Global Refugee Forum, humanitarian and development

actors, civil society organizations, private sector actors, and refugees themselves. It defines specific areas in need of support within reception practices including institutional preparation by States and relevant actors for refugee situations, arranging immediate reception responses and safety and security, registration and documentation, and identification of international protection needs (UNHCR, 2018). In this respect, the GCR envisions the strengthening of institutional capacities, infrastructure, and accommodation at the local and national level and urges stakeholders to mobilize a variety of stakeholders to create response modalities to do so. It also presents the fields of response modalities on how to meet refugee needs and to support refugee and host communities. This modality unfolds certain areas such as education, jobs and livelihoods, health, women and girls, children, adolescents, and youth, accommodation, energy, and natural resource management, food security and nutrition, civil registries, statelessness, and fostering good relations and peaceful coexistence.

Fostering the principle of peaceful coexistence promotes the creation of good relations between communities that combat all forms of discrimination and promote peaceful coexistence among communities, being in line with national policies (UNHCR, 2018). Serving this purpose, it sets out an inclusive approach in which relevant actors must incorporate refugees to key forums such as city councils and processes to actively interact with people they intend to protect. However, in Chapter 4, this study will highlight the point, deduced also from the field, that to enhance such an inclusive approach, refugees should be, at the first place, able to maintain their lives so that they can spare time and develop such interest to these forums (IBC, interview A, personal communication, August 20, 2019; Sultanbeyli Strategic Development Department, interview B, personal communication, May 20, 2019).

In sum, since the Syrian war has erupted, the international body has endeavored to come up with better responses to forced displacement. The New York Declaration and Global Compact on Refugees reiterated the long-standing principles of responsibility sharing and urged different types of stakeholders to get involved in the creation of responses in the region. 3RP programming constitutes a concrete example of international burden-sharing efforts. Through the program, the international body adopts a resilience approach that aims to increase the capacity of host countries in absorbing refugees, strengthening the self-reliance of refugees, and fostering social cohesion by incorporating refugees and host society. In the next part, we will see what kind of practices and interactions have been carried out in Turkey regarding the 3RP after explaining Turkey's policy on Syrian refugees.

3.2 Turkey's policy on Syrians and the incorporation practices

When the war in Syria erupted in 2011, the President of Turkey, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, had an open-door policy when thousands of refugees entered the country and Turkey has become the world's largest refugee-hosting country since 2015. Turkish government welcomed them and called the society for embracing the refugees reasoning the brotherhood of two nations and the common history ("Davutoglu Fas," 2012; "Cumhurbaşkanı Erdoğan," 2019). The government has adopted the guest discourse regarding Syrians implying that their stay in the country will not be permanent. Upon their arrival, refugees are contained in the camps referred to as Temporary Protection Centers (TPC) which remained until 2014 and managed by the Afet ve Acil Durum Yönetimi (AFAD - Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency). However, due to the dire conditions in the camps, and the desire to seek a decent life, most of the refugees left the camps to move toward cities

mostly preferring the metropolis while some tried to cross the borders for Europe as we discussed. Hence, local governments have become at the forefront of the refugee response and service provision since refugees see them as the first level of contact with state authorities. Before discussing the institutional responses at state level regarding refugee incorporation in Turkey, I will first provide information on the temporary protection status granted to Syrians and the political context regarding Syrian refugee governance.

In 2013 Turkish Parliament enacted the Law on Foreigners and International Protection (LFIP) No. 6458 replacing the 1994 Regulation, under a degree of pressure from the European Union. The Regulation on Temporary Protection was created on October 22, 2014. It identifies the acceptance and the stay of the persons under temporary protection status, their “rights and duties”, measures against the mass mobilizations; and it organizes the cooperation between national and international institutions (Law on Foreigners and International Protection no. 6458). This new legislation demarcated four status categories for international protection while identifying regulation for entrance and exit of foreigners as well as the administrative division during their stay in Turkey. These categories are refugees (from Europe), conditional refugees (from outside Europe), subsidiary protection (individual, human rights-based), and temporary (for mass influx situations) which was offered to Syrians (Ineli-Ciger, 2014).

By obtaining the temporary protection status, Syrians are granted some of the social rights available to Turkish citizens, thereby incorporating Syrians within its existing social welfare system. Upon receiving a *kimlik*, Syrian refugees can access certain limited social rights, often similar to those provided to Turkish citizens

(Baban et al., 2016). These rights include access to free health care¹⁰ and education for children. Besides, in January 2016, the Regulation on Work Permits of Refugees Under Temporary Protection was put in force. Although this has given a way to the legal work for Syrians, the regulation generates under certain conditions and within certain restrictions (Memisoglu et al., 2017). Since 2016, more than 132,497 work permits have been issued to Syrian nationals (including those under temporary protection and Syrians who have a residence permit) as of December 31, 2019 (UNHCR, 2020). Though this number is very low in the presence of almost four million refugees in the country, it does not even exclude the work permits whose annual renewal is not made (Leghtas, 2019).

As part of the EU-Turkey Deal signed in 2016, a funding program called Facility for Refugees in Turkey Program (FRIT) was created and the financial fund has been provided to Turkey in two installments (3 billion for the years 2016 and 2017, and an additional 3 billion for the years 2018 and 2019). The EU guaranteed the first 3 billion by forming 72 project contracts. In this context, almost 2 billion euro was paid to Turkey and the remaining amount will be paid via the projects until the midst of 2021. From the budget of the second 3 billion, 450 million euro was guaranteed through the projects contracted. Also, FRIT has provided more than 1.5 million recipients with a modest level of cash assistance to help families meet their basic needs since November 2016, which was put in force via the Emergency Social Safety Net of Turkey. A committee consisting of EU member states and in the leadership of the European Commission makes the strategic guidance on determining the budget of the activities and the kinds of financial instruments used for the implementation of the FRIT. Turkey participates in this committee as an advisor.

¹⁰ Basic health care services are covered, including visits to doctors, necessary surgery and 80% of all drug costs (Kutlu, 2015).

Unfortunately, on November 2018, European Court of Auditors stated that European Union shared their resentments due to the no-transparent scheme showing the use of the fund and stated that they do not know whether it is used for good (“AB Göçmenler,” 2018). Responding to the EU, President Erdogan made speeches highlighting that Turkey has spent way more money for refugees than the FRIT Program provided (AK Parti, 2019; “Turkey No Longer,” 2019).

Furthermore, although Turkey has discussed the Syrian question at the international level and given certain basic rights to Syrians, Turkey has not proposed a National Migration Policy that could address the problems and solutions at the domestic level; instead, its policy-making approach has revolved around “a mix of pragmatic ‘muddling through’ and strategic policy development/implementation’, in which frequently, the latter has followed facts created by the former” (Hoffman & Samuk, 2016). In this vein, depending on the socio-political tension in the country, the state authorities have started to respond to the refugee issue.

In this political context, the tension between Syrians and host society has prevailed and some scholars briefly showcased them as follows:

Businesses run by Syrians and their homes were attacked in Ankara by the locals in July 2016 and other cities also experienced the same incidents, the level of racist discourse rose on the social media in July 2017 with the hashtags #suriyelilersinirdisiedilsin (Syrians should be deported) and #suriyeliistemiyoruz (We do not want Syrians). These discourses were altered by the incident of rape and killing of a Syrian by two Turkish people while leading the Prime Minister Binali Yıldırım make a public call for peace between the citizens and the Syrian ‘guests’. In this speech, Yıldırım underlined that any Syrians ‘stepping out of line’ would be deported (Ataç et al., 2017, p. 15).

Later, another statement by the state authorities that attempt to regulate the social order in society came in July 2019 after the election for mayor of Istanbul was lost to the main opposition party of the government in June 2019 and the economic

recession led to the rise of anti-Syrian discourse in the society. The Minister of Internal Affairs, Süleyman Soyulu, declared that Istanbul Provincial Directorate of General Migration Management will not register Syrians to the city anymore. In their explanation, it is stated that “under a temporary period, Istanbul Province is closed for the first registration of Syrians in order to prevent irregular migration and the activities of terror organizations in the region on human trafficking and to sustain healthy and sustainable services towards Syrians. While not registering new Syrians to the city, people who have registered before will continue to hold their status” (Koyuncu, 2019). This decision was justified during the press release by Suleyman Soyulu. While attributing importance to the harmonization activities that have been going on, he said that we cannot allow somebody to impose his/her understanding upon the other and spoil the social order (Koyuncu, 2019). In a way, Soyulu presupposed that refugees are asserting their understanding of living in the host society. In an interview, Prof. Murat Erdogan interpreted the new regulation by stressing that more importantly, receiving serviced granted, especially health services, is made possible only in the cities they live and registered (“İstanbul’da Daha,” 2018). Erdogan also touched upon that the concentration of refugees in certain cities and the need for a balanced dispersion. To put the policy in practice, the refugees who cannot document their registration to Istanbul were sent to the city they are registered. If they are illegal, they are deported from the Syrian border although the Turkish government denied deportations from the country (Gall, 2019). However, regardless of the geographical restrictions, as a country ratified the Geneva Convention, Turkey must uphold the principle of non-refoulment of persons to countries where they are at risk of torture, cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment (“Protecting refugees,” n.d.). Yet the arbitrary use of the language of deportation

shows how Turkey uses the Syrian case as a tool for national interests at the international level and for managing daily politics at the domestic level. In Chapter 4, we will see that these actions of governments adversely affect the realization of what is originally intended by harmonization – promoting a peaceful coexistence.

In sum, temporary protection status has provided certain rights to Syrians, but certain obstacles such as language barrier and economic hardship factors into their precarious conditions in the country (Baban et al., 2016; Yıldız & Uzgoren, 2016). In addition to that, the status neither guarantees a permanent residency nor allows them to apply for full citizenship, which renders them another insecure position where they cannot claim their fundamental rights (Yildiz & Uzgoren, 2016). While the government expects society to embrace Syrians, it is seen that socio-political tension arises from time to time. Since the refugees have no political rights, authorities might expel them from the country reasoning any act spoiling the social order/social cohesion. While this attitude contradicts international principles such as non-refoulement, due to having good hands on the border with Europe, the state authorities could act more loosely. As this thesis shows, local practitioners of harmonization projects argue that these kinds of government's actions erase immediately what they have invested in nine years (IKGV, interview B, personal communication June 28, 2019; WALD, internship field notes, July, 2019).

Having posed the general picture of legal and socio-political context regarding Syrians in Turkey, I will move towards looking at first the principle of harmonization uttered as the main goal of the services provided by the state authorities. The following section will highlight how the institutional responses at the national and municipal level generate by discussing their interactions with the international level through the 3RP programming. In that way, at the end of the

Chapter 3, we will be equipped with knowledge on the ideas and practices within harmonization in Turkey at the national level.

3.2.1 Turkey's approach to the Syrian refugee incorporation: Harmonization principle

While there is no clear statement on the duration of the Syrians' presence in the country either in the law or in the government discourse, the principle of harmonization stated in the LFIP gives a context for how Syrians and Turkish state and society organize their co-existence. The government adopted the language of harmonization and as this research shows the practitioners also use the same language to a certain extent. In addition, the government declared that the year of 2019 will be the year to carry out harmonization. To analyze the practices held in respect to the principle of harmonization in the field, I will here first look at the objectives of the principle and the assigned roles to fulfill such objectives. In Chapter 4, we will deal with to what extent these objectives are translated into practice and in Chapter 5, how municipal and NGO officers craft strategies in the name of serving refugee incorporation when they face difficulties.

The Article (96), in the Law on Foreigners and International Protection, states that social services can be delivered by public institutions and agencies, local governments, non-governmental organizations, universities, and international organizations. "The Directorate General may plan for harmonization activities in order to facilitate mutual harmonization between foreigners, applicants, and international protection beneficiaries and the society as well as equip them with the knowledge and skills to be independently active in all areas of social life without the assistance of third persons in Turkey or in the country to which they are resettled or

in their own country” (Article 96(1)). From this statement, three conclusions can be made.

First, the law purports that the self-reliance of the beneficiaries is aimed at generating harmonization practices by emphasizing the independency from the help of third persons. However, any path ensuring their self-reliance is not explicitly stated but only certain roles are attributed to practitioners and beneficiaries. It attributes roles to ‘public institutions and agencies, local governments, non-governmental organizations, universities and international organizations (Article 96(1))’ in enhancing their self-reliance through ‘courses related to access to public and private goods and services, access to education and economic activities, social and cultural communications, and access to primary healthcare services and, awareness and information activities (Article 96(3))’. The beneficiaries attending these courses can learn the ‘basics of political structure, language, the legal system, culture, and history of Turkey as well as their rights and obligations’ (Article 96(2)). In sum, the harmonization activities can be seen as a means for informing the beneficiaries on how to adapt themselves to the institutional structures of the country and a means for providing refugees the ‘tools’ for access to services and economic activities. The crucial point here appears that the state does not promise to fully provide the access to services and economic activities rather expect the actors to seek or, in other words, expect the refugees to find their way to receive services and attend activities.

Second, deriving from the first point, it conceptualizes the principle of harmonization through attributing activities that harmonize foreigners with host society rather than a process that may indicate certain criteria for either citizenship or termination of their status at the end of it. Hence, the mere emphasis on activities

precludes any visionary statements about their long-term presence in the country. This situation has been compounded with the government's guest discourse whose stays are temporary and with their call for society to embrace the Syrian population because of religious commonalities and being brothers and sisters (The Ombudsman Institution of the Republic of Turkey, 2018).

Third, the law underlines the point of mutual harmonization by including host society. However, while identifying the roles and responsibilities of the international protection beneficiaries, that of host society has left blank. Also, whether the principle of equality is intrinsic to this mutual relationship arises as a major issue. This point is also linked to the question of whether harmonization practices should be considered as integration which is a "two-way process and relies on the 'adaptation of one party and 'welcome' by the other". Nonetheless, the Turkish law on harmonization does not offer a clear reference to the responsibilities of the receiving society in 'welcoming'. While discussing the findings, we will see that practitioners complain about not being able to find members of the host community to attend social cohesion activities.

Lastly, we should note that any 3RP country chapter or strategic overview for Turkey does not identify the efforts under the plan as integration even if their overall efforts cover UNHCR's definition of refugee integration policies explained in the previous chapter. Rather, it reiterates the significance of self-reliance approach to reach social cohesion ideals and conflates them with the harmonization policy of Turkish Government. In fact, through the 3RP, UNHCR explains UNHCR's understanding of what Turkey aims with the harmonization policy by saying that harmonization aims to reduce dependency on third party support and create an environment where foreigners and international protection beneficiaries live in

harmony with the host community (UNHCR, 2019). Furthermore, when the 3RP reports evaluate the ongoing interventions, the achievements in social cohesion and livelihood sectors in Turkey are calibrated according to the number of individuals assisted to access wage employment opportunities (UNHCR, 2014a). This might also imply that social cohesion can be assessed through the integration to formal economy as the self-reliance approach contributes to its realization. This point reveals itself when local practitioners could not reach out to the refugees to attend harmonization/social cohesion activities because of their non-availability to participate in these activities due to dire working conditions and long working hours to maintain a basic living.

3.2.2 Institutional response of Turkey on Syrian refugee incorporation

When dealing with refugees, state authorities refer to the Law on Foreigners and International Protection regarding both roles and responsibilities of state and non-state institutions and justification of service provision to Syrians. In line with the Law, the government has tasked certain ministries to provide services to Syrians and two government-based organizations Turkish Red Crescent (TRC) and the Disaster and Emergency Management Agency (AFAD). It also discursively attributes certain roles to municipalities. In this section, I provide a general overview of what state-level actors such as ministries and state organizations like Turkish Red Crescent and AFAD are doing. After that, I will explain the position of municipalities in refugee governance and the role of non-governmental organizations in Turkey.

The Turkish law tasks the Directorate General of Migration Management (DGMM) as ‘the migration body’ to ensure coordination among law enforcement units and relevant public institutions and agencies, develop measures, and follow up

on the implementation of such measures to combat irregular migration (Law on Foreigners and International Protection no. 6458). The law assigns DGMM the tasks of the identification and registration processes of the foreigners. In the case of Syrians, upon completion of the identification and registration, refugees get an identity card issued by the provincial directorates of DGMM, then their stay in Turkey becomes legal and they have to renew their identity card after a year. Therefore, their identity card does not give the right for a long-term stay and the termination of temporary protection status is determined by the Council of Ministers' decision (Ineli-Ciger, 2014).

Furthermore, the law authorizes DGMM "to ensure cooperation and coordination with public institutions and agencies, universities, local governments, non-governmental organizations, and private and international organizations concerning its duties (Article 104 (2)). On the state level, the actors responsible for refugee governance are the Turkish Crescent, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Family and Social Policies, the Ministry of National Education, the Turkish Red Crescent, and the Disaster and Emergency Management Authority (AFAD). I will explain the role of each institution below.

The Ministry of Health has provided primary health care services to those under temporary protection status. Migrant health centers are established to provide basic health services to Syrians. By employing bilingual health personnel and referral personnel, the directorate aims to better assist the health needs of Syrians and reduce the overload in public hospitals. In these centers, a doctor serves a population of 4000 Syrians. Registered Syrians can access health services as free in the cities they are registered within the scope of the general health insurance.

The Ministry of Family and Social Policies attributes roles to existing Social Services Centers (SSCs) and Violence Prevention and Monitoring Centers (VPMCs) in the provision of protection services to refugees as well. Through the SSCs, the government manages a cash assistance program called Socio-Economic Support (Sosyo-Ekonomik Destek Programı) to those who have children in education and are in need.¹¹ SSCs also provide home care services and individuals can apply to get this service if they meet the eligibility criteria for disability status. Furthermore, VPMCs provide psychosocial counseling, referral, and monitoring services to the individuals who are subjected to the physical, sexual, economic, or discursive violence or harassment if the center has a capacity to do so (since some centers might not have staff for such service). As part of these centers, women shelters are in place to accommodate those in need of support and empowerment.

In line with the Law on Foreigners and International Protection, the Ministry of Education (MoE) is in charge of all the educational activities of refugees at primary and secondary schools. In 2014, the MoE announced that Syrian students can attend either in Temporary Education Centers (TECs) established across the country or public schools (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 2014). The language of instruction in TECs was Arabic, and the curriculum was created by the Ministry of Education of the Syrian Interim Government and revised by the Turkish Ministry of Education (Aras & Yasun, 2016, p. 1). It also included Turkish language courses. Even before the TECs, Syrian schools in Turkey were teaching in Arabic following the Syrian curriculum, but the diplomas obtained upon graduation were not recognized by the Turkish authorities (Ferris et al., 2013). In addition to that, many CSOs both national and Syrian started to deliver Turkish courses to children and also for adults before

¹¹ However, the assistance is contingent upon meeting certain requirements.

the TECs (Ferris et al., 2013). At the beginning of the 2016/17 school year, the Ministry of National Education planned the gradual inclusion of the Syrian children into the Turkish education system and the termination of the temporary education centers eventually (“Government directs,” 2017).

Regarding the refugee service provision, TRC holds different projects. In the area of protection, the Conditional Cash Transfer for Education program funded within the 3RP is carried out in partnership with UNICEF to enable school enrollment and attendance (UNHCR, 2019). In this respect, for example, during the 2017/218 school year, 360, 090 students consisting of 61% of Syrian students benefitted from the program (UNHCR, 2019). To ensure the protection of the refugees, TRC also carries out the cash support program known as The Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN) Programme funded by the EU. The fund is used from the “EU Facility for Refugees in Turkey” (FRIT) (“The emergency social,” n.d.). The program is generated in close collaboration with the Turkish Red Crescent, World Food Programme, Turkish government institutions. It provides a debit card charged with a fixed amount of money to the most vulnerable refugees to meet their basic needs. The card can be used in any shop depending on their needs. With this program, refugee participation in daily life and contribution to the local economy is aimed and social cohesion among communities will be fostered (Turkish Red Crescent Migration Service Directorate, 2020). As part of their protection framework, TRC works on restoring family links through tracing and family reunification activities. Through their community centers - two centers operate in Istanbul -, Turkish Red Crescent holds a psychosocial support and health program where psychosocial counseling, health seminars, and psychoeducational services are provided to Syrian refugees in coping with negative effects of the war and migration.

Furthermore, community centers organize livelihood support activities in which vocational courses and referrals to job employment are carried out. Last, TRC organizes social cohesion activities in the areas of sports, cultural activities, art training volunteering, and so on, by bringing communities together to strengthen social cohesion (Turkish Red Crescent Migration Service Directorate, 2020).

As mentioned before, when Syrians entered Turkey, they were located in refugee camps, called Temporary Protection Centers in Southeast Turkey by the Turkish government. The government managed the camps through the Disaster and Emergency Management Agency (AFAD) and The Turkish Red Crescent (TRC). AFAD coordinated the humanitarian assistance provided by both national and international organizations in camps in the areas of education, food, healthcare, psychosocial services, livelihood, and vocational training (Baban et al., 2016). Besides their role in camps, AFAD generated two projects.

First, AFAD created the EYDAS (Electronic Aid Distribution System), a database system where information on the people of concern needs, the collection of the aids, and the distribution schemes are contained (Sagnic & Markerach, 2017). Through EYDAS, AFAD coordinates the supply and demand side of the material aid by restricting CSOs' access to the aid recipients' information, collecting the money and material from the CSOs, and controlling over the distribution of the aids. Second, CSOs can only work in the field and provide humanitarian aid if they are accredited to AFAD. In addition to that, if a CSO wants to provide health service to refugees, their accreditation to the Ministry of Health will also be required. Sagnic and Markerach (2017) argued that these initiatives are the state's attempt to centralize the authority in refugee assistance since it is not easy for the state to supervise every activity of CSOs. Furthermore, they asserted that these actions expel

CSOs from the decision-making processes of getting in touch with society in case of need. We can conclude that through an accreditation scheme, the direct connection between society and CSOs is cut off.

To look at the interaction between international actors and the national ones in response to Syrians, we can showcase the practices generated through 3RP programming. 3RP programming and 3RP partners played a support role to the Government of Turkey to sustainably include Syrians under temporary protection into national systems such as health, education, employment, and social services through addressing the capacity gaps (UNHCR, 2018). Thus, in support of ministries and local authorities across all agencies and sectors, they generated a variety of modalities of assistance for developing the capacities of public systems, including the construction of infrastructure, rehabilitation of facilities, staffing support, training of civil servants, and the provision of equipment or stipends to be delivered to beneficiaries.

In addition to the USD 430 million worth of support being provided via these modalities in 2017-18, partners have made sure that other forms of assistance, such as cash transfers to refugees, which constitute the bulk of the remaining assistance, are also channeled through existing public systems, such as the Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN) system or the Conditional Cash Transfers for Education (CCTE) program (UNDP, 2016). Regarding the staffing support, UNHCR employs personnel in the Social Service Centers in certain locations. Furthermore, for the training of civil servants, teachers in public schools received training on how to meet the social and pedagogic needs of Syrian children under temporary protection, organized by UNHCR (UNHCR, 2018). In sum, the 3RP partners assess the needs and vulnerabilities of Syrians, fill out capacity gaps through staffing and training, and

make referrals to specialized assistance (services for prevention and responses to gender-based violence, child protection, and legal aid) provided primarily by public services (UNDP, 2018).

3.2.2.1 Refugee incorporation at the municipal level in Turkey

In 2017, President Erdogan organized a huge meeting bringing all the municipalities together and emphasized their role in refugee assistance within their regions (Erdogan, 2017a). This showed that the government is also aware of the fact that refugees consider the city-level as their primary contact for their livelihood, which necessitates the city level intervention on urban refugee governance. However, no directives on the roles and responsibilities of the municipalities in refugee assistance within their regions have been issued, which makes President Erdogan's calls remain at the discursive level. Consequently, studies (Erdogan, 2017b; Genc, 2018) showed that there is no common position taken by all municipalities: municipalities' level of support to refugees vary and some municipalities in Istanbul launched refugee incorporation projects and some did not. Now we will look at the laws regulating municipalities (non-)intervention to refugee settlement and the activities carried out by the municipal and non-governmental organizations including 3RP partners and local CSOs. The field chapter will show us the strategies municipalities use to circumvent the laws that restrict their operations in order to serve refugees.

Regarding the local governments, LFIP No. 6458 and Municipal Law No 5393 frames the legal basis on service provision to refugees. The Article 96 of LFIP asserts that social services can be delivered by public institutions and agencies, local governments, non-governmental organizations, universities, and international organizations. Second, the Municipal Law No.5393 enacted in 2005, states clearly

that municipalities serve only the “citizens”. However, the ambiguity of law on the definition of who constitutes a citizen and whether people without Turkish citizenship may be eligible for municipal services underlines the fact that the ambiguity regarding the refugee status in Turkey left the role of municipalities unclear (Erdogan, 2017b). Therefore, this lack of specificity could help to explain some of the diversity of responses to immigration that exist at the local government scale. For example, concerning their electorates, some municipalities do not want to provide services in order not to make their regions attractive to the refugees. Those municipalities serving refugees do not share some of the services they provided with the public to prevent public grievances (Erdogan, 2017a, p.122).

Municipalities who provide services to refugees refer to Article 13 of the Law No.5393 to legitimize their service provision to refugees, stating that “everyone is a *hemşehri* (fellow-townsmen) of his neighborhood. Fellow-townsmen are entitled to participate in municipal decisions and services, to be informed about municipal activities, and to benefit from the help of municipal authorities” (Grand National Assembly of Turkey as cited in Balamir & Uçar, 2018). The differing use of the law on serving *hemşehri* or only citizen shows that local governments provide particular services and functions on a discretionary basis, meaning that they can choose to provide them but do not have to. With regards to migration, such activities include providing services within social assistance departments of the municipal body or through their separate migration units in Istanbul. Acting upon the issue, they work collaboratively with mukhtars and NGOs (local, national, and international). Despite the limited resources poured down from the state,¹² municipalities reach out to INGOs in pursuit of funds, material, and technical help. Besides, they also work with

¹² Please see footnote 7.

domestic NGOs believing that they are also close to society and well aware of their needs.

Given the structural constraints for municipalities in response to refugees mentioned above, 3RP partners have supported and mentored municipalities to increase their capacity to respond to daily challenges of the Syrian crisis in their districts and cities. Refugees consider municipalities as the first interaction point with state institutions to receive assistance. However, the lack of clarity in the legal framework of the municipal law ties the hands of municipal authorities in service provision to refugees. 3RP partners have stepped in the field to guide them by interpreting the law and providing consultancy on how to accommodate social services. 3RP partners have organized annual workshops with municipalities to better identify the areas that they can pour their expertise in support of municipal efforts. Thanks to the outputs from these workshops, 3RP partners trained municipal staff and local NGOs for the process of identifying refugees and referring them to existing social service centers, which resulted in a surge in the number of service beneficiaries between 2016 and 2017 (UNDP, 2018). It seems that these workshops reached their aim since 3RP has kept more space for municipal support intervention. In 2017, 14 million US dollars was invested in for municipal support interventions both at the district and metropolitan levels, and a budget of 25 million US dollars was spared for the interventions in 2018 which was more than in all previous years combined (UNDP, 2018). From 2014 to 2018, 182 municipal support intervention was implemented (UNDP, 2018).

Along with the roles in identification and referral mechanism implementation, municipal authorities might also take a role in the service provisions by bearing the cost of outreach activities and office needs, and engaging in livelihood

and social cohesion activities. For outreach activities, municipalities might be willing to pay the transportation costs of social cohesion activities, and, for office needs, municipalities might give an office to the 3RP partners to implement their projects to operate in their districts contributing to social cohesion. For example, WALD's district offices do not pay for the rent. In addition to those, municipalities have been entities which cooperated with partners in the areas of livelihood. They have been identifying the refugees and host community members who are most in need and endeavoring for income-generation activities. 3RP points to the cash-for-work program as one of the creative initiatives in this respect. The cash-for-work programs gave an opportunity to work for 3 to 6 months through NGOs and temporarily contribute to municipal services, such as cleaning or rehabilitating public spaces like roads and parks, building schools, or planting trees and green areas. Until 2019, 4,800 people have benefitted from the program (UNDP, 2018). Moreover, municipalities' contribution to social cohesion is formed through strengthening interaction between the host community and refugees, empowering communities, and training them for life skills. One of their social cohesion can be given as the training of Syrian youth and youth from host communities on peaceful coexistence (UNDP, 2018). In Chapter 4 and 5, I will deliver, for instance, how WALD, as a partner of the 3RP, and generate these refugee incorporation projects in collaboration with municipalities.

3.2.2.2 The role of NGOs in refugee incorporation in Turkey

Since refugee incorporation projects are generated through the involvement of both state and non-state actors, looking at the role of CSOs in refugee governance and their past with state authorities will provide us a background while dealing with the

interactions between CSOs and municipal authorities in Istanbul. For this reason, in this section, we will discuss Turkey's recent history with civil society. Turkey became one of the routes for the forced migrants due to political disorder in the world beginning with 1979 Iranian Islamic Revolution, followed by 1980 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, 1980-88 Iran-Iraq War, 1989 Bulgarian mistreatment of its Turkish-speaking citizens, 1991 Gulf War, and the American invasion of Iraq in 2003 (Danis, 2006, p.12). Recently, when the civil war in Syria began in 2011, Syrians began moving to Turkey from civil war and the number of Syrians rapidly increased as the war exacerbated, now amounting more than three million. The previous refugee influx was at the small numbers and there was no state attention in integrating them to the society and the attention of civil society organization remained very low.

Since the 1980s, the civil society sector has gotten momentum with practices in various areas including human rights, environment, democratization, Islamization (Keyman & Icduygu 2003, p. 221). During the 1980s, with the rise of neoliberal policies, the responsibilities of the welfare states on the provision of services to its citizens have been discarded to the private and non-state actors (Erder & İncioğlu, 2013). To ease the deprivation of society due to the lack of service provision by the state, civil society actors put their effort in the form of humanitarian assistance and charitable activities. In this way, civil society actors played a complementary role to the state with the "volunteering" mechanisms (Can, 2007, p. 96). Morvaridi argued that social protection in the form of humanitarian assistance is provided via moral obligations in these volunteering mechanisms rather than claimable entitlements based on equal rights and social justice (Morvaridi, 2013, p. 318). The activities of these civil society organizations have not necessarily been opposed to that of the

state; rather cooperation between the two has been much observed (Can, 2007) thanks to the strong ideological and organizational ties with the governmental institutions (Danis & Nazli, 2018). Since the 1990s when the conservative right parties gained much support and with the rise of the AKP in 2002, the religiously motivated associations and Islamic charities have gotten visibility thanks to the governments' overt support of the policies favoring these entities and conservative bourgeoisie (Göçmen, 2014). These showed that the history of civil society in Turkey has not been considered separate from its close ties to the state institutions. For this reason, while Danis and Nazli (2018) called these actors "pro-governmental organizations" rather than non-governmental, Diner (2018) and Sunata and Tosun (2018) categorized them as government organized non-governmental organizations (GONGOs) which adversely affect the playing field of civil society organizations and their power in Turkey due to the rising reliance on the state (Diner 2018, p.13).

In short, the strong state and centralized administrative structure of Turkey have long dominated the civil society sector. To note, along with this image, foreign policy has also been influential in the development of civil society. The European Union (EU) accession process beginning in 2004 brought a new dynamic to the sector due to its support to civil society since then, which pointed to the 'Europeanisation of civil society in Turkey' as Öner (2012) described. The interactions between the EU institutions and the civil society organizations strengthen the hands of these organizations against the state level authorities (Alemdar, 2008). More concretely, Alemdar (2008) showed that the civil society actors' fight for rights has been backed up by European institutions such as the European Commission of Human Rights and their relations have contributed to the development of organizations' capacities.

Second, in response to the Syrian crisis, the world directed attention to the region and the international community lent a hand to the refugee-hosting countries in the forms of foreign aid but also compelled them towards taking certain measures through the conditionality of the negotiations. In this vein, for instance, the European Union pushed the government to enact the new Law on Foreigners and International Protection and create a Directorate General of Migration Management. However, due to the complexity and difficulty of the refugee assistance and incorporation both at the society and state level, civil society actors have also gotten involved to meet the urgent needs of millions of refugees and to take a role in their incorporation into the society. According to Government statistics, the number of registered NGOs increased from 88,646 in 2011 to 111, 307 in 2017, deduced from the official government records (Mackreath & Sağrıç, 2017, p. 29). Along with the entrance of new organizations to the sector, many existing CSOs also either adapted their programs for refugee assistance or increased their activities (Sunata & Tosun, 2018). As discussed above, thanks to the Turkish-EU Deal signed in 2016, Turkey received a great amount of funds under the FRIT Program that should be used to increase state capacity for border management as well as the capacity development of the civil society actors acting upon refugee integration and assistance. Many local civil society organizations have also benefited from this fund and implemented refugee incorporation projects on the ground.

While these organizations endeavor to put projects in practice in the field, their capacity to do so is punctuated by the domestic politics along with foreign relations given the complex reality of interdependence among the stakeholders in different levels. As Ulas and Sunata (2018) claimed that ‘the repressive measures of the government during the Gezi Park protests in 2013, the failure of the so-called

‘Peace Process’ in 2015, a subsequent declaration of the state of emergency in the following of failed coup-attempt in 2016, trials of ‘Academics for Peace’ and closure of hundreds of NGOs by the decree laws have pointed to the authoritarianization of the government’ (p. 5). These tensions between the state and civil society have also played out in the refugee regime. In this context, the state heavily controlled the refugee camps and restricted the access of the civil society actors to the camps (Özden, 2013). Some CSOs, especially international ones were accused of being foreign spies (Sunata & Tosun, 2018) seeing the sector as a threat to its sovereignty and tighten the supervision over the organizations. Another example to these tensions is government’s restriction on CSOs in making house visits to determine the needs of refugees while subjecting them to receive a dispensation from the Ministry of Family and Social Policy (“Turkiye Suriyeli,” 2018). While the position of the government here is preventing any potential increase in unregistered refugees thanks to the availability of services provided by CSOs upon a house visit need-assessment, CSOs interpreted the situation as an incapacitation to reach out refugees most in vulnerable conditions (“Turkiye Suriyeli,” 2018).

In sum, in this section, we covered the refugee governance structure with its dynamics in Turkey. The refugee regime relies on multi-layered interactions of the state and the non-state actors in which multilateral (UN and EU) institutions and international humanitarian agencies, as well as the domestic NGOs, take a role. The refugee regime had been confined to the regime in the camps at the beginning of the eruption of the Syrian crisis, but as the war in Syria prolonged and the camps’ viability had been questioned, the domains of refugee governance has expanded to the urban context. Civil society organizations have involved in the relief projects geared towards the Syrians taking part in city-level refugee governance. Due to the

mutual need between the CSOs and the municipal bodies to each other, the cooperation between the two has become inevitable. Besides, civil society actors which are not endorsed with the governmental institutions have been subjected to exclusion or strict supervision. In the following chapters, we will analyze these cooperations and the determinants of interactions between the municipal and non-governmental actors for the implementation of the incorporation projects.

CHAPTER 4
THE UNDERSTANDING OF “HARMONIZATION”
AND ITS SCOPE AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

In Chapter 3, we have seen that the principle of harmonization is imprecise in terms of its scope. First, it does not clearly define whether it is only an activity that promotes mutual interaction between refugee and host community or every activity that contributes to their adaptation to the country i.e., registration to the PDMM, access to services such as health, education, economic activities or socio-cultural gatherings. Second, it purports to promote dialogue between communities, but the responsibility to the host community is not clearly specified; rather the interaction is centered on the efforts of the refugees. Furthermore, we have also seen that the ambiguity within the Municipal Law regarding to whom the municipalities can serve poses another difficulty in responding the refugee questions in a settlement.

Apart from the difficulty to locate the legal framework on harmonization, state authorities approach to Syrians also brings another challenge to understand harmonization. While the temporary protection status granted to Syrians provides them rights including access to free healthcare and education, the limited nature of their status put them in a precarious position where they cannot claim fundamental rights. Thus even though the structural constraints in terms of legal and socio-political terms prevail, municipalities who are relying on the *hemsehri hukuku* in their operations generate refugee incorporation practices seeing that there is a need to assist refugees living in their districts. Driving from all these difficulties and notwithstanding current efforts at municipal level, my research question consists of two interlinked questions: what harmonization is in its relation with refugee

incorporation and how do local actors carry out the refugee incorporation projects under the limited circumstances including the ambiguities in the Municipal Law, limited nature of the temporary protection status granted to Syrians, and economic hardship in the country. To analyze these questions, I selected the Zeytinburnu and Sultanbeyli Municipality as my main case districts to reveal the trajectories of local practitioners.

In this chapter, through the fieldwork, we will see that harmonization subsumes all the efforts of municipalities and NGOs in carrying out registration processes of refugees, certain empowerment training that are crafted to improve the life skills of refugees, and gathering activities that aim at creating dialogue between communities so as to contribute peaceful co-existence. In generating those refugee incorporation practices, the municipal units collaborate with NGOs in order to, for instance, organize certain events geared to promote harmonization within the host society and refugees. These activities can be in either the special days such as World Women's Day on March 8th, World Children Day on April 23rd, Fight for the Violence Against Women on November 25th or can target certain issues in a module series such as raising awareness on child labor, early age marriage, hygiene and empowerment of girls. NGOs provide their expertise in a specific area with their personnel and knowledge whereas municipal units provide the logistics for the event and find the participants both refugees and local people to attend the event.

Yet, to crystalize the *rules of the game* within Syrian refugee incorporation projects in Turkey, first I aimed to discern how the local practitioners conceive these projects because they have been the ones who transformed certain ideas determined by higher-level authorities within harmonization into practice. This focus enabled me to see the scope of the harmonization practices in terms of its objectives and its

shortcomings with respect to the principles and standards formed at the national and international refugee governance.

Hence, I categorized my findings into two chapters. In this chapter, I will analyze what the local practitioners understand from harmonization concerning their practices. Then, in the second chapter of my findings, in Chapter 5, I will unfold how the interactions and collaborations between municipal and non-state local actors - namely domestic and international non-governmental organizations - are generated in the course of the implementation of harmonization projects showing the determinants of and interests from such engagement. Also in Chapter 5, to study the implementation of harmonization projects, I approached the notion of implementation according to two respects: first, how the first contact between the municipal and non-state actors is enabled; second, how the interaction among the stakeholders during the implementation process is handled upon agreement. In this chapter, we will discuss the views of the officers, who are engaging internationally on the projects on refugees, in ZEYKOM in Zeytinburnu Municipality and the Strategic Development Department in Sultanbeyli Municipality; the officers in the municipal migration units of these municipalities namely in AKDEM and Multeciler Derneği; and the officers in the NGOs with which municipal officers collaborate.

4.1 Harmonization: Bringing host communities and refugees together

As we discussed in the previous chapters, local integration with the self-reliance approach dominates the protracted refugee situations today as it is the case in Turkey as well. Yet, neither 3RP nor the Turkish state authorities define their intervention in humanitarian work as integration. Rather, while the Turkish state envisions the principle of harmonization to explain its service provision to Syrians, the

international body within the 3RP follows the state discourse underscoring the main aim of contributing to harmonization in society. The two levels' approach to the service provision to Syrians converges at two interlinked points: first, making Syrians self-reliant with a dignified life "in Turkey or in the country in which they are resettled or in their own country upon their return"; second, Syrians who are not the persons in need of but contributors to the local economy can also be considered as contributors to the social cohesion. While such ideas are appealing in the paper, it is quite hard to associate what is going on the ground with refugee incorporation projects. In this part, I will bring an understanding of the harmonization through local actors' practices on the ground. My findings suggest that regardless of being a municipal or NGO officer, it is unlikely that Turkey is close to the practices and standards ascribed within the formal texts due to certain structural factors based on economy and limited nature of the temporary protection status. This might also show why local practitioners meet at the baseline of bringing people together in associating the term with what they do on the ground.

In all interviews, I started with the question of how they understand harmonization and how do they associate it with their works in their organization. An officer defines harmonization as "spending time together [host community and refugees] and preventing prejudices" (Sultanbeyli Municipality Strategic Development Department, personal communication, May 20, 2019). When I directed the question of what they do to fulfill this aim, the officer exemplified their previous and ongoing projects on the matter done by Multeciler Dernegi by saying that "we organize sewing workshops, meetings at breakfast and iftars, and some visits for women. Our activities that especially bring children from both sides are very effective"

(Sultanbeyli Municipality Strategic Development Department, personal communication, May 20, 2019).

The officer in Sultanbeyli Mülteciler Derneği presented her understanding of the term harmonization while further explaining the activities done by the Mülteciler Derneği. She said:

In our aim for harmonization, we generate Turkish language courses and vocational courses: ‘in order to make them exist in society’. We support (harmonization) via hobby activities. We try to organize attractive gatherings for Turkish society and Syrians so that we can ensure the interaction and communication among the communities. For example, we introduce women to each other then we support them to create a ‘*gün*’¹³ atmosphere among them then they keep communicating. They created a Whatsapp group and they meet by themselves and no need for us is left anymore even if they have a smattering of each other’s language... Ultimately, when they come together the hate speech changes in positive terms and this is what we aim for (Sultanbeyli Mülteciler Derneği, personal communication, April 19, 2018) (see Appendix C, 1).

It appears that, in their activities on harmonization, Sultanbeyli Municipality officer and the officer in the Mülteciler Derneği aim for bringing communities together and enhancing communication among them. Speaking to one another constitutes the main bridge that can ease the tensions by breaking the prejudices and hatred. When we look at the Zeytinburnu Municipality, we also see the conception of harmonization similar to Sultanbeyli Municipality. The officer at AKDEM conceptualizes the term harmonization as “learning to live together” (AKDEM, personal communication July 24, 2018). Yet, in explaining their works under harmonization, she made a distinction between organizing activities that require the participation of both communities and that do not. She explained it by saying that:

If we think that they need to come together in certain activities, we organize accordingly but if we do not think in that way then we only serve refugees. We organize visits to Miniaturk and Panorama 1453 History Museum and there is no need to make the host society involved in these visits given their long presence in the city. In activities such as archery, culture nights, culinary

¹³ Gün refers to a special gathering in Turkey. Women gather in a certain place, mostly at one of the group member’s apartments, where they chat about their daily life and eat their homemade products.

fair, we always commit to the idea of bringing people together (AKDEM, personal communication July 24, 2018) (see Appendix C, 2).

While evaluating the general course of events, she emphasized that “despite the cultural differences, certain reactions, and apprehensions, there had not been any issue that caused a very big problem. I think that society demonstrated forbearance and did not stir up trouble out of it” (AKDEM, personal communication May 13, 2019).

From her words, first, on the activities organized in serving the idea of harmonization, it is hard to understand why archery activities can be regarded as a suitable occasion for harmonization but not the museum visits. Then I asked how they came up with the idea of archery courses and how they associate the activities with harmonization. She explained that “in my perspective, it is not very related but there was a collaboration between Okcular Derneği (Association of Archers) and the municipal authorities, therefore they came and carried out these courses” (AKDEM, personal communication May 13, 2019). Noteworthy, Okcular Dernegi has close ties with the government since Bilal Erdogan, the son-in-law of President Erdogan, is the member of the board of trustees (“IBB’den Okcular,” 2019). In this respect, we see that close ties based on political networks can play a role in the communication of the local actors to produce a course of events in pursuit of harmonization and we will discuss on this point more in Chapter 5. Similar to the quandary on the activities done in this regard, during my internship, in a tea-talk with WALD officers, I assessed that some officers at WALD were also questioning certain activities being held in the name of harmonization. For example, when UNHCR recommended the to through a jazz concert for a harmonization activity, the officers approached the idea with caution because thinking that jazz concert is neither Syrians’ nor our culture and

can be a need for all that can only be ranked at around 100,000. (WALD, internship field notes, August 16, 2019).

Looking back to the words of the officer in AKDEM, it is interesting that the officer interpreted the refugee presence in the country as to ‘bear’ them. Hence, it implies that the officer does not clearly attribute a role on the part of society in achieving the mission of “learning to live together” likewise the Turkish Law also stated as we discussed before. Rather, saying that no trouble made by the host society might imply that Syrians should make an effort and contribute to harmonization in that no task is attached to the host community. Moreover, the officer in Zeytinburnu Strategic Development Department and also the City Council Coordinator of the Zeytinburnu approached harmonization with the same logic that any responsibility of host society for harmonization is overlooked by saying that “due to forced migration, Syrians came here and we need to determine the problems of Syrians. We delivered our ideas to our municipal authorities on the necessity of their education and how to harmonize them with society” Municipality (ZEYKOM, interview A, personal communication April 26, 2018).

It seems that for him, harmonization comes through solving the refugee problems in society and an understanding of bringing communities together did not appear at first sight. Yet, like the officer in AKDEM, he primarily approached the matter of harmonization as a one-sided issue, that is, refugees should be incorporated into the society and no responsibility attached to the host society. The municipal officers' view on harmonization also showed that the general effort of state officers to use the term harmonization instead of integration Erdogan (2017a) and to differentiate from one another appears as futile.

On the other hand, an officer in IKGV explicitly criticized the one-sidedness of harmonization practices meaning that host society is exempted from the process.

She said:

... In the last gathering of the Harmonization Meetings organized by DGMM, all the audience was Syrian. They explained the rights and responsibilities of refugees. They literally gave a lesson on how to conform themselves to the legal system, but the title of the gathering is harmonization... I also reject the use of the term social inclusion for refugees because our society needs to involve humanity as well. Turkey is a country of migration. If you dig for the family history of each citizen in Turkey, you will end up with the idea that everybody has a story of immigration. That means, we (host society) need to learn how to live together. Why is then this resistance against refugees? We need to break that resistance (IKGV, interview B, personal communication June 28, 2019) (see Appendix C, 3).

The officer envisions a policy which should incorporate both communities into harmonization practices. She also believes that it would not be that much difficult to empathize with a refugee considering Turkey as a country of immigration, which basically constitutes her main point of why society must undertake a task for such a policy. However, what she says on the attitude of state institutions cannot be generalized to every officer working for the state institutions. Besides municipal officers who saw harmonization as harmonizing Syrians into society, some municipal officers might interpret the situation in other ways. For instance, an officer in the Strategy Development Department of Sultanbeyli Municipality stated that “all the humanitarian responses should be transformed into activity in the harmonization process and ([host] society must be ready to uphold it because this [harmonization] is not a work of only one institution. It needs a holistic approach” (Sultanbeyli Strategy Development Department, interview A, personal communication, April 19, 2018). From his words, it seems that the term entails a mutual interaction of societies and the officer captured the fact that society should also put some effort into embracing the newcomers. Yet, although the views of the

municipal officer and the NGO officer seem contradictory to one another in response to the state institutions' perspective to harmonization, their perspectives point out that local practitioners are aware of the resistance on the side of the host community to the harmonization process and necessitate their involvement in the process.

Another officer in IKGV discussed the meaning of harmonization from a different angle rather than readily defining it as bringing refugees and the local community together. He argued that:

In order to discuss the notion of harmonization, we need to look at the political and legal conjunction at the international level. At that point, the Geneva Convention and the refugee status in Turkey limit the scope. Here, the emphasis of the third country is made, that is, Turkey cannot host refugees and the temporary protection status was created according to that. In order not to use the term integration, they preferred harmonization. What is intended with harmonization is this: Syrians should learn the laws and comply with the legal and formal arena. The framework is thus more to do with how they can maintain their lives without kicking up a fuss in society. Nonetheless, we carry out such projects but the number of refugees we can reach is very low (IKGV, interview A, personal communication, June 20, 2019) (see Appendix C, 4).

Among the interviewees, he was the only person who approached the issue from a legal perspective. Similar to his colleague at IKGV, he thinks that national authorities' effort consists of exposing refugees towards learning the laws and rules in society. Hence, according to these officers, the harmonization practices are seen as a tool to reduce the social tension, but unlikely considered having a transformative capacity on the part of society in terms of 'learning to live together'. Thus, it appears that, according to the officer, the harmonization principle and discourse emerge as the accommodative approach of the government in order to reduce the tension while upholding the international refugee regime through granting status in line with the Geneva Convention and restricting their movement to Europe.

The NGO officers yielded more insight for the term harmonization compared to the municipal officers while building upon the argument of creating dialogue among communities. When we look at their understanding of the term, the ideas of bringing communities together and making them spend time with each other to create a dialogue among communities come to the forefront as the aim of harmonization practices. While some of them discussed it more in line with the municipal officers through the emphasis on living together, others drew attention to the learning of the state institutions in society as well. In addition, they were also aware of the ambiguity of the term ‘harmonization’ and stated that they learned what it accounts for in time while engaging in refugee incorporation projects and interacting with officers serving refugees. In this respect, the IKGV officer argued that “we as social workers on refugees are the ones who define the term ‘harmonization’ through our observations of refugees’ and society’s needs” (IKGV, interview B, personal communication June 28, 2019).

The officer working at IBC also claimed that “harmonization has never been an issue in Turkey historically. We tailored a role for ourselves in the course of harmonization through combining the theory with practice. In fact, we did not know what it stands for” (IBC, interview A, personal communication, August 20, 2019). The officer further explained how he sees harmonization associating with their practices. He framed harmonization as coming and living together and addressed what kind of activity can be considered as a practice of harmonization:

Harmonization accounts for all practices that aim at bringing children and youth from host society and refugees together and seeking empathy. Under our harmonization unit, we have educational, cultural and sports activities, and site visits. In our Children and Youth Club, for example, we work on peer-bullying, personal development, goal setting. These works also intersect with harmonization but we work on them by focusing more on psychological support. The game workshops we hold generates a common language and unites children via games by freeing them from the language of the ‘other’.

(IBC, interview A, personal communication, August 20, 2019) (see Appendix C, 5).

The scope of harmonization in terms of which practices should be considered as serving harmonization and which one cannot was also raised by an officer working at IKGV that worked with Zeytinburnu Municipality. When she explains their works on the awareness seminars on child labor and the rights of children funded by WHH, she stated that:

This work consists of people who are not Turkish citizens, and refugees. If there were Turkish children, it would be regarded as harmonization. Actually, this is not something set in stone...these things also contribute to harmonization, but we differentiate among them so as no problem emerges during reporting to the donor (IKGV, interview B, personal communication June 28, 2019) (see Appendix C, 6).

From their words, it seems that where the direct dialogue between communities generates there occurs a *direct* harmonization, but other activities geared tailored for refugees such as the empowerment of refugee youth through psychological support are also related to harmonization even so *indirectly*. This approach brings us to the point that the idea of creating a dialogue through gathering communities corresponds to harmonization as practice. The other practices such as strengthening the well-being of refugees or empowering women training serve harmonization as ideal. Indeed, the lack of clarity in determining what is counted as harmonization activity and what is not is illuminated by the UNHCR officer:

Harmonization is two-folded consisting of making refugees aware of the state institutions and making the institutions informed about how to respond to the refugees. The dialogue between service providers and individuals and the dialogue among the communities. In the latter, we include the empowerment of belonging, equality for opportunities in access to employment and aid, ensuring their recognition in city life through legal counseling, and their participation in city councils. It is important to have a structured dialogue between communities, and interaction and communication that breaks the prejudices. For example, cooking workshops in six districts in Istanbul are very important for enabling communication between communities. Also, in

this regard, we should feature the works that would enrich the positive image of refugees to stymie the spread of the idea of refugees as persons who are only in need of. The Syrian Women Chorus took a stage by IKSÜ, producing and spreading the videos on successful Syrian entrepreneurs' stories, giving space in Biennale for the artworks made by refugees... are just some examples that can break the prejudices (UNHCR, personal communication June, 19, 2019) (see Appendix C, 7).

The officer's definition is very much the reflection of the Turkish Law on Foreigners and International Persons in that it underscores the importance of informing refugees about the state institutions along with the mutual interaction among communities. Relying on such similarity, I asked whether I can get any documents of UNHCR that put forth such a definition. Yet, she said the document is not public but I could write it down the officer's quotation. When we look at the operations of UNHCR on making refugees aware of the state institutions, its partner NGOs such as WALD does so through providing social and legal counseling when a refugee comes with a question of which state institution they should go to get their official documents processed. As a result, according to the officer, the dialogue should be created not only at the level of society through come-together activities and attempts to change the image of refugees, but at the state level through informing both refugees and officers on how to communicate with one another. Yet, the officer in IKGÜ (the institution is also a partner of UNHCR) underlined this very point that only refugees are treated as a side that can contribute to the 'dialogue' creation in the Harmonization Meeting and not the officers in state institutions.

Similar to the officer in IKGÜ, the officer in IBC exemplified the lack of responsibility felt on the side of state institutions through the case of teachers at schools. She was mainly worried about the apathy on refugee children that lead to drop-outs:

The number of guidance teachers is very less. Some teachers might not care about the children and even refugee children might be subjected to their violence. Students drop out of school because of this indifference. The schooling rate among refugee youth is 60%, which must increase. Yet, on the other hand, we should question the absenteeism rate within this 60% of refugee children who go to school. Because of indifference and because of child labor, students drop out of the school (IBC, interview B, personal communication, August 20, 2019) (see Appendix C, 8).

Therefore, although the LFIP and UNHCR states that state institutions should act responsively in creating dialogue among communities to serve the ideal of harmonization, unfortunately, from the words of officers, we see that their level of involvement in such a task is not at a desired level. Rather, responsibility is shouldered upon refugees who should learn the state institutions, the norms and culture of the society, and obey the rules and regulations. Furthermore, the ideal image of a self-reliant refugee is deemed as the person who can reach his/her own potential thereby contributing to the economy of the family and the local economy. It seems that refugees are expected to do all the efforts to gain such respect, to have such a dignified living, and to be part of the dialogue, in front of officers who do not seem to tend open to dialogue. Hence, how refugees can become self-reliant if they cannot be seen as a side of the ‘dialogue’ emerges as a question that can be empirically investigated in further research.

4.2 The scope of harmonization: Struggles to carry out refugee incorporation projects

While in both national LFIP and the texts informing the international response to the Syrian crisis in Turkey attributes an economic dimension to the scope of harmonization by underscoring the importance of becoming self-reliant individuals as we discussed in the previous chapters, this dimension is hardly the component of

their activities. Not very surprisingly, the officer from IBC deliberately dissociated any effort to make refugees self-sufficient in terms of the economy from the practices of harmonization:

In our cultural events, we make trips to the places where a common history has passed and right after the visit we have a structured dialogue workshop in which participants try to find solutions to common problems. These common problems are not ones based on the economy, but more to do with communication problems such as language problems because you know... the economic dimension is hard to deal with. We are not able to touch upon that. Besides, there is a bond between communities thanks to the common history but without coming together, it (harmonization) is not possible. Hence, we try to make them touch each other. And we know that these (our activities) are not enough at the macro level in the absence of economic support (IBC, interview A, personal communication, August 20, 2019) (see Appendix C, 9).

While creating dialogue and opening up spaces that can enable such interaction are at the forefront in discussing the practices within harmonization, the absence of good economic conditions that strengthen the self-reliance of refugees also affects the functioning of their activities aiming for harmonization. Concerning the role of the economy in harmonization, we can evaluate first the venues such as refugee or city councils, or opinion clubs or workshops that are deemed as the spaces for dialogue generation.

Likewise, UNHCR officers argued that refugees' participation in city councils strengthens their sense of belonging through communicating with the local community (UNHCR officer, personal communication, June 2019). Yet, the level of communication assessed by the NGOs might be unsatisfactory to the UNHCR. The underlying reason behind this 'failure', according to the officer in Sultanbeyli Municipality, is that they are mostly concerned with their economic problems. With his words:

To listen to their voices, we created a Refugee Council that gathers once in a month but refugees are not very open to democracy. They were talking about

their economic problems in the council. When we realized that this attitude will not change, we changed the council structure: now the council consists of refugee students studying at the level of bachelor and masters. We want to invite them to the City Council after a while. Studying with adults is very problematic. Our harmonization department is working on that but they have to adapt and integrate themselves... We also have “Opinion Clubs” in order to increase awareness (for harmonization) yet the demand is low (Sultanbeyli Strategic Development Department, interview B, personal communication, May 20, 2019) (see Appendix C, 10).

The expectation from refugees in harmonization activities here emerges as to discuss the issues that are not based on economic problems and make effort to integrate themselves to the society, underscoring the state’s position, in the Article 96 of LFIP, of expecting them to find the ways and access to reach out the services and opportunities that assist their integration into the society. Thus, it seems that because of the overall incapacity within the economy due to high unemployment rate (Kavak, 2016) the difficulty to receive work permits (Baban et al, 2018; Icduygu & Millet 2016) not only deteriorates the lives of refugees in the country, but these factors brought about the fact that that local practitioners have to overlook the economic dimension of harmonization and can only serve in the category of socio-cultural harmonization. Furthermore, refugee youth are seen as more prone to ‘adapt’ themselves rather than adults who are deeply occupied with the livelihood problems of the family. This idea was also elaborated by the officer working at IBC:

We cannot pull a good number of participants from both refugee and local communities to attend our harmonization activities. Especially we have a problem reaching out to male adult refugees. This is simply based on economic reasons. They are working and have to work for many hours... even on the weekends. Thus they cannot come to our events. What we thought as a solution is to find shopkeepers and their children from local people and refugees and to meet them at breakfast (IBC, interview A, personal communication, August 20, 2019) (see Appendix C, 11).

During my experience in organizing the harmonization activities at WALD, I also assessed that since they cannot maintain their lives economically they do not

want to spend money on transportation to attend these gathering events (WALD, internship field notes, August 2019). Furthermore, as the IBC officer mentioned the difficulty to find participants for harmonization activities not only from the refugee community but also from the local ones, the officer in Mülteciler Derneği underscored the same point while also drawing attention to the hesitance on the side of host communities to attend these activities. She stated that “Turkish society thinks that these events are not geared towards them. We make announcements via schools, our personnel, or social media. However, the Turkish participants represent 25% of our event participants. We want to increase that number.” (Sultanbeyli Mülteciler Derneği, personal communication, April 19, 2018).

Furthermore, in assisting to carry out harmonization activities during my internship at WALD, I also observed that the officers’ relatives and friends are attending the event in representation of local people mostly (WALD, internship field notes, July 2019). Besides the difficulty to get refugee male adults to participate in the activities, the officer working at Save the Children in Zeytinburnu Municipality underscored another social group whose attendance is not likely unless any steps are taken: refugee children working illegally. In this respect, the officer explained their effort by saying that:

We put creative work to care about the children working under very bad conditions. Our personnel open the center during Sundays, to make the refugee children who work enjoy the books and toys in the center because Sunday is the only day that children do not work in general. For this reason, we call this application Open Sunday (Save the Children, personal communication, July 5, 2019) (see Appendix C, 12).

Therefore, we can conclude that reaching out to the refugees especially men and children poses a great problem for the officers working on refugee incorporation, which led them to find new solutions to be able to carry out the refugee incorporation

project in question. Since male adults are the breadwinners and children must work to support the family income, the participation of them to the events done by the local practitioners seems highly difficult. Considering all the challenges stemming from the refugees' economic insufficiency, the words of WALD personnel seems very clear: we can organize harmonization events more easily in the districts whose refugee residents are wealthier, Beylikduzu for instance, in the sense that they can maintain their lives with their income and already solved their registration problems (WALD, internship field notes, August 2019) and might have time to attend these events. In addition, the host community does not seem very much engaged with these events. If the activities can be more likely to be organized in relatively wealthier districts - having also refugee settlement - and if low level of participation of host communities in these activities poses a question in realizing the ideal of harmonization, then we should rethink the question of whose harmonization are we talking about.

Related to that point of economic basis factoring into the harmonization, the distribution of school kits to the Syrian children at schools questioned not only whether the practice aimed is really targeting harmonization but also how the economic hardship prevailing in the country triggers its inapplicability. In response to the question of their struggles during the implementations officer at IBC shared her frustration during the distribution of school kits and asserted that:

We were told by the donors that the kits will be given to Syrian children at the school. We distributed the kits to them but there were poor children from Turkey who needed the kits as well. I really felt sorry at that moment. This situation actually becomes a kind of seed for discrimination (IBC, interview B, personal communication, August 20, 2019) (see Appendix C, 13).

In this case, we should not forget that the target beneficiaries within the fund-based structure of the refugee regime, in a sense, produce its own inefficiency

through impeding the generation of dialogue among the refugee and host society and triggering more of the discriminatory attitude rather than bolstering harmonization and social cohesion.

The limited nature of the temporary protection status was also underlined as a difficulty to succeed in harmonization. This point was vivid in the case of warrant of arrest. As we discussed in Chapter 3, in July 2019, the government, with the speech of Suleyman Soylu, the Ministry of Interior, decreed a regulation on the movement of refugees within the country aiming to take the unregistered and/or illegal refugees under control. The government also froze the registrations to Istanbul reasoning the incapacity of the city. It was also stated that any refugee who is found without his/her identity card and whose registered settlement is seen in another city will be arrested and sent to the city of settlement. The news indicated different applications in this regard and it was said that the refugees without documents are deported from the country and dumped in Idlib. This situation led to a great chaos in the refugee community and many feared, even those who are settling in their registered city, to go out on the streets.

These tensions were occurring just after a few weeks when I started to do my internship in WALDs office sites. All of a sudden the number of beneficiaries decreased significantly. Those who visited the offices were coming with huge concerns i.e., that their child, or a relative stuck in another city and cannot enter Istanbul, that a shopkeeper having business license is worried about his business and could not open his shop with the fear of loots and law enforcement officers, that he is favored by a Turkish man with shelter and a job (illegal) and do not want to put his employee in trouble with his arrest, and that one of their friend is under coma in Izmit, another city, but she cannot visit her and take care of her children during those

difficult times. In those times, what WALD officers could do was only saying “lie low” for a while and do not go outside and get in touch with state institutions if not necessary. During those days, I saw the frustration of the WALD officers in their efforts of harmonization as they were reiterating that all the things we did for harmonization came to naught; people are scared to death even to go to a market. They were ruminating on the question of how they could bring the communities together after all these things happened (WALD, internship field notes, July, 2019) The IBC officer was also going to frame the situation in those days in the same manner.

When we were saying that we were advancing very well in society (on harmonization), these warrants of arrests and displacements dropped like a bombshell to our works, which led us back to square one. All those ambiguous state policies are affecting us, our work. Unless these wrong policies are fixed, all the things we had done will go to waste (IBC, interview A, personal communication, August 20, 2019) (see Appendix C, 14).

As a result, the insecurity of the refugees due to having no political rights put refugees in precarious conditions (Yıldız & Uzgoren, 2016) as we have seen the level of fear refugees had during the decree by the Ministry of Interior in July 2019. They have no right to object to the decision of the law enforcement units. The fear on the side of refugees of being deported if found unregistered and the fear of being subjected to arbitrary arrests even if found registered and with documents put a huge impact on refugees’ capacity to get involved in daily life. Parallel to that, local practitioners’ hands were tied off and could only recommend them not to be outside to save them from the fear and any trouble. Yet, they were very well aware of the fact that those days and experience was going to jeopardize all the harmonization works which aim at creating a dialogue in between communities and a ‘peaceful’ existence in society.

Hence, the structural factors ranging from the economic vulnerability and the limited nature of the temporary protection status to social acceptance on the side of host society hampers the materialization of what is primarily intended by the harmonization. In sum, while harmonization practices are mostly understood as bringing communities together, harmonization stands also as an ideal attributed to every action within service provision which can consist of hygiene training, learning state institutions, making referrals among state and non-state institutions for identity registrations, peer-bullying awareness training and so on. That is to say, every action within service provision is subsumed by the mission of harmonization and in the Chapter 5, we will also treat every action mentioned above as part of harmonization. Furthermore, from this chapter, we can conclude that their understanding of harmonization as bringing communities together likely relies on the fact that they cannot do anything to improve Syrians' economic conditions which is an indispensable part of the harmonization as it is recognized also at the national and international levels. Their understanding of harmonization and practices on the ground showed us the scope of their work. In the next part, I will look at the interactions of the local practitioners among one another while implementing the refugee incorporation projects. By doing that, I will also demonstrate the institutional properties that enable and constrain in carrying out the refugee incorporation projects and that shape the rules of the game within local refugee governance.

CHAPTER 5
INTERACTION WITH NGOs AND MUNICIPALITIES
FOR IMPLEMENTING HARMONIZATION PROJECTS

In the implementation of the projects at the municipal level, we see two kinds of interactions: interaction of INGOs and NGOs with Municipal Units, and interactions of those NGOs with state institutions (such as PDMM, hospitals, and ministries like the Ministry of the National Education and Ministry of Health) in proceeding their work. I also categorized the interaction among the stakeholders in two phases as the generation of the first contact among stakeholders and the process in which the project is carried out. This division will enable us to better grasp the kinds of rule system being in use within local refugee governance in the sense that how NGOs can enter in the field of local refugee governance and what are the possible entry points for fulfilling their tasks on service provision upon their agreement in implementing a project or putting an action.

The first contact for such a collaboration between the municipal units and NGOs depends on a couple of points. IKGV officer told the story of their collaboration with AKDEM by saying that:

Two years ago, IKGV knocked on the door of AKDEM for any collaboration but AKDEM did not lean towards such work. Last month, AKDEM reached out to us to get support on the activities on harmonization to be held in the center. They said we have money and a project, but we want to get help because we do not know how to do. We asked which areas you want to work with us. They specified the peer-bullying topic and during the project, we worked on both children who were going to school and who was not (IKGV, interview B, personal communication June 28, 2019) (see Appendix C, 15).

Thus, interactions generate according to the needs of the people living in that municipal territory and it is the municipal body that determines whether there is a

need or not. UNHCR officer and Save the Children officer stated that municipal authorities discuss the needs they assessed in their territories but cannot find resources to act upon the issue (UNHCR, personal communication June 19, 2019; Save the Children, personal communication, July 05, 2019). Yet, it is known that municipalities vary in their response to a refugee settlement in their territory (Erdogan, 2017a; Erdogan, 2017b; Genc, 2018) thus the driving point of making collaboration also changes accordingly.

Political networks among the local practitioners can also initiate the collaborations between local actors. When I was tasked with helping out the operations in WALD's office in Gaziosmanpasa, an officer wanted to introduce me the office and talked about the position of the office in the district along with the kinds of activities done:

No NGO providing services to refugees existed before WALD in Gaziosmanpasa because the municipality wants to be enclosed against such interactions. The Gaziosmanpasa Municipality allowed WALD to operate in their district not mainly because of its expertise in the field but more due to their close contacts with the municipality based on sharing the same political vision (WALD, internship field notes, June 2019) (see Appendix C, 16)

To elaborate more on the low level of openness within the municipality, she added that “remember the election campaign of Ekrem Imamoglu.¹⁴ He (Ekrem Imamoglu) in a public speech said that I will be mayor of Gaziosmanpasa as well pointing to the conservative atmosphere of the district ” (WALD, internship field notes, June 2019).

Another WALD personnel stressed the competence of the organization in communication with municipalities by pointing to how WALD became a partner to UNHCR and work within the 3RP programming. According to the personnel

¹⁴ He was running for the mayoral election for the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality and won the election in 2019.

“UNHCR is not working with WALD for love. Rather, it is because they cannot do anything without WALD at the municipal level” (WALD, internship field notes, June 2019).

Moreover, the political networks can also help speeding up the bureaucratic processes when a project requires the approval of different state authorities. More concretely, the officer at ZEYKOM claimed that these political networks become a shortcut in putting a project in practice while giving the example of municipal personnel training. He stated that “NGOs have to undertake certain procedures when they organize training for personnel at state institutions. Yet, if an NGO is close to the government, they can pass the procedures quickly.” (ZEYKOM, interview B, personal communication April 26, 2018).

Similarly, the political atmosphere at the national level influences NGOs’ relationships with municipalities. After the speech that denigrates ASAM and Yuva Derneği by Süleyman Soylu (Koyuncu, 2019), the Minister of Internal Affairs at the time, the project of Yuva Derneği operating in Avcılar Municipality was taken from the Yuva Derneği and charged with the Save the Children, but all the officers and the content of the project stayed the same so the name of the organization in cooperation was the only thing that changed (WALD, internship field notes, July 2019). In sum, political atmosphere at the national level and existing political networks shape the interactions among institutions regarding whom an institution can work or cannot. To put it differently, close ties to the municipal authorities enable NGOs in pursuit of service provision to refugees to do their humanitarian work (Danis & Nazli 2018; Sunata & Tosun 2018).

Likewise, the domination of municipal state authorities over the NGOs and their work prevails in the form of monitoring the content of the projects done by the

NGOs and the lack of trust to NGOs at the beginning of a project. The IKGV officer explained their effort in giving training to the MEB officials and their struggle during the process:

Meritocracy does not exist and partisanship takes the stage. We face these problems because we cannot reach out to qualified personnel in state institutions. When we deliver our seminars, for instance, on sexual health, somebody stands out and says let's not say sexual health and say women's health or let's not draw a vagina over there (IKGV, interview B, personal communication June 28, 2019) (see Appendix C, 17).

Thus, the content of the project in question was checked by the municipal authority. To deliver such a seminar, they had to comply with the municipal authorities' directives, in other words, to be in the service and remain within the refugee governance structure, they had to align with the national terms which have been dominated by the conservative ruling party. Hence, not only the political proximity, but also the convergence of gender norms become a prerequisite for cooperation and/or for starting these projects.

When we come to the process within the implementation of the project, we see that the role of bureaucracy and lack of coordination among state institutions cannot be overlooked. The IKGV officer stated:

The National Education Ministry communicated with us to collaborate on their project. We provided a trainee but they required a great number of documents, even our criminal records. It is unbelievable. We have a protocol with the Family and Social Work Ministry, but that protocol does not help at all with the National Education Ministry. The state has to issue a document that ties up all state institutions (IKGV, interview B, personal communication June 28, 2019) (see Appendix C, 17).

Similar to what IKGV officer argues, a recent report prepared by Save the Children (2019) stresses that lack of single mandated agency to regulate case management at district and province-levels and unclear referral pathways challenge front line workers in their engagement with various state agencies (e.g. Provincial Directorates

of Migration Management, Social Support Centers, school administrations, Public Education Centers, Centers on Monitoring and Prevention of Violence (VPMCs). It draws attention to the fact that the absence of overarching protocols within the ministries at city and district levels and of specific mandates are the obstacles that the NGO officers face in interaction with state institutions.

Another example regarding the domination of state in refugee incorporation processes can be associated with the low level of trust to the NGOs serving refugees by the state hospitals during referrals. As I assessed during my internship at WALD, the collaboration with municipalities might not be sufficient to fulfill their tasks during their implementation of projects, which led NGO workers to find a strategy to fulfill the tasks. More concretely, for instance, NGO officers do not introduce themselves with the name of their organization when they want to get an appointment for their beneficiaries but introduce themselves as the neighbor, brother, or sister of the beneficiary.

Furthermore, the personal motivation of the personnel who will be in charge of the implementation of incorporation projects has an impact on the implementation process from the outset. This is the case because as the interview shows below, municipal bodies might not be willing to undertake a task or training on refugee incorporation. More concretely, the officer at IKGV highlighted the issue by stating that:

We prepared a module to train municipal officers who have the potential to contribute to harmonization. The training was about making personnel informed about refugees on legal institutions and order in Turkey within the scope of harmonization. But it was not easy to find a municipality to introduce such work. Then, thanks to my family contact in Maltepe Municipality, we accomplished such a task (IKGV, interview B, personal communication June 28, 2019) (see Appendix C, 18).

She further added that:

... Personnel from the Social Services and Child Protection Institution also calls them to get help for registration and psycho-social problems of the refugees. But at the end, these are not systematic and only happen if the personnel is idealist enough (IKGV, interview B, personal communication June 28, 2019) (see Appendix C, 19).

In line with that, during my intern in different district offices of WALD, I also observed the importance of this personnel motivation to do something for refugee incorporation. To remind that within the scope of the 3RP programming, certain municipalities assign their own social workers previously working in the municipality's other departments to the position of the social worker in service to refugees. Some of the social workers of WALD working under the Social Protection Project in partnership with UNHCR were also assigned by the municipalities. However, during my interactions in the offices, I observed that the level of effort put by those social workers was subjected to criticism (WALD, internship field notes, August 2019). In other words, according to them, the contribution of the personnel to the project depends on the personal motivation of the social worker. An officer of WALD explained the situation reasoning that since the social worker had a good relationship with his/her municipal authorities, nobody cares if we (WALD officer) complain about their performance to them (WALD, internship field notes, August 2019). Therefore, since the municipal body's authority cannot be questioned vis-a-vis the NGOs, the NGO workers are subjected to municipal personnel in their operations.

We have seen that personal motivation of those under the authority of state plays a significant role in putting an effort to hold a harmonization activity or welcoming the initiatives by the NGO to do so. We also saw that existing interactions based on political networks ease the process of starting to implement such projects. In addition, complying with and crafting the content of the projects in

line with the conservative character of the government become a requirement to keep their interactions and thereby put a practice within refugee incorporation. Having done that we can move to the questions of why do these actors collaborate; in other words, what are the interests of the municipal bodies and the non-governmental organization from such collaboration? Since municipalities' resources including financing, personnel, and knowledge on refugee governance are limited (Erdogan, 2017a), the collaborations with NGOs bring an opportunity to find these resources. In fact, the municipal units benefit from the expertise of the NGOs in assessing the refugee and society needs as we discussed above. On the NGOs' end, it also has a lot of advantages such as being visible and trustable in the eyes of the refugees due to even having the logo of the municipality, ease to get funds from international donors, and reaching out to the other state institutions to get things done. Below, I will discuss these points with the findings assessed through interviews and participant observation.

First, the IBC officer explained the role of cooperation between local governments and the NGOs by first stating their aim through their works:

We as NGOs want to reach out to the refugees and serve them while maintaining peace in society. When a certain NGO wants to do these works on their own, social acceptance is highly difficult. However, signing a protocol with state institutions easily regulates this process. In addition to that, it extends our operational context by enhancing our access to more people (refugees). People in any location of the district can find us with the help of the visibility obtained via cooperation with the municipality (IBC, interview B, personal communication, August 20, 2019) (see Appendix C, 20).

Another advantage of such cooperation is the ease earned due to standing by the municipalities to find the fund to operate a project crafted to serve refugees. Both the officer working in Sultanbeyli Multeciler Dernegi and the officer from ZEYKOM stated that the international project applications necessitate a

sustainability perspective in the project (Sultanbeyli Multeciler Dernegi, personal communication, April 19, 2018; ZEYKOM, interview B, personal communication April 26, 2018). In other words, while carrying out the project, there must be an exit strategy that can scale up the impact of the project to the future, upon the termination of a project in question. The officers put forth the idea that the impact of the projects is desired to be long-lasting thus the donors highly suggest working with state institutions. In this vein, Save the Children officer stated that:

We would like to make our services sustainable. For this purpose, we work with mukhtars for instance. We want to create a commission for women refugees including both Syrians and Afghans. This commission will collect the clothes not used by the owner, clean them, and help other people to get those clothes from a specific location. Our aim is the continuation of this mechanism when our project finishes up in two years because we would be able to pass it over to the mukhtars under the coordination of the municipality (Save the Children, personal communication, July 05, 2019) (see Appendix C, 21).

International refugee regimes' reliance on national terms and the idea of exit strategy directed the actions that should be taken in making projects and services sustainable towards working with local authorities. The UNHCR Officer also highlighted this point in the discussion of how to support harmonization processes by stressing that "for example, we raised the question of how to leverage the harmonization processes and then put the application that WALD officers working in collaboration with municipalities educate the state personnel in terms of the scope of harmonization" (UNHCR, personal communication June 19, 2019).

Lastly, the collaboration with municipalities enhances an opportunity for both municipal units and NGOs to speed up the registration process to the DGMM - more importantly after the restrictions on receiving new registrations to the city of Istanbul since July 2019. All the NGOs I interviewed with complained about the rapid changes in registration regulations by especially freezing registration to Istanbul

PDMM in July 2019. Due to this fact, the referrals of NGOs to the Istanbul PDMM for registration purposes were interrupted; however, the NGOs working in collaboration with the municipality and the Municipal Unit itself could find their way to finalize such process. The personnel from Save the Children elaborated more on that:

When you call the PDMM or a hospital for complex registration cases, you very likely face difficulties. But, using the name of the municipality opens us a space to make advocacy. When we go to these institutions with our lawyers, there emerges an opportunity to make advocacy, for example, to prevent the deportation processes. For instance, we talked with the District Police Directorate to make them allow the refugee children to go to school even if they do not have an identity card (unregistered refugees). Also, we know that school authorities might arbitrarily reject these students (Save the Children, personal communication, July 05, 2019) (see Appendix C, 22).

Refugees can only enjoy the right to access to health services and education if they are registered to the PDMM. Those who are not registered are struggling for receiving services and struggling for maintaining life. They were also at risk of deportation when the Istanbul PDMM froze registrations. The officer at Save the Children and the officer in AKDEM in Zeytinburnu argued that if we aim for harmonization, we should include those who are not registered as well, thus we follow a parallel process to serve them (Save the Children, personal communication, July 05, 2019; AKDEM, personal communication May 13, 2019). The officer of Save the Children identified the process by giving an example “if they do not hold an identity card, we leave the space blank and this does not lead to any problem with municipal authorities.” (Save the Children, personal communication, July 05, 2019). The officer in AKDEM gave another example of how they serve to the unregistered refugees:

For example, an unregistered Syrian woman beat up by her husband might have many problems. This woman needs psycho-social support and protection support along with the registration. While prioritizing registration,

other needs are also provided by the Migration Unit in the meantime (AKDEM, personal communication May 13, 2019) (see Appendix C, 23).

Thus, UNHCR Officer explained how refugees in Zeytinburnu can receive services regardless of being registered or unregistered by stressing that “it is well known that the mayor of Zeytinburnu Municipality has explicitly supported an inclusive and extensive approach on services” (UNHCR, personal communication June, 19, 2019).

Therefore, municipalities and NGOs overcome the obstacle of serving only to registered refugees thanks to the power of municipality in front of other state institutions requiring registration such as Istanbul PDMM, hospitals, or schools. In sum, in this part, we have seen the enablers and constraints of their interactions, which shape the rules of the game within the refugee incorporation projects and practices in Istanbul. We can conclude that for NGOs, working with state authorities puts NGOs in a privileged position where they can perform their humanitarian work more easily. This is the case also because international refugee incorporation practices rely heavily on national terms and in the case of Turkey, the centralized state with its authoritarian character heavily orients the interactions among the actors serving in this field. Thus to provide services to refugees and contribute to the ideal of harmonization, NGO officers can enjoy the autonomy of municipal bodies via working with municipalities if they can create such a bond. The possibility of bonding with state institutions are quite arbitrary thinking of the benefits brought by personal networks through acquaintances and political networks through ideological ties. Even if the municipalities and NGOs need each other to operate their works, the prospects for cooperation are not ensured and systematic. More significantly, the interactions are very much politicized appearing at the first contact, which shapes the content and operation of the works in the implementation afterwards.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This study analyzed the implementation of the harmonization projects tailored for Syrians at the local level in Istanbul focusing on the trajectories of its very practitioners. It adopted a governance approach to better show the actors, dynamics, and decision making processes. For this reason, it discussed the literature on governance and analyzed the rules of the game in the local governance of refugee incorporation. As the governance structure is constituted by two concurrent types of exchanges; a formal, constitutionally defined exchange and an informal, contextually defined exchange (Peters & Pierre 2005, p. 89), I approached the implementation of those projects in respect to these types of exchanges. For the former, I looked at the rules, regulations, jurisdictions, objectives, and guidelines that could inform the practitioners on the matter. By analyzing the principle of harmonization defined by the Turkish Law on Foreigners and International Protection, in relation to the self-reliance and local integration framework given by the international texts, I put forth the point that these two levels' understanding of refugee incorporation meet in the aims of making refugees independent from third party support and fostering an environment where refugee and host communities peacefully live together.

Nonetheless, presuming on this formal understanding, through fieldwork, I showed the limitations of this principle during the implementation of the projects at the local level. By investigating what harmonization means on the ground from the eyes of the municipal and NGO officers, I showed that harmonization is understood as both as an ideal and as a practice and their understanding is shaped by the structural constraints limiting their practices. Harmonization as practice refers to

bringing social cohesion to society and its mode of realization revolves around bringing communities together in every activity as much as possible. Harmonization as practice refers to every action, done by state and non-state authorities, that incorporates refugees to the society, that is, ranging from registration, referrals among institutions to socio-cultural and economic activities. As a result, the fieldwork shows that harmonization corresponds to every action done within the refugee incorporation.

However, we see a misfit among the levels during the implementation of the projects driving from certain structural constraints when we compare what is intended formally at national and international level by the self-reliance approach and harmonization with what is actually happening on the ground. This is largely the case because, first, due to the limited nature of the temporary protection status and the restrictive character of the work permit opportunity in a country with a high unemployment rate put them in precarious position in which maintaining a minimum living independent from third party support appears not possible. Due to non-ability of NGO and municipal officers in ameliorating the economic conditions of Syrians, these organizations and the municipalities they are working with are constrained to operate in the area of socio-cultural incorporation. Concomitantly, even the gathering activities (forums, city councils, site-visits etc.), the main practice uttered by the local practitioners for harmonization, are hampered by lack of self-sufficiency and severe economic difficulties of the Syrians in the country. This is the case since refugees cannot spend time attending the gatherings and city councils which were supposed to be where the dialogue between communities could cherish. Therefore, due to the lack of insufficiency, the economic challenges they face, the existing harmonization activities also seem highly unlikely to reach its current aim of

bringing societies together and creating a dialogue in between. Likewise, the field shows that materializing these gatherings are easier in the wealthier districts hosting refugees such as Beylikdüzü, which prompts the question of whose harmonization are we talking about.

Another obstacle in implementation arises in organizing these gathering activities. As we have seen in Chapter 3, the LFIP emphasizes that refugees are expected to adapt and harmonize themselves into the society through their participation in educational, socio-cultural, and economic activities. In addition, the responsibility of host society is left blank in the law and the only reference to the host society made was when the President discursively called for embracing Syrians as brothers and sisters. In response to the lack of emphasis on the host society at the formal level, this research similarly showed that the host society has a low level of interest in these gathering projects, which make the realization of harmonization move away from its aim of creating a dialogue. As a result, the structural factors of legal restrictions, economic hardship in the country, and the low level of host community's interest in dialogue disable the realization of what is aimed by harmonization. To put it differently, instead of tackling with these structural factors at the national and international level, we see authorities in every level of refugee governance including local, national, and international continue to put effort in socio-cultural activities for the realization of such ideals. This narrow definition of harmonization raises significant concerns over the question of integration at the local level.

On the other hand, in analyzing the second type of exchange – the informal and contextually defined exchange – in the governance structure at local level, this study examined how municipal and NGO officers carry out harmonization projects

under given constraints such as the ambiguity of the Municipal Law, the authoritarian tendency of the government which bring about the low level of trust to NGOs (Salamon, 2006), and again the limited nature of the temporary protection status. In generating refugee incorporation projects in Turkey, the emphasis has been drawn to strengthen the networks and coordination among actors (Erdogan, 2017a; Elicin, 2018; Genc, 2018). As tightened networks, and good coordination are attributed as the imminent cornerstones of a ‘good governance’ (Stoker, 1998), the rationale of these interactions among actors plays a significant role in generating a course of action in the order. In this respect, I investigated how resources including knowledge, expertise, power is exchanged at the local level acknowledging the interdependency of actors in the field of refugee governance. Thereby, I analyzed the informal properties that make the interactions possible, which highlighted how the reflexive self-organizations -self-governing networks- in local refugee governance operates (Jessop, 2005).

The nature of these interactions automatically determines the ‘definition of who is a player’ along with the ‘definition of the stakes’ (Peters & Pierre 2005, p. 81).

Accordingly, we saw that under the authoritarian power of the government with its centralist nature, the kind of self-governing networks regarding refugee incorporation at the local level is constructed upon political ties and networks, and thereby political affiliations become key in reducing the transaction costs in implementing the relevant projects. In a context where being not a pro-governmental organization or showing no inclination to the directives of the government’s political discourse can restrict the operational context of the NGOs. Within this scheme, on the side of NGOs, the stake presents itself via the struggle for legitimacy and visibility that they can gain through their interactions and collaborations with

municipalities. The close links among actors thanks to being in the same political circle enable them to easily mobilize resources such as bonding stakeholders for a course of the event through passing the bureaucratic obstacles smoothly such as receiving permission from different ministries to carry out an activity or registering a Syrian in times when no more registration is taken to the city of Istanbul. In this way, they also receive more attention from refugees and become legitimate in the eyes of the public as well while being able to put their work in practice.

To conclude, this study analyzed first the formal ground of exchange in the refugee governance at local level looking at the laws at the national level and international texts defining refugee incorporation processes. By discerning the reflection of the laws and ideas on the ground, it revealed the scope of harmonization projects through the practices of the local actors. It demonstrated the fact that the ideas and associated practices defined at the national and international level regarding harmonization and peaceful co-existence are not incompatible with the reality of the local ground where certain structural factors restrict the realization of the objectives defined on the paper.

Second, it showed that even if certain structural factors exist on the ground, the local practitioners muddle through in generating their projects on harmonization thanks to certain informal properties that enable the exchange among actors stressing the significance of political ties among actors in creating the bonds and finalizing a course of action on harmonization. Hence, restating the argument of previous studies (Can, 2007; Gocmen, 2014; Markerach & Sagnic, 2017; Danis & Nazli, 2018; Sunata & Tosun, 2018; Diner, 2018), I also argue that the interactions with state and non-state actors are politicized during the implementation of refugee incorporation projects.

However, structural factors are not the sole determinant of the implementation of harmonization projects on the ground. Agency of the officers also factors into the process considerably. As we have seen in the previous chapters, even if the bonds among these actors can be created pertaining to political ties, it does not necessarily mean that the tasks on refugee incorporation are translated into practice. As the fieldwork informs, the personal motivation for such an action plays a significant role remembering the restrictions to serve unregistered Syrians and the lack of diligence of social workers' working at Social Protection Desks operated by WALD but being paid by the municipalities compared to that of NGO officers. Driving from that this research also put forth the argument that it is also precisely this misfit among the levels in refugee incorporation ideals and institutional capacities on the ground that leads the faith of the projects to the good will of the practitioners.

Lastly, in terms of the policy implications of this research, this study underlined the fact that a standardized and systematized rules and regulations on service provision to refugees are needed along with a clear definition of the principle of harmonization and a guideline for its implementation. In order not to leave the issue of refugee incorporation to the good will of the local practitioners, Turkish state authorities should formally assign certain roles and responsibilities to the municipalities while also clearing the ambiguity in the Municipal Law. Furthermore, it should also initiate a protocol among ministries taking a role in refugee incorporation in order to enhance a better coordination among local practitioners. Last but not least, Turkey should grant a refugee status to Syrians living in Turkey with which they can have more fundamental human rights in a foreseeable future and more likely become self-reliant on their own terms. As this research showed, only in

this way, a meaningful dialogue between Syrians and host society can be created; thereby, both national and international actors' ideal of social cohesion can be realized and make more sense on the ground.

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW LISTS

Municipal Bodies

The officer in AKDEM (interviewed in two different times: July 24, 2018 and May 13, 2019)

The officer A in ZEYKOM (April 26, 2018)

The officer B in ZEYKOM (April 26, 2018)

The officer A in Sultanbeyli Strategic Development Department (April 19, 2018)

The officer B in Sultanbeyli Strategic Development Department (May 20, 2019)

The officer in Sultanbeyli Multeciler Dernegi (April 19, 2018)

NGOs

The officer A in IKGV (June 20, 2019)

The officer B in IKGV (June 28, 2019)

The officer A in IBC (August 20, 2019)

The officer B in IBC (August 20, 2019)

The officer in Save the Children (July 5, 2019)

The officer in UNHCR (June 19, 2019)

APPENDIX B
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

For Interviews with Municipal Authorities (Working at Strategic Development
Department and ZEYKOM)

1. Could you give information about your department?
(Biriminize dair biraz bilgi verebilir misiniz?)
2. What kind of work are you carrying out?
(Ne tür çalışmalar yürütmektesiniz?)
3. When did your department start giving services to refugees?
(Biriminizin mülteci topluluklara yönelik çalışmaları ne zaman başladı?)
4. What kind of aims do you have while carrying out these activities?
(Bu çalışmaları yürütürken ne gibi amaçlarınız bulunmaktadır?)
5. How do you define harmonization?
(Sosyal Uyumu nasıl tanımlıyorsunuz?)
6. What is your work on harmonization?
(Sosyal Uyuma yönelik yaptığınız çalışmalar nelerdir?)
7. How do you address the presence of Syrians in the country?
(Suriyelilerin ülkedeki varlığını nasıl ele alırsınız?)
8. What can you say about harmonization in the case of Syrian refugees?
(Suriyeli mülteciler özelinde, sosyal uyuma dair neler söyleyebilirsiniz?)
9. How do you evaluate your interaction with Syrian population in your territory?
(Bölgenizdeki Suriyeli halkıyla olan etkileşiminizi nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?)

10. What kind of ties do you see between your department and AKDEM (to be asked in the case of Zeytinburnu Municipality/ Mülteciler Derneği (to be asked in the case of Sultanbeyli Municipality)?

(AKDEM/Mülteciler Derneği ile biriminiz arasında nasıl bir bağ görmektesiniz?)

11. Are there any areas where you have experienced difficulties in implementing your projects while working in the field of migration and refugees?

(Göç ve mülteciler alanında çalışırken projelerinizi uygulamada zorluk çektiğiniz alanlar var mıdır?)

12. If yes, can you perform any activity to overcome these difficulties?

(Varsa bu zorlukları aşmaya yönelik herhangi bir çalışma gerçekleştirebiliyor musunuz?)

13. Are there any local or global civil society organizations that you cooperate on projects?

(Ortaklaşa projeler yürüttüğünüz yerel/uluslararası sivil toplum kuruluşları var mıdır?)

14. If yes, what do you think about the kind of effects that these collaborations might have had on your work?

(Varsa, sizce onlarla yaptığınız işbirliklerinin size nasıl bir etkisi olmuştur?)

15. In which areas do you have communications with other government agencies?

(Diğer devlet kurumlarıyla hangi noktalarda temaslarınız olmaktadır?)

16. Have you experienced any ease or difficulty while making these communications?

(Bu iletişimleri kurarken kolaylık ya da zorluk yaşadığınız durumlar oldu mu?)

For Interviews with AKDEM and Multeciler Dernegi

1. When was your institution established? (*Kurumunuz ne zaman kuruldu?*)
2. What kind of needs and factors were considered in the establishment of the institution?
(*Hangi faktörler göz önüne alınarak, nasıl bir ihtiyaca hizmet için kuruldu?*)
3. What kind of works does your institution carry out?
(*Kurumunuzun yürüttüğü çalışmalar nelerdir?*)
4. Who are the target audience of your institution?
(*Kurumunuzun hedef kitlesini kimler oluşturmaktadır?*)
5. How do you define harmonization? (*Sosyal Uyum nasıl tanımlıyorsunuz?*)
6. What is your work on harmonization?
(*Sosyal Uyuma yönelik yaptığınız çalışmalar nelerdir?*)
7. How do you address the presence of Syrians in the country?
(*Suriyelilerin ülkedeki varlığını nasıl ele alırsınız?*)
8. What can you say about harmonization in the case of Syrian refugees?
(*Suriyeli mülteciler özelinde, sosyal uyuma dair neler söyleyebilirsiniz?*)
9. How do you evaluate your interaction with Syrian population in your territory?
(*Bölgenizdeki Suriyeli halkıyla olan etkileşiminizi nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?*)
10. What kind of ties do you see between your municipality and your institution?
(*Belediye ve kurumunuz arasında nasıl bir bağ görmektesiniz?*)
11. Are there any areas where you have experienced difficulties in implementing your projects while working in the field of migration and refugees?
(*Göç ve mülteciler alanında çalışırken projelerinizi uygulamada zorluk çektiğiniz alanlar var mıdır?*)

12. If yes, can you perform any activity to overcome these difficulties?
(Varsa bu zorlukları aşmaya yönelik herhangi bir çalışma gerçekleştirebiliyor musunuz?)
13. What do you think about the kind of effects that your collaboration with municipality might have had on your work?
(Sizce belediyeyle birlikte çalışmanın size nasıl bir etkisi olmaktadır?)
14. Are there any local or global civil society organizations that you cooperate on projects?
(İşbirliği yaptığınız yerel ya da uluslararası sivil toplum kuruluşları nelerdir?)
15. How did you get in touch with these civil society organizations?
(Bu sivil toplum kuruluşları ile nasıl iletişime geçtiniz?)
16. What kind of a process carried out when a joint project is decided to be implemented? Who has what duties and responsibilities?
(Ortak bir proje uygulanmak istendiğinde nasıl bir süreç yürütülür? Kimler hangi görev ve sorumluluklara sahiptir?)
17. In which areas do you have communications with other government agencies?
(Diğer devlet kurumlarıyla hangi noktalarda temaslarınız olmaktadır?)
18. Have you experienced any ease or difficulty while making these communications?
(Bu iletişimleri kurarken kolaylık ya da zorluk yaşadığınız durumlar oldu mu?)

For Interviews with NGOs

1. How do you define harmonization? (*Sosyal Uyumu nasıl tanımlıyorsunuz?*)
2. What is your work on harmonization?
(*Sosyal Uyuma yönelik yaptığınız çalışmalar nelerdir?*)
3. How do you address the presence of Syrians in the country?
(*Suriyelilerin ülkedeki varlığını nasıl ele alırsınız?*)
4. What can you say about harmonization in the case of Syrian refugees?
(*Suriyeli mülteciler özelinde, sosyal uyuma dair neler söyleyebilirsiniz?*)
5. With which municipalities your institution has in interaction?
(*Kurumunuzun etkileşimde olduğu belediyeler nelerdir?*)
6. How do you get in touch with these municipalities?
(*Bu mercilerle nasıl iletişime geçiyorsunuz?*)
7. What kind of a process carried out when a joint project is decided to be implemented?
(*Ortak bir proje uygulanmak istendiğinde nasıl bir süreç yürütülür?*)
8. Who has what duties and responsibilities?
(*Kimler hangi görev ve sorumluluklara sahiptir?*)
9. How is the content of the project is determined?
(*Projenin içeriği nasıl belirleniyor?*)
10. Are there any areas where you have experienced difficulties in implementing your projects while working in the field of migration and refugees?
(*Göç ve mülteciler alanında çalışırken projelerinizi uygulamada zorluk çektiğiniz alanlar var mıdır?*)
11. If yes, can you perform any activity to overcome these difficulties?

(Varsa, bu zorlukları aşmaya yönelik herhangi bir çalışma gerçekleştirebiliyor musunuz?)

12. What do you think about the kind of effects that your collaboration with municipality might have had on your work?

(Sizce belediyelerle birlikte çalışmanın size nasıl bir etkisi olmaktadır?)

13. In which areas do you have communications with other government agencies?

(Diğer devlet kurumlarıyla hangi noktalarda temastığınız olmaktadır?)

14. Have you experienced any ease or difficulty while making these communications?

(Bu iletişimleri kurarken kolaylık ya da zorluk yaşadığınız durumlar oldu mu?)

APPENDIX C

EXCERPTS IN THE ORIGINAL TURKISH

1. “Sosyal uyum hedefimiz doğrultusunda, ‘toplumda var olmalarını sağlamak için’ Türkçe dil kursları ve meslek kursları düzenliyoruz. Hobi aktiviteleri ile destekliyoruz. Topluluklar arası etkileşimi ve iletişimi sağlamak için hem Türkiye halkı için hem de Suriyeliler için cezbedici etkinlikler düzenlemeye çalışıyoruz. Örneğin, kadınları kendi aralarında tanıştırap sonra da bir gün atmosferi yaratmalarını sağlıyoruz. Sonra onlar iletişimlerine devam ediyorlar. Bir Whatsapp grubu oluşturdular ve kendi başlarına buluşuyorlar. Birbirlerinin dillerini çat pat biliyor olsalar bile bize gerek kalmıyor artık... En nihayetinde bir araya geldiklerinde nefret söylemi olumlu anlamda değişiyor ve biz de bunu hedefliyoruz.”
2. “Bazı etkinliklerde bir araya gelmeleri gerektiğini düşünürsek ona göre etkinliği organize ederiz ama bu şekilde düşünmezsek sadece mültecilere hizmet ederiz. Miniaturk ve Panaroma 1453 Tarih Müzesi’ne geziler düzenliyoruz ve ev sahibi toplulukların şehirde daha evvelden var olmaları nedeniyle bu gezilere dahil olmalarına gerek yok. Okçuluk, kültür geceleri, yemek fuarı gibi etkinliklerde insanları bir araya getirme fikrine her zaman bağlı kalıyoruz.”
3. “...Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü tarafından düzenlenen Sosyal Uyum Toplantılarının son toplantısında tüm dinleyiciler Suriyeli idi. Mülteciler hak ve sorumluluklarını anlattılar. Kendilerini yasal sisteme nasıl uyduracakları konusunda kelimenin tam anlamıyla bir ders verdiler, ancak bakınca toplantının adı uyum.... Toplumumuzun da insanlığa dahil olması gerektiği için mülteciler için sosyal içermeye teriminin kullanılmasını da reddediyorum. Türkiye bir göç ülkesi. Türkiye’deki her vatandaşın aile geçmişine bakarsanız, herkesin bir göç hikayesi olduğu fikriyle

karşılaşacaksınız. Yani biz birlikte nasıl yaşayacağımızı öğrenmeliyiz. O halde nedendir bu direniş mültecilere karşı? Bu direnişi kırmalıyız.”

4. “Uyum kavramını tartışmak için, uluslararası düzeydeki siyasi ve hukuki konjonktüre bakmamız lazım. Bu noktada, Cenevre Sözleşmesi ve Türkiye’deki mülteci statüsü, bu kapsamı daraltıyor. Burada üçüncü ülke vurgusu yapılıyor yani Türkiye mültecilere ev sahibi olamaz ve buna göre geçici koruma statüsü oluşturuldu. Entegrasyon terimini kullanmamak için de sosyal uyum kelimesini tercih ettiler. Uyum ile amaçlanan şudur: Suriyeliler kanunları öğrenmeli, yasal ve resmi alana uymalıdır. Dolayısıyla bu çerçevede, toplumda yaygara çıkarmadan hayatlarını nasıl sürdürebilecekleri ile ilgili. Yine de biz bu tür projeler yapıyoruz ama ulaşabildiğimiz mülteci sayısı çok az.”
5. “Uyum, ev sahibi toplumdan ve mültecilerden çocukları ve gençleri bir araya getirmeyi ve empati kurmalarını amaçlayan tüm uygulamaları açıklıyor. Uyum birimimiz kapsamında eğitim, kültür ve spor faaliyetleri ile geziler gerçekleştiriyoruz. Örneğin, Çocuk ve Gençlik Kulübümüzde akran zorbalığı, kişisel gelişim, hedef belirleme üzerine çalışıyoruz. Bu çalışmalar da uyumla kesişiyor. Ama biz daha çok psikolojik desteğe odaklanarak çalışıyoruz. Düzenlediğimiz oyun atölyeleri ortak bir dil oluşturuyor ve çocukları ‘öteki’nin dilinden kurtararak oyunlar aracılığıyla birleştiriyor.”
6. “Bu çalışma Türkiye vatandaşı olmayanlardan ve mültecilerden oluşmakta. Türkiyeli çocuklar da olsaydı bu uyum olarak kabul edilirdi. Aslında bu böyle çok keskin değişmez bir şey değil... Bu çalışmalar da uyuma katkı sağlıyor ama biz donöre raporlama yaparken sorun çıkmasın diye aralarında ayırım yapıyoruz.”
7. “Uyum iki ayakta oluşuyor: mültecilerin devlet kurumları konusunda bilinçlendirilmesi ve kurumların mültecilere nasıl yanıt verecekleri konusunda

bilgilendirilmesi. Hizmet sağlayıcılar ve bireyler arasındaki diyalog ve bireyler arasındaki diyalog. İkincisine, aidiyetin güçlendirilmesini, istihdam ve yardıma erişim fırsatlarının eşitliği, hukuki danışmanlık yoluyla şehir yaşamında tanınmalarını ve kent konseylerine katılımlarını dahil ediyoruz. Topluluklar arasında yapılandırılmış bir diyaloga ve on yargıları kıran etkileşim ve iletişime sahip olmak önemlidir. Örneğin, İstanbul'un 6 ilçesindeki yemek atölyeleri, toplumlar arası iletişimi sağlamak için çok önemli. Ayrıca bu bağlamda, mülteci fikrinin sadece ihtiyacı olan kişiler olarak yayılmasını engellemek için mültecilerin olumlu imajını zenginleştirecek çalışmalara yer vermeliyiz. Suriyeli Kadınlar Korusu, IKSIV'de sahne aldı. Sonra... Suriyeli girişimcilerin hikayelerini konu alan videoların yapımını ve yayılmasını sağlamak, Bienal'de mültecilerin yaptığı sanat eserlerine yer vermek... Önyargıları kırabilecek örneklerden sadece birkaçı.”

8. “Rehber öğretmen sayısı çok az. Bazı öğretmenler çocukları umursamayabiliyor ve hatta mülteci çocuklar şiddete maruz kalabiliyor. Öğrenciler bu ilgisizlikten dolayı okulu bırakıyorlar. Mülteci gençler arasında okullaşma oranı %60, bu artmalı. Yine de okula giden bu %60'ın içindeki mülteci çocukların devamsızlık oranını sorgulamalıyız. İlgisizlik yüzünden ve çocuk işçiliği yüzünden öğrenciler okulu bırakıyor.”
9. “Kültürel etkinliklerimizde ortak bir tarihin geçtiği yerlere geziler düzenliyoruz ve ziyaretin hemen ardından katılımcıların ortak sorunlara çözüm bulmalarına yönelik yapılandırılmış bir diyalog atölye çalışması yapıyoruz. Bu ortak problemler ekonomiye dayalı değil, daha çok dil problemleri gibi iletişim problemleriyle ilgili, çünkü biliyorsunuz ekonomik boyutla uğraşmak zor. Ona değinemeyiz. Ayrıca ortak tarih sebebiyle toplumlar arasında bir bağ var ama bir araya gelmeden uyum mümkün olmuyor. Bu nedenle biz birbirine dokunmalarını sağlamaya çalışıyoruz.

Ve ekonomik desteğin olmadığı durumlarda bunların makro düzeyde yeterli olmadığını biliyoruz.”

10. “Onları dinlemek için ayda bir toplanan Mülteci Konseyi oluşturduk. Ancak mülteciler demokrasiye pek açık değiller. Konseyde ekonomik sorunları hakkında konuşuyorlar. Bu tutumun değişmeyeceğini anladığımızda konsey yapısını değiştirdik. Şimdi konsey lisans ve yüksek lisans düzeyinde okuyan mülteci öğrencilerden oluşuyor. Bir süre sonra onları Kent Konseyine davet etmek istiyoruz. Yetişkinlerle çalışmak çok sorunlu oluyor. Uyum birimimiz bunun üzerinde çalışıyor ama uyum sağlamak ve adapte olmak zorundalar. Farkındalığı artırmak için de ‘Fikir Kulüplerimiz’ var ama talep az.”
11. “Uyum faaliyetlerimize gerek mülteci gerek yerel topluluklardan çok sayıda katılımcı çekemiyoruz. Özellikle yetişkin erkek mültecilere ulaşma konusunda sorun yaşıyoruz. Bu durum aslında basitçe ekonomik nedenlere dayanmaktadır. Çalışıyorlar... ve hafta sonları bile saatlerce çalışmak zorundalar. Bundan dolayı etkinliklerimize gelemiyorlar. Çözüm olarak düşündüğümüz şey, yerel halktan ve mültecilerden esnaf ve çocuklarını bulmak ve onlarla kahvaltıda buluşmak.”
12. “Çok kötü koşullarda çalışan çocukları önemsemek adına yaratıcı çalışmalar yapıyoruz. Personellerimiz, çalışan mülteci çocukların merkezdeki kitap ve oyuncaklarını keyfini çıkarması için pazar günleri merkezi açıyor. Çünkü pazar, çocukların genellikle çalışmadığı tek gün. Bu yüzden bu uygulamaya Açık Pazar diyoruz.”
13. “Bağışçılar tarafından kitlerin Suriyeli çocuklara okulda verileceği söylendi. Kitleri onlara dağıttık ama Türkiye’den de kitlere ihtiyacı olan yoksul çocuklar vardı. O an gerçekten çok üzüldüm. Bu durum aslında bir tür ayrımcılık tohumu ekmiş oluyor.”

14. “Bu uyum konusunda toplumda çok iyi ilerlediğimizi söylerken, bu tutuklama ve yerinden etme emirleri çalışmalarımıza bomba gibi düştü ve bu da bizi aslında en başa döndürdü. Tüm bu muğlak devlet politikaları bizi, işimizi etkiliyor. Bu yanlış politikalar düzeltilmedikçe yaptığımız her şey boşa gidecek.”
15. “İki yıl önce herhangi bir işbirliği yapmak için IKGV, AKDEM’in kapısını çaldı. Ancak AKDEM bu tür çalışmalara yanaşmadı. Geçtiğimiz ay merkezde yapılacak uyum çalışmaları konusunda destek almak için bize ulaştı. Paralarının olduğunu ve bir projelerinin olduğunu söylediler ama nasıl yapacaklarını bilmedikleri için bizden yardım almak istediklerini söylediler. Hangi alanlarda çalışmak istediklerini sorduk. Akran zorbalığı konusunu belirlediler ve proje sırasında hem okula giden hem de okula gitmeyen çocuklar üzerine çalıştık.”
16. “Gaziosmanpaşa’da WALD’tan önce mültecilere hizmet sunan hiçbir STK yoktu çünkü belediye bu tür etkileşimlere kapalı kalmak istiyor. Gaziosmanpaşa Belediyesi, WALD’ın kendi ilçesinde faaliyet göstermesine, WALD’ın bu alandaki uzmanlığından dolayı değil belediye ile aynı siyasi vizyonu paylaşmasından dolayı izin verdi.”
17. “Meritokrasi yok ve particilik sahnede. Biz bu problemlerle karşılaşıyoruz çünkü devlet kurumlarında kalifiye personele ulaşamıyoruz. Örneğin cinsel sağlık üzerine seminer düzenlemek istediğimizde biri çıkıyor ve cinsel sağlık demeyelim kadın sağlığı diyelim diyor ya da oraya vajina çizmeyelim diyor.”
18. “Uyuma katkıda bulunma potansiyeline sahip belediye görevlilerini eğitmek için bir modül hazırladık. Eğitim, mültecileri Türkiye’deki yasal kurumlar ve düzen hakkında uyum kapsamında bilgilendirmektir. Ama bu tür çalışmalar başlatacak bir belediye bulmak kolay olmadı. Sonra, Maltepe Belediyesi’ndeki aile iletişimlerinin sayesinde biz bu çalışmayı yapmayı başardık.”

19. "... Mültecilerin kayıt ve psikososyal sorunları için yardım almak adına Sosyal Hizmetler ve Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu personeli de onları arıyor. Ama sonunda bunlar sistematik değil ve yalnızca personeller bu konuda yeterince idealistse bu çalışmalar gerçekleşebiliyor."
20. "Biz sivil toplum kuruluşları olarak mültecilere ulaşmak ve sosyal uyumu sağlayarak onlara hizmet etmek istiyoruz. Belli bir sivil toplum kuruluşu kendi başına bu çalışmaları yapmak istediğinde sosyal kabul çok zor oluyor. Ama devlet kurumları ile protokol imzalamak bu süreci kolaylaştırıyor. Buna ek olarak, daha fazla insana erişim sağlayarak operasyonel bağlamımızı genişletiyor. Belediye ile işbirliği yapılarak edinilen görünürlülük sayesinde bölgenin herhangi bir yerinde olan insan da bize ulaşabilir."
21. "Biz sivil toplum kuruluşları olarak mültecilere ulaşmak ve sosyal uyumu sağlayarak onlara hizmet etmek istiyoruz. Belli bir sivil toplum kuruluşu kendi başına bu çalışmaları yapmak istediğinde sosyal kabul çok zor oluyor. Ama devlet kurumları ile protokol imzalamak bu süreci kolaylaştırıyor. Buna ek olarak, daha fazla insana erişim sağlayarak operasyonel bağlamımızı genişletiyor. Belediye ile işbirliği yapılarak edinilen görünürlülük sayesinde bölgenin herhangi bir yerinde olan insan da bize ulaşabilir."
22. "Komplike kayıt vakaları için İl Göç İdaresi Müdürlüğünü veya bir hastaneyi ararsanız, büyük olasılıkla zorlukla karşılaşacaksınız. Ancak belediyenin adını kullanmak bize bir savunuculuk alanı açıyor. Mesela sınır dışı etme süreçlerinin önüne geçmek için bu kurumlara avukatlarımızla birlikte gittiğimizde, savunuculuk yapma fırsatı çıkıyor. Mesela İlçe Emniyet Müdürlüğü ile mülteci çocukların kimlik kartları olmasa da okula gitmelerine izin verilmesi için görüştük. Ayrıca okul yetkililerinin bu öğrencileri keyfi olarak reddedebileceklerini biliyoruz."

23. “Örneğin kocası tarafından dövülmüş kayıtsız bir Suriyeli kadının birçok sorunu olabilir. Mesela bu kadının psikososyal desteğe ve koruma desteğine ihtiyacı var. Kimlik kaydı önceliklendirilirken diğer ihtiyaçlar da Göç Birimi tarafından bu arada sağlanıyor.”

REFERENCES

- AB, göçmenler için verilen mali yardımın izini sürememekten şikayetçi. (2018, November 13). *Euronews*. Retrieved from: <https://tr.euronews.com/2018/11/13/ab-turkiye-ye-suriyeli-gocmenler-icin-verilen-mali-yardimin-izini-surememekten-sikayetci>
- AK Parti. (2019, December 17). President Recep Tayyip Erdogan speaks at the first Global Refugee Forum [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GqocZvw9f3c>. Prior to the Global Refugee Forum in 2019
- Agiers, M. (2011). *Managing the undesirables: Refugee camps and humanitarian government*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Alemdar, Z. (2008). *Turkish civil society and the European Union: Domestic politics through international organizations*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.
- Alexander, M. (2007). *Cities and labour immigration: Comparing policy responses in Amsterdam*. Paris, Rome and Tel Aviv: Ashgate Publishing.
- Aras, B., & Yasun, S. (2016). *The educational opportunities and challenges of Syrian refugee students in Turkey: Temporary education centers and beyond*. Istanbul: Istanbul Policy Center.
- Ataç, İ., Heck, G., Hess S., Kaşlı, Z., Ratfisch, P., Soykan C., & Yılmaz, B. (2007). Contested b/orders: Turkey's changing migration regime: An introduction. *Movements*, 3(2), 9-21.
- Baban, F., Ilcan S., & Rygiel K. (2016). Syrian refugees in Turkey: Pathways to precarity, differential inclusion, and negotiated citizenship rights. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 43(1), 41-57.
- Balamir G. & Uçar A.Y. (2018). Local responses to the Syrian refugee movement: The case of district municipalities of Istanbul, Turkey. *Movements*, 4(2), 103-126.
- Betts, A. (2010). Survival migration: A new protection framework. *Global Governance*, 16(3), 261-282.
- Betts A. (2018). The global compact on refugees: Towards a theory of change? *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 3(4), 623-626.
- Çağlar, A. (2015). *World migration report 2015: Urban migration trends: Challenges and opportunities in Europe*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.
- Can, Y.I. (2007). Türkiye'de sivil toplumu yeniden düşünmek: Neo-liberal Dönüşümler ve Gönüllülük. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 108, 88-128.

- Carpenter, R. C. (2010). Governing the global agenda: Gatekeepers' and 'issue adoption' in transnational advocacy networks. In D.D. Avant, M. Finnemore & S. K. Sell (Eds.), *Who governs the globe?* (pp. 202-237). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castles, Stephen. (2007). The migration-asylum nexus as regional approaches. In S. Kneebone, and F. Rawlings-Sanaei, (Eds.), *New regionalism and asylum-seekers: New challenges ahead* (pp. 25-43). New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Cumhurbaşkanı Erdoğan: 'Suriyeliler gitsin' diyorlar eyvallah edemeyiz. (2019, August 11). *Haberler*. Retrieved from: <https://www.haberler.com/cumhurbaskani-erdogan-mevlid-i-nebi-haftasi-12597926-haberi/>
- Danıs, D. (2009). Integration in limbo: Iraqi, Afghan, Maghrebi and Iranian migrants in Istanbul. In A. İçduygu & K. Kirişçi (Eds.), *Land of diverse migrations: Challenges of emigration and immigration in Turkey* (pp. 441-636). Istanbul: Bilgi University Press.
- Danıs, D. & Nazlı, D. (2018). A faithful alliance between the civil society and the state: Actors and mechanisms of accommodating Syrian refugees in Istanbul. *International Migration*, 57(2), 143–157.
- Davutoğlu, Fas Dışişleri Bakanı Osmani ile görüştü. (2012, March 19). *Haberler*. Retrieved from: <http://www.haberler.com/davutoglu-fas-disisleri-bakani-osmani-ile-gorustu-3462944-haberi/>
- Diner, C. (2018). Gender politics and GONGOs in Turkey. *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, 16(4), 101-108.
- Elicin, Y. (2018). Refugee crisis and local responses: An assessment of local capacities to deal with migration influxes in Istanbul. *Hrvatska i komparativna javna uprava: casopis za teoriju i praksu javne uprave*, 18(1), 73–99.
- The Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN): Providing cash to the most vulnerable refugees in Turkey. Retrieved from: <http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/turkey-no-longer-able-to-face-new-refugee-flow-erdogan-141349>
- Erder, S., & İncioğlu N. (2013). *Türkiye'de yerel politikanın yükselişi: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi örneği, 1984-2004*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Erdogan, M. (2017a). *Urban refugees from "detachment" to "harmonization": Syrian refugees and process of management of municipalities: The case of Istanbul*. İstanbul: Marmara Belediyeler Birliği Kültür Yayınları.
- Erdogan, M. (2017b). Thinking outside the camp: Syrian refugees in Istanbul. Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from:

<https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/thinking-outside-camp-syrian-refugees-istanbul>

- Ferris E., Dinçer, O.B., Federici V., Karaca S., Kirişçi K. & Çarmıklı E. Ö. (2013). *Turkey and Syrian refugees: The limits of hospitality*. Brookings Institute. Retrieved from: https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Turkey-and-Syrian-Refugees_The-Limits-of-Hospitality-2014.pdf
- Gall, C. (2019, September 10). Turkey's radical plan: Send a million refugees back to Syria. *New York Times*. Retrieved from: https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/10/world/middleeast/turkey-syria-refugees-erdogan.html?utm_source=NewsletterList2018&utm_campaign=b4d4eb2082-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2019_09_14_04_50&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_8d337d2478-b4d4eb2082-226645733
- Genç D. (2018). Responding to irregular migration: High potential of local governments in Turkey. *International Migration*, 56(3), 73-87.
- Glick-Schiller, N., & Caglar, A. (2009). Towards a comparative theory of locality in migration studies: Migrant incorporation and city scale. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35(2), 177–202.
- Glick-Schiller, N., Basch, N., & Szanton Blanc, C. (1995). From immigrant to transmigrant: Theorizing transnational migration. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 68(1), 48–63.
- Government directs Syrian refugee children to Turkish schools. (2017, September 03) *Hurriyet Daily News*. Retrieved from <https://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/govt-directs-syrian-refugee-children-to-turkish-schools--117491>
- Göçmen, I. (2014). Religion, politics and social assistance in Turkey: The rise of religiously motivated associations. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 24(1), 92-103.
- Hathaway, James C. (1990). A reconsideration of the underlying premise of refugee law. *Harvard International Law Journal*, 31(1), 129-183.
- Healey, P. (2006). Transforming governance: Challenges of institutional adaptation and a new politics of space. *European Planning Studies*. 14(3). 299-320.
- Hoekstra, M. (2017). Governing difference in the city: Urban imaginaries and the policy practice of migrant incorporation. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 6(3), 362-380.
- Hoffman S., & Samuk, S. (2016). *Turkish immigration politics and the Syrian refugee crisis*. Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik German Institute for International and Security Affairs.

- Hohn, U., & Neuer, B. (2006). New urban governance: Institutional change and consequences for urban development. *European Planning Studies*, 14(3), 291–298.
- ‘İBB’den Okcular Vakfına 1.2 milyonluk Yardimin Belgesi Ortaya Cikti.’ (n.d.).Retrived from <https://www.sozcu.com.tr/2019/gundem/ibbden-okcular-vakfina-1-2-milyonluk-yardimin-belgesi-ortaya-cikti-5339627/>
- Icduygu, A., & Millet, E. (2016). Syrian refugees in Turkey: Insecure lives in an environment of pseudo-integration. Retrieved from: http://www.iai.it/sites/default/files/gte_wp_13.pdf
- Ineli-Ciger, M. (2014). Implications of the new law on foreigners and international protection and regulation No. 29153 on temporary protection for Syrians seeking protection in Turkey. *Oxford Monitor of Forced Migration*, 4(2), 28-36.
- Istanbul’a daha fazla Suriyeli mülteci kaydı alınmayacak. (2018, February, 06). *Yesil Gazete*. Retrieved from: <https://www.haberler.com/cumhurbaskani-erdogan-mevlid-i-nebi-haftasi-12597926-haberi/>
- Jacobsen, K. (2006). Refugees and asylum-seekers in urban areas: A livelihood perspective. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 19(3), 273-286.
- Jessop, B. (1995). The regulation approach, governance and post-fordism: Alternative perspectives on economic and political change. *Economy and Society*, 24(3), 307-333.
- Jorgensen, M.B. (2012) The diverging logics of integration policy making at national and city level. *International Migration Review*, 46(1), 244–278.
- Kastoryano, R. (2002). *Negotiating identities: States and immigrants in France and Germany*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kavak, S. (2016). Syrian Refugees in Seasonal Agricultural Work: A case of adverse incorporation in Turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 54, 33-53.
- Keyman, E. F., & İcduygu, A. (2003). Globalization, civil society and citizenship in Turkey: Actors, boundaries and discourses. *Citizenship Studies*, 7(2), 219-234.
- Koopman, J. (1999). Social-political governance: Overview, reflections and design. *Public management: An International Journal of Research and Theory*, 1(1), 67-92.
- Koopmans, R., & Statham, P. (1999). Challenging the liberal nation-state? Postnationalism, multiculturalism, and the collective claims-making of migrants and ethnic minorities in Britain and Germany. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(3), 652–696.
- Koyuncu, H. (2019). Süleyman Soylu: İstanbul Suriyeli kaydına kapalıdır. *Euronews*. Retrieved from: <https://tr.euronews.com/2019/07/06/suleyman->

soylu-istanbul-suriyeli-kaydina-kapalidir?fbclid=IwAR26SO2bgMvWL8lUmU6NatQ3QbK7vQxTekKZMv mx36pJXWNmF4Mdf9TTtNk

- Kutlu, Z. (2015). *From the ante-chamber to the living room: A brief assessment on NGO's doing work for Syrian refugees*. Istanbul: Anadolu Kultur and Acik Toplum Vakfi (Open Society Foundation).
- Kyambi, S. (2012). *Establishing migrants' access to benefits and local authority services in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Convention of Scottish Local Authorities.
- Lahav G., & Guiraudon V. (2006) Actors and venues in immigration control: Closing the gap between political demands and policy outcomes. *West European Politics*, 29(2), 201–223.
- Law on Foreigners and International Protection No. 6458 (2013). Retrieved from: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/5167fbb20.html>
- Leghtas, I. (2019, September 19). *Insecure future: Deportations and lack of legal work for refugees in Turkey*. Retrieved from: <https://www.refugeesinternational.org/reports/2019/9/18/insecure-future-deportations-and-lack-of-legal-work-for-refugees-in-turkey>
- McCollum D., & Packwood, H. (2017). Rescaling migration studies: Migration policy-making and implementation at the local government level. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 133(3-4), 155-171.
- Mecliste mülteci sempozyumu: 2019'u uyum yılı ilan ettik'. (2018, December 13). *Hurriyet*. Retrieved from: <https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/mecliste-multeci-sempozyumu-2019u-uyum-yili-ilan-ettik-41050289>
- Memişoğlu, F., Ali, A., & Betts, A. (2017) *Local politics of Syrian refugee crisis report*. Oxford: University of Oxford Refugee Studies Centre. Retrieved from: https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Local-politics-of-syrian-refugee-crisis_report-web.pdf
- Ombudsman Institution of the Republic of Turkey. (2018). *Special report on Syrians in Turkey*. Ankara: The Grand National Assembly of Turkey. Retrieved from: https://www.ombudsman.gov.tr/syrians/special_report.pdf
- Öner, S. (2012). Europeanisation of civil society in Turkey during the accession process to the European Union. In Nas, Ç. & Özer Y. (Eds.), *Turkey and the European Union: Processes of Europeanisation* (pp. 99-118). Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.
- Özden, S. (2013). *Syrian refugees in Turkey: MPC Research Reports 2013/05*. Robert Schuman Center for Advanced Studies, San Domenico di Fiesole (FI): European University Institute. Retrieved from: www.migrationpolicycentre.eu/docs/MPC-RR-2013-05.pdf

- Peters, B. G., & Pierre, J. (2005). Multi-level governance and democracy: A Faustian bargain? In I. Bache & M. Flinders (Eds.), *Multi-level governance* (pp. 75-93). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Piattoni S. (2010). *The theory of multi-level governance: Conceptual, empirical, and normative challenges*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pierre, J. (2000). *Debating governance: Authority, steering and democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poppelaars, C., & Scholten, P. (2008). Two worlds apart: The divergence of national and local immigrant integration policies in the Netherlands. *Administration & Society*, 40(4), 335–357.
- Protecting refugees. (n.d.). *Human Rights Watch*. Retrieved February 24, 2020, from <https://www.hrw.org/reports/2000/turkey2/Turk009-10.htm>
- Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) launched in Ankara.’ (n.d.). *Birlesmis Milletler Dergi*. Retrieved June 09, 2020, from <http://www.bmdergi.org/en/the-regional-refugee-and-resilience-plan-3rp-launched-in-ankara/>
- Ray, B. (2003). The role of cities in immigrant integration. Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from: www.migrationinformation.org/feature/display.cfm?ID167
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies*, 44(4), 652-667.
- Rosenau, J. N. (2005). Strong Demand, Huge Supply: Governance in an Emerging Epoch. In I. Bache & M. Flinders (Eds.), *Multi-level Governance* (pp. 31-49). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rutter, J. (2013). *Back to basics, towards a successful and cost-effective integration policy*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Sagnic, Ş. G., & Mackreatch, H. (2017). *Civil society and Syrian refugees in Turkey*. Istanbul: Citizens’ Assembly-Turkey. Retrieved from: <http://www.hyd.org.tr/attachments/article/214/civil-society-and-syrian-refugees-in-turkey.pdf>
- Salamon, L. M. (2006). Government-nonprofit relations from an international Perspective. In E. Boris & C. E. Steuerle (Eds.), *Nonprofits & government: Collaboration & conflict*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.
- Schiller, M. (2017). The implementation trap: The local level and diversity policies. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 83(2). 267-282.
- Scholten P. (2013). Agenda dynamics and the multi-level governance of intractable policy controversies: The case of migrant integration policies in the Netherlands. *Policy Sciences*, 46(3), 217-236.

- Scholten, P., Baggerman, F., Dellouche, L., Kampen, V., Wolf J., & Ypma R. (2016). *Policy innovation in refugee integration: A comparative analysis of innovative policy strategies toward refugee integration in Europe*. Rotterdam: Erasmus University Rotterdam Press. Retrieved from: hdl.handle.net/1765/122531
- Scholten, P., & Penninx, R. (2016). The multilevel governance of migration and integration. In B. Garces-Mascarenas & R. Penninx (Eds.), *Integration processes and policies in Europe: Contexts, levels and actors* (pp. 91-108). Heidelberg and New York: Springer.
- Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory five propositions. *International Social Science Journal*, 50(155), 17–28.
- Sunata, U., & Tosun, S. (2018). Assessing the civil society's role in refugee integration in Turkey: NGO-R as a new typology. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 32(4). 683-703.
- Turkey no longer able to face new refugee flow: Erdoğan. (2019, February 20). *Hurriyet Daily News*. Retrieved from: <http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/turkey-no-longer-able-to-face-new-refugee-flow-erdogan-141349>
- Türkiye Suriyeli sığınmacıları kayıt altına almayı durdurdu. (2018, July 16). *Human Rights Watch*. Retrieved from: <https://www.hrw.org/tr/news/2018/07/16/320295>
- Turkish Red Crescent Migration Service Directorate. (2020). *Syria Crisis Humanitarian Relief Operation*. Ankara: Turk Kizilayi Genel Mudurlugu. Retrieved from <https://www.kizilay.org.tr/Upload/Dokuman/Dosya/april-2020-syria-crisis-humanitarian-relief-operation-29-05-2020-47231296.pdf>
- Uitermark, J., Rossi, U., & Van Houtum, H. (2005). Reinventing multiculturalism: Urban citizenship and the negotiation of ethnic diversity in Amsterdam. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(3), 622–640.
- United Nations Development Fund (UNDP). (2018). *Support to public institutions in the Turkey refugee and resilience response plan (3RP)*. Retrieved from: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/57ceb74a4.html>
- United Nations General Assembly. (2016). *New York declaration for refugees and migrants: resolution / adopted by the General Assembly*. Retrieved from: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/57ceb74a4.html>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2002). *Global consultations on international protection/third track: local integration*. Retrieved from: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3d6266e17.html>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2003). *Framework for durable solutions for refugees and persons of concern*. Retrieved from: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/4124b6a04.html>

- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2005a). *Conclusion on local integration*. Retrieved from: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/4357a91b2.html>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2005b). *Handbook for planning and implementing development assistance for refugees (DAR) programmes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/428076704.html>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2009). *UNHCR policy on refugee protection and solutions in urban areas*. Retrieved from: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/4ab8e7f72.html>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2014a). *Regional refugee and resilience plan 2015-2016 in response to the Syria crisis — Regional Strategic Overview*. Retrieved from: <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/3RP-Report-Overview.pdf>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2014b). *State parties to the 1951 Convention relating to the status of refugees and/or its 1967 Protocol*. Retrieved from: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/51d3dad24.html>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2015, July 01). *Mediterranean crisis 2015 at six months: refugee and migrant numbers highest on record*. Retrieved from: <https://www.unhcr.org/news/press/2015/7/5592b9b36/mediterranean-crisis-2015-six-months-refugee-migrant-numbers-highest-record.html>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2018). *Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees part II: Global Compact on Refugees*. Geneva: UNHCR. Retrieved from: <https://www.unhcr.org/5c658aed4.pdf>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2019). *Regional refugee and resilience plan 2019-2020 in response to the Syria crisis — Country Plan Turkey*. Retrieved from: <https://reliefweb.int/report/turkey/turkey-3rp-country-chapter-20192020-entr>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2020). *Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan in Response to Syria Crisis - Country Chapter Turkey*. Retrieved from: <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/74179>
- Winkler, I. T., & Satterthwaite, M. L. (2017). Leaving no one behind? Persistent inequalities in the SDGs. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 21(8), 1073–1097.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2014, September 23). *Yabancılarla yönelik eğitim-öğretim hizmetleri*. Retrieved from <http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/dosyalar/1715.pdf>

Yıldız, A., & Uzgören, E. (2016). Limits to temporary protection status: Non-camp Syrian refugees in İzmir, Turkey. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 16(2), 195-211.

Zapata-Barrero R., Caponio T., & Scholten P. (2017). Theorizing the ‘local turn’ in a multi-level governance framework of analysis: A case study in immigrant policies. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 83(2), 241-246.