Contradictions in Western Immigration Regimes Securitization, Humanity and Power

Joseph, Jo*

Institute of Migration Studies, University of Granada, Spain

*Corresponding Author
Joseph Jo, Institute of Migration Studies, University of Granada, Spain.

Abstract
In Western countries, migrants are often portrayed as a threat to national security, and boat migration is no different. In response, Western countries and many of their member states have adopted extensive securitization policies aimed at controlling and preventing unwanted migration. Among these, externalization has emerged not only as a policy mechanism but also as a diplomatic tool for states to utilize migration to pursue national interests. This paper explores and examines three key paradoxes: the simultaneous portrayal of immigrants as threats and victims, the contradictory logic of search and rescue operations, the changing power dynamics that create migration diplomacy. From this perspective, externalization policies not only concern the rights of immigrants, the paper also reveals how inter-state relations are being reshaped in ways that reflect deep asymmetries in global migration governance.

Keywords: Western Countries, Refugees, Immigrants, Policies, Externalization Etc.

1. Introduction

Many refugees and asylum seekers have made dangerous journeys at sea, risking their lives to reach a safe destination. There has been a lot of media attention about these boats and their fate in recent years, but not much scholarly attention has been paid to these voyages from a legal or international relations perspective. Although many academics have written about the externalization of unwanted migration, legal, political, and international relations perspectives have been this article attempts to contribute to this scholarly debate through a distinctive and integrative approach. Building on the foundational work of Valeria Bello (2017), in this article advances the study of contradictions in migration governance, highlighting how securitization strategies often produce paradoxical outcomes, Bello also identified how insecurity is exacerbated rather than alleviated. Their analysis presents a critical framework for understanding the contradictions embedded in contemporary migration control. They identify four contradictions in current migration management and argue that securitization strategies often undermine real security rather than strengthen it. Using the concept of human security, Bello argues for a new migration model focused on regularization and interculturality, while emphasizing

the importance of addressing the perceptions and structural causes of migration. While Bello focused on the general interaction between migration, national security, and human security, this article develops and extends his approach by applying a dialectical lens specifically to the governance of boat migration. In doing so, it examines how externalization practices create new tensions, shape power relations, and allow for the sharing of responsibility between states.

2. Conflicts Related Migration Governance

This study seeks to advance the academic debate by identifying and examining three distinct conflicts related to migration governance, with a particular focus on externalization practices. The first contradiction highlights the dual portrayal of immigrants as a threat to national security and as victims in need of protection. The latter argues that the formulation of 'search and rescue operations' is misleading because it fails to reflect actual practices on the ground. The third addresses the asymmetric power dynamics inherent in migration diplomacy. There are multiple paradoxes associated with boat journeys undertaken by refugees and asylum seekers. Some scholars have argued that these journeys are both

life-threatening and life-saving [1,2]. As dangerous as they are, they are often seen as the only viable solution for those who board these boats, this represents a desperate path to salvation. Based on this perspective, this paper advances the study of boat migration by examining three specific paradoxes. The first concerns the way politicians and the media portray migrants - often as threats, but also as victims when they die at sea. The second addresses the dual nature of search and rescue operations, which, while potentially life-saving, can also result in forced returns. It pushes individuals to new risks and raises questions about responsibility and intent. The third and final paradox explored in this article relates to the changing power dynamics emerging from migration diplomacy, there, migrants are used as bargaining chips with countries of origin or transit states, to influence negotiations with countries of destination. This article attempts to answer the following research question such as the paradoxes in the governance of boat migration especially the formation of migrants, how are power relations and the distribution of responsibility between states shaped in relation to search and rescue operations and migration diplomacy? By addressing this question, also this study offers a new contribution to the existing academic literature in two main ways. Thus, it draws on the literature on boat migration from legal studies, international relations, and political science. It advances an interdisciplinary framework that analyzes boat migration not only as a humanitarian or security issue, but also as a site of strategic negotiations and symbolic meaning. This article adopts a qualitative and interpretive methodology grounded in critical migration studies and international relations theory. Drawing on existing scholarly literature, policy documents, and political discourse, this analysis aims to conceptualize and interrogate the paradoxes in the governance of irregular boat migration. The paradoxes are identified through a critical reading of securitization practices, humanitarian narratives, and migration diplomatic frameworks in the European Union context. Integrating theoretical contributions from migration governance, security studies, and political sociology, the paper explores the implications of externalization policies for this study develops an interdisciplinary analytical framework aimed at improving the understanding of tensions and conflicts.

3. The Western Countries Externalization of Migration in the Modern Era

Securitizing migration, powerful actors such as governments recognize migration as a security threat and legitimize the use of extraordinary measures to combat it. After political discussions linking immigration to national security and measures to control unwanted immigration, many sections of society now see immigration as a national security issue seen as a threat to welfare systems, the economy, and cultural identity. The securitization debates that have followed these arguments have become more successful over time, this increased the representation of far-right political parties and allowed the introduction of very restrictive policies on immigration within the Western countries. A practice that has now become common in the surgical union is externalization. Developing countries in the Global North are closing their borders to their territory to prevent the influx of migrants. Externalization refers to the attempt to extend control. This can be done through the establishment of border control measures or through bilateral agreements with transit and or origin countries in the Global South. These states are trying to implement migration policies by establishing or transferring responsibility for international protection, which is implemented in accordance with international standards. Externalization is distinct from legal measures, for example the proper application of the concept of 'safe third country' or responsibility sharing mechanisms. Therefore, the externalization of migration involves the governance and design of policies in the field of migration between two or more countries. Often, these countries share an unequal relationship in their ability to cope with migration. Measures can include unilateral, bilateral and multilateral measures by public and private actors [3]. In the words of Human Rights Watch, the externalization of migration is the process by which migrants, including asylum seekers, are subjected to arbitrary detention in the legal jurisdictions or territories of destination countries or territories. Foreign state measures to prevent entry or to render them legally inadmissible without considering the merits of their protection claims on an individual basis [4]. Externalization practices have been developed in three distinct periods [5]. The first occurred in the 1970s through the "liberal paradox", at that time, the human rights of immigrants were more important than the interests of the sovereign state. In order to prevent immigrants from reaching their territories, the second period was marked by efforts by the European Union and its member states to externalize migration policies. These policies were intended to "overcome the liberal paradox." In this context, the European Union first acknowledged at the Seville European Council in 2002 that external relations instruments were needed to deal with illegal immigration. The third and final period is the period when EU countries engaged more directly with third states in migration and border diplomacy. At a recent international meeting, approximately 20 government leaders from Africa, the Middle East, and Europe gathered to discuss the latter's externalization proposals. The most emphasis has been placed on ways to manage and control irregular migration to European countries which shows the main concerns when designing externalization measures. This is the second period in which measures such as visa policies or withdrawal measures appeared. In the 1990s, the European Union established visa conditions and Schengen requirements to control immigration. However, these also generate the same illegal practices they seek to prevent [6]. During the 2015 migration crisis, the Western countries attempted to preserve humanitarian pathways for migrants seeking protection These proposals have largely disappeared or been linked to safer approaches. That is the reality of most immigration policies today, the 2015 migration crisis triggered a series of measures related to border closures and the distribution of migratory pressure, which mainly affected countries in Southern Europe among different member states. Over time, cooperation with countries of origin and transit countries has become the western countries' primary strategy for preventing further migrant arrivals in the Eurozone. The Global Approach to Migration and Mobility is a cornerstone of the Union's cooperation strategy on migration issues from an external perspective. Of the four main priorities established by migration mobility, the most

widely developed is aimed at controlling irregular migration, which is addressed through externalization agreements with third countries. Externalization patterns show that they are strongly linked to power relations between the political actors involved. Some might think that the EU occupies a grand position. Instead, the argument of this paper is that third countries are also involved in migration and border diplomacy, this has made the western countries an indispensable and key actor and has thus acquired more relevant roles. These practices thus make European Union and its member states more dependent on countries of origin and transit countries. Some cooperation in migration management between the EU and third countries has taken place through "mobility partnerships". Through these agreements, states provide citizens of these countries with agreeing to strengthened border control and/or re-entry procedures in exchange for visa-free travel to the EU, or at least providing visa facilitations. For example, in the case of Turkey, the country has been able to position itself in a self-conscious way relative to the European Union. However, these countries have not yet decided whether to agree to a partnership or not. They may even threaten to allow migrants to cross borders into the Eurozone thus increasing pressure on destination countries. Rejected refugees the more the European Union tries to find more efficient ways of returning, the more influence it can give third countries and the tools to increase their leverage at the negotiating table. In this sense, since the procedures for managing international migration include diplomatic methods to achieve national strategic objectives, migration is used as a diplomatic tool between countries. In this sense, Surapas (2017) distinguishes between cooperative and coercive migration diplomacy, depending on the negotiating habits of those sitting at the table. Therefore, externalization is not another policy direction for managing international migration, but rather a way to confront states and their national interests. It is also a diplomatic tool to use their power to take advantage of the situation. However, these negotiations are not solutions to problems. They do not address the root causes of migration flows, nor do they protect the rights of refugees and asylum seekers. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has announced his opposition to the externalization proposals, this is against the law, does not offer practical solutions to the problems that drive people to flee, and runs counter to calls for greater responsibility sharing [7].

Such practices may hinder the ability to seek or access asylum or determine refugee status. The principle of resettlement may also be violated, because when refugees are returned to a third state where they face persecution or a serious threat of being returned to their country of origin, externalization measures violate a cornerstone of the international refugee protection framework. The EU is committed to preventing people from reaching its borders or to returning its citizens to their places of origin. In order to bring about, the EU is trying to negotiate agreements with non-EU countries. This confirmation of the security logic against immigration, which leads to a greater focus on the outsourcing of border control, this has huge consequences for people on the move. On the one hand, their freedom of movement is limited, but on these very dangerous migration journeys, they are also unable to reach asylum and safe and legal this includes their access to roads and means of transport. The most important factor to consider when analyzing externalization measures is where to draw the line between protecting or separating human rights? Human rights protection, transparency and accountability should be central pillars of cooperation agreements with third countries. Maritime operations represent the largest operating portion of the agency's budget, and these activities also include rescue operations. Among its operational activities, return operations represent the third largest part of its budget in 2023, preceded by the European Standing Corps and the agency's equipment. Although externalization has become a central pillar of EU migration governance, its implementation reveals several fundamental contradictions. The following section introduces three key paradoxes that expose these tensions.

4. Contradictions of Immigration

In the European Union, immigrants have been portrayed as a threat to national security and social identity. However, with regard to refugees and asylum seekers at sea, they have been referred to as victims of smuggling and debt [8]. Discussions following the terrorist attacks of the 21st century and the migration crisis of 2015 have reinforced this idea, linking migration to the idea of potential danger or enemy [9]. Although migrant boats are not the main means of reaching the European Union, the significant number of deaths at sea has captured the media's attention and brought this reality to the fore. However, questions remain about how to secure human rights in international waters or how externalization practices shift responsibility from the European Union and its member states to third countries. As a result, the European Union's approach to saving migrants through search and rescue operations clashes with the reality of these migrants, they are often sent back to the country they left from, and where they may face prosecution or return to their homeland where they fear such prosecution, thus violating the principle of non-refoulement. The relationship between humanitarianism and securing 'boat migrants' as a model has already been explored. But it has been recognized that further research in this area and related methods is essential. Therefore, this paper attempts to contribute to the literature by continuing the discussion on analyzing migration through dialectical perspectives. In this context, three paradoxes have been identified in relation to boat migration. The following subsections will develop each of these paradoxes. Threatvictim paradox the first irony is how migrants are simultaneously constructed as threats and victims, especially in political and media discourse. Boat migrants are often presented as victims. They make dangerous journeys at sea in unsafe boats and with minimal safety protection. Many of them drown, while others reach ports after days of unimaginable hardship. The images of children arriving in Greek, Italian and Spanish countries show a heartbreaking reality, images of those risking their lives at sea in desperation to escape unsafe countries. They are accused of profiting from welfare systems, stealing citizens' jobs, and increasing crime rates, being terrorists, and even threatening cultures. Far-right arguments have supported these ideas, resulting in the spread of xenophobia and racism at the hands of some political parties. As a result, securitization practices have spread around the world, and laws and policies linking

migration to security have proliferated. Political leaders and the media use these speeches, which create a sense of insecurity across the population, fueling anti-immigrant sentiment. They have also helped to consolidate the securitization of migration, on a wider scale. Examples of such discourses related to boat migration and their contrast with softer messages can be found in various it can be easily heard in countries. An example is France, where Marine Le Pen, leader of the Front National, has said on several occasions that immigration should be temporarily suspended to protect France Most criminal acts on the streets of France are not attributable to immigrants or Muslim immigration has been said to be a serious threat to the country [10].

Italy has become a hotbed of debate as far-right parties have gained power in recent years. Salvini, who first became interior minister and then prime minister, has passed a series of measures to curb immigration and following the anti-immigrant rhetoric, he made several announcements. He defended tough measures on immigration, including stripping terrorists of their citizenship and giving the police greater powers [11] He stated that migrant increase the risk of terrorist attacks or that Italians do not have enough accommodation and jobs, even half of the African continent, irregular migrants were given messages saying get ready to pack your bags [12]. Later, the leader of Giorgia Meloni's right-wing Brothers of Italy party campaigned with anti-immigrant messages and after winning elections in October 2022, similar discussions and policies were spread. In her first speech as Prime Minister, she called for an end to illegal departures from North Africa, meanwhile, the new Interior Minister, Matteo Piantedozzi, defended the idea of closing Italian ports to two rescue boats that were supposed to carry hundreds of passengers [13]. In her first speech to the United Nations General assembly, she declared that Italy would not be turned into Europe's refugee camp, at the same time, he promoted Christian European values and promised to defend the country against attacks by migrants arriving by boat. Some news reports detailing the plight and sorrow of boat migrants in Italy contradict these views. The number of dead and missing on the Mediterranean coast Corriere della Sera published an extensive report entitled La straige del Mediterranean massacre with the UNHCR. La Stampa and La Repubblica are the other two major newspapers in the country, and understanding the impact of migration or some articles have also been published about losses at sea, calling the Mediterranean a great cemetery.

Examples of this discursive paradox have also been seen in the United Kingdom. In 2012, then Home Secretary Theresa May announced the goal of creating a truly hostile environment for illegal immigrants here in Britain Measures were designed to tighten control at borders and introduce new criminal offenses to address the problem of foreign terrorist fighters. Robert Jenrick, who was the Minister of state for immigration between 2022 and 2023, stated that the values and lifestyles of those crossing the channel in small boats were a threat to the country's social cohesion. Labor leader Keir Starmer has stated that terrorism laws should be used to address the small boat crisis. On a similar note, manhunt for six terror suspects after plot to attack small boats or headlines

like the facts are now clear mass illegal immigration is a terrorist threat show how powerful these messages are to inform citizens. On the other hand, other news articles have also acknowledged the UN's criticism of the UK asylum system or father's grief as 7-year-old daughter buried on cross-Channel migrant boat. The sadness behind these journeys is shown with headlines like UK human rights watchdog criticizes Sunak's small boat bill.

5. Australian and New Zealand's Approaches Against Migrants
Looking beyond Europe, migration to Australia increased in the early 2000s. As a result, since then, politicians have often referred to waves, floods, illegal refugees, and illegal immigrants or boat people have been used to refer to migrants in the country. In 2024, the government recently passed new legislation on migration, which expands the powers of the Australian Immigration Minister and it also allowed the withdrawal of refugee status from someone who had previously been granted such status. In addition, these people must cooperate in their deportation, even to places where they would face persecution - even to places that violate the principle of non-refoulement - or they may face imprisonment. Australia's strict border protection policies have led to the illegal boat no one will be allowed to settle permanently in Australia, the Australian Border Force announced in a public statement. In parallel, news about incidents related to boat migration where lives have been lost at sea is also often seen in the press. A headline in the Guardian asylum seekers die as boat sinks off Australia's Christmas Island. The article describes the tragic fate of many who have already reached Australian shores by boat. The same is true of news published by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, where the neglected children of boat arrivals have only known life in Australia. Now they can proposer migration or be deported under refugees living with the loss of identity, family, language, culture and home by (Burgus, 2024) or SBS News. On the one hand, these discourses show that political and media rhetoric has contributed to the securitization of immigration. They have fostered a negative image of the immigrant, who has been accepted by a part of civil society, this allowed security measures to be applied to control the migrant threat. On the other hand, images of migrants or boat migrants dying at sea have become a source of alarm about the dangerous journeys these migrants make public concerns have been dispelled. It is therefore ironic that migrants are often portrayed as threats, while boat migrants are at the same time seen as victims. Those who flee their homes and risk their lives by land and sea All refugees and asylum seekerss are vulnerable groups in need of special protection, and there should be no distinctions in the way we portray them. In short, the threat-victim paradox underscores how conflicting discourses shape public perceptions and policy responses, often obscuring the complexity of immigrant experiences.

6. The search and Rescue Paradox
Apart from how immigrants are portrayed, a second paradox focuses on border practices - especially the tension between humanitarian narratives and the operational logic of 'search and rescue' missions. The debate on immigration policy paradoxes began a few decades ago. In the early 1990s, identified the liberal

paradox in immigration governance. He described it in these words states are caught in a liberal paradox. Since the end of World War II, international economic forces as trade, investment, migration has pushed states towards greater openness, at the same time, the international system of governance and powerful domestic political forces are pushing states towards greater closure. A key feature of globalization and modern political and economic this is a liberal paradox because it highlights some of the contradictions inherent in liberalism as a philosophy. Over time, different scholars have defined the liberal paradox from different perspectives [14-17]. Some see it as the failure of states to effectively regulate immigration. Others see a gap between political discourse and its implementation. But other paradoxes about immigration have emerged. Among them, there is the migration development paradox, which conceptualizes migration as part of the development process rather than its antonym. In relation to the contribution that immigrants make to the host country's economy, they tend to live in neighborhoods and edge economies or the migration-climate change paradox, where the richest countries in the world pollute the most, while the weaker countries suffer the consequences of climate change. They are places where their inhabitants must go and search for better places to go. This paper, which focuses on the paradox of search and rescue operations at sea, it studies the impact of externalization measures on these activities and how they endanger migrants' rights rather than protecting them. The irony of search and rescue operations is that, despite their name, instead of saving lives, they are reducing the rights of migrants and establishing more alienated militarized borders. Refugees and asylum seekers flee persecution in their countries and undertake dangerous journeys to reach their destinations. Externalization measures are forcing them to find more dangerous alternatives. The "professionalization" of smuggling networks has increased (Feist, 2019), they will have to pay smugglers more money to find alternative ways to circumvent the restrictions. The financial costs increase, but so does the safety of these individuals. As a result, the same measures originally designed to prevent illegal immigration are not preventing migrants from leaving, but are making their journeys more dangerous than they already were, leaving migrants in an even more vulnerable position. The migrant who decides to jump on a boat to cross the Mediterranean Sea is desperate and in urgent need to escape to save their life. It's already difficult to find a way to cross the sea and go to a country where you can find the means to do so. But once you find a way to get on a boat, one of the most dangerous parts of the journey is actually walking on water. The worst-case scenario is that the boat doesn't arrive, as a significant portion of it ends up drowning. Another route is for authorities to catch her and bring her back to her starting point. Few ever reach their desired destination, but even when they do, they may face deportation. Irregular entry means crossing a border without complying with the requirements necessary to legally enter that state. Globally, the definition of "irregular entry" can be found in Article 3(b) of the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, which supplements the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. Gammeltoft and Hansen (2016) describe a two-way relationship between boat migrants from the perspective of origin and destination, their rights and

duties. He argues that it is the result of the state's failure to protect migrants who take the dangerous risks of fleeing their countries in a dangerous boat across the sea. On the other hand, receiving states have the sovereign right to decide who should enter their territory and who should remain there. The failure of the duty to protect and the right derived from the principle of sovereignty differs between the two states. The end result is that a vulnerable migrant fleeing conflict finds it difficult to find a safe place. However, international law imposes an obligation on states to assist and disembark those lost at sea. Furthermore, when these migrants become refugees, the principle of nonrefoulement plays a fundamental role. Furthermore, states cannot expel or return them to a territory where their life or freedom would be threatened. Following this principle, they are prohibited from sending refugees to a region where they fear their lives or freedom will be threatened. However, in practice, states have removed boats carrying migrants and refugees with devastating consequences. To avoid responsibility, member states have increasingly externalized immigration control to prevent migrants from reaching their jurisdictions. Agreements with third countries are one of the tools used for this purpose, as they even intend to prevent these migrants from leaving these regions in the first place. To then reduce migratory flows, the EU and its members are increasing border security, establishing partnerships with third countries and strengthening the role of Frontex. These partnerships are not a new phenomenon. These arrangements have existed since the 1960s, as France signed bilateral agreements with Gabon, Congo, and Benin, and Italy with Libya, Tunisia, and Egypt [18]. However, there has been an increase in the development of such agreements in recent years, and these have been particularly strengthened after the 2015 migration crisis.

The European Union has terminated migrant readmission agreements with third countries, and its member states have also terminated bilateral agreements on returns to third countries, or passed controversial laws. Many of these arrangements have been heavily criticized for their dealings with third countries notorious for violating fundamental rights. In European Union which the Italian government signed with the Libyan government in 2017 and renewed in 2020, one such agreement is the sponsored agreement. The aim of the agreement is to help the Libyan Coast Guard increase maritime surveillance. But the issue of migrants and refugees NGOs has consistently argued that this is done in violation of rights [19]. Another example is the highly criticized legislation in the United Kingdom, the Safety of Rwanda Asylum and Immigration Act 2024. It is worth noting that the ECHR has confirmed that human rights apply in international waters. In the judgment Hirsi Jamaa and others versus Italy, the ECHR ruled that expulsions are contrary to human rights standards and can be considered collective expulsions [20]. However, the court did not provide general guidelines in its decision. However, pushing methods are still a reality today. So if the journey wasn't threatening enough, the world has seen European coastguards in recent years illegally return these migrants across the EU's sea borders to the countries they left from [21]. Since collective expulsions are prohibited, the European Court of Human Rights requires an individual assessment of each return, in order to ensure

a safe return that prevents a violation of Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights. However, the highest risk is the violation of the principle of non-refoulement, as a person could be returned to a country where they face a risk of persecution. In short, counter-retaliation practices raise serious concerns about the rights of asylum seekers and refugees. However, they are a reality. They often occur when large numbers of migrants attempt to enter the territory of a state, but they also seem to be less than the number of arrivals.

The irony in this case concerns what some have described as "search and rescue operations," but in reality these are designed to combat unwanted migration and result in return practices. In the end, they are not safe because the goal is to send them back to where they went or to their countries of origin, where they face persecution. Boats being pushed out to sea then violence forcing them back to the offshore processing, these are just some of the measures used to externalize immigration control of arrivals by sea. Paradox that shows that the true purpose of these search and rescue measures were hidden behind name that does not does justice to its purpose. In conclusion, this paradox reveals how the label search and rescue often masks methods of prevention and control, challenging the authenticity of humanitarian commitments. It is worth noting that the ECHR has confirmed that human rights apply in international waters. In the judgment Hirsi Jamaa and Others v. Italy, the ECHR ruled that expulsions are contrary to human rights standards and can be considered collective expulsions. However, pushing methods are still a reality today. If the journey is not sufficiently threatening, in recent years, the world has seen European coastguards illegally push these migrants across the EU's sea borders back to their countries of origin.Since collective expulsions are prohibited and to ensure safe returns that prevent violations of Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights, However, the highest risk is violating the principle of non-refoulement, as a person could be returned to a country where they face a risk of persecution. In short, counter-retaliation practices raise serious concerns about the rights of asylum seekers and refugees. However, they are a reality. They often occur when large numbers of migrants attempt to enter the territory of a state, but they also seem to be less than the number of arrivals. The irony in this case concerns what some have described as "search and rescue operations," but in reality these are designed to combat unwanted migration and result in return practices. In the end they are not safe because the goal is to return them to where they went or to their countries of origin where they face persecution. The backlash of boats at sea, the violence that forces them to return, the offshore processing these are just some of the measures used to externalize immigration control of sea arrivals. An irony that shows that the true purposes of these search and rescue measures were hidden behind name that does not justice its purposes, in conclusion, this paradox reveals how the label search and rescue often masks methods of prevention and control, challenging the authenticity of humanitarian commitments.

7. Migration Diplomacy

The final paradox turns the focus to state-level interventions, revealing how migration is used as a diplomatic tool in negotiations between countries of origin, transit, and destination. As migration becomes an important tool for national and foreign policy strategies, there is a need to negotiate between host countries, manage cross-border migration, and obtain certain benefits in return. States are beginning to use it as a diplomatic tool. There is a clear internal dimension to migration, as major flows of migrants can strain the capacity of reception systems, and political leaders have used antiimmigration rhetoric to strengthen their voter base. However, in recent years, the external dimension of migration has also been exploited, placing the burden of dealing with migrants on third countries, whether countries of origin or transit. In this sense, when negotiating with other states, national, states use migration as a tool to advance non-immigrant agendas. Adamson and Surapas (2019) define migration diplomacy as "diplomatic tools for managing cross-border population movements, state use of processes and procedures. They go on to describe the scope of the definition. First, migration refers to state actions on cross-border movement related to state diplomatic objectives. They explain that diplomacy implies. Secondly, a state's migration diplomacy may not be identical to its overall migration policy, as these can be very diverse. Third, migration diplomacy represents the importance of migration movements as an international issue. Recently, the concept of migration diplomacy has been used in international relations, it is used as a general term that includes negotiations, agreements, and disputes between states. Migration diplomacy is a method used to determine the relationship between countries of origin or transit and the destination countries. It is important to distinguish between countries and interests. From the perspective of the countries of destination, in order to increase the control of migrants departing from the territory of these third states they are interested in using their diplomatic powers to engage with sending countries. Destination countries, usually in the Global North, use their economic resources as incentives. They have also discussed facilitating visas for citizens of the countries they are negotiating with, investing in infrastructure such as building detention centers, and providing budget support or development assistance. The sending country needs to increase border control on land or at sea to prevent migrants from moving to their destination and to return them to their place of departure. Measures may include setbacks, foreign processing, increased surveillance, or handling of refugee and asylum claims. Usually, this is a burden for migrants because it prevents them from choosing their preferred destination. But the conditions for returning and detaining those who face violence are worse. Examples include Australia sending migrants to the Papua New Guinea island of Nauru in exchange for financial assistance, or the increasing number of migrants to the European Union in exchange for visa-free travel for Turkish citizens. The 2016 EU-Turkey agreement, designed to combat migration flows, and the final negotiations on EU membership are widely known examples. From the perspective of countries of origin and transit, migration is regulated to achieve migration objectives, such as obtaining financial assistance, investments, and other political benefits. Their main goal is to use their power. The stronger the state, the more influence they will have in negotiations with the target countries. Examples of the threats and pressures from these countries are the

threats and pressures of the former Gaddafi government, which said that Europe will become Africa threatened and threatened to get at least 5 billion euros to stop irregular migration and avoid a "black Europe" [22].The EU Commission and Libya signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) under which the EU agreed to provide technical assistance and cooperation to the Libyan government between 2011 and 2013, including on human rights, including the rights of migrants in Libya. Despite being repeatedly identified as a country with severe deficits (Knoll and Niger has been pressuring the EU to provide financial assistance in exchange for combating irregular migration. Turkey has been under pressure to take advantage of the major migration flows from the European Union to the European Union. The EU-Turkey agreement, signed in March 2016, it is designed to prevent people from traveling irregularly from Turkey to the European Union, and Turks from Turkey to Greek shores. The government also agreed to accept the return of irregular migrants. In return, the EU provided €6 billion to improve refugee reception in the country. It also promised to speed up the visa liberalization process for Turkish citizens [23]. Morocco has also tried to influence the European Union to accept agreements that suit its own interests. After years of negotiations, they decided to conclude a deal with their rival, not wanting to bear the burden of repatriating their citizens and other foreigners to their own country. Rabat was unwilling to accept the level of conditions required. The withdrawal of previous visa-free travel options to different EU countries following the unification of the Schengen visa policy also prevented the agreement from being concluded. This shows that discussions about visa policies have an important symbolic meaning for countries, as restricting freedom of movement can be linked to questions of dignity and self-respect [24]. The resistance to the conclusion of the agreement with the European Union was expressed by representatives of the country "so-called a country of origin or transit country" in the re-entry agreement has been described as an example of a"successful avoidance of the agreement" [25]. As will be seen later in the paper, the use of force to pressure Spain and achieve a number of economic and political benefits Morocco has also used migration as a tool. In short, migration is used as a diplomatic tool, and states instrumentalist it, also, it gives origin and transit states significant leverage to obtain benefits in exchange for externalizing measures. Migration has become a major bargaining chip that can then be used forcefully. Contrary to popular belief, destination countries do not always benefit. Third states can also pressure migrant countries to the negotiating table. They have learned to use migration as a pressure tool to advance their interests. However, the key is not to focus on ways in which states can manipulate the negotiations in their favor, rather, it is to emphasize that it is migrants' rights that are ultimately at stake. Destination countries should not use migration to reduce arrivals and evade international responsibility. Countries of origin should not use migrants as a bargaining chip to advance national interests, because in the end, they are bargaining with the lives of the desperate. Instead, states should find ways to address the problems that drive migrants to decide to leave in the first place. Ultimately, this paradox highlights how migration is useful in diplomatic negotiations, there the interests of states override the rights and dignity of migrants.

8. Conclusion

Returning to the central question of the article, how do conflicts influence and this concluding section reflects on how this is becoming increasingly complex. By bringing together a conceptual framework and an empirical case study, this conclusion reflects the broader implications of controlling immigration through paradox. This paper examines externalization measures from a different perspective, which involves analyzing these measures through the prism of three paradoxes. In relation to the threat-victim migration narrative, one is in relation to so-called search and rescue operations, and one is in relation to migration as a diplomatic tool between destination and origin or transit countries. This article contributes to the growing literature on migration governance by advancing the study of the contradictions first identified by Bello (2017). While Bellow laid the groundwork by exposing the contradictions inherent in the securitization of migration, this study develops and applies the conflict framework specifically to regulating boat migration and externalization practices. Focusing on conflicts surrounding threat-victim narrative, search and rescue operations, and migration diplomacy, it explores how structural contradictions shape power relations and undermine human security. The article provides a more detailed account of the. In doing so, it argues that the contradictions are not isolated anomalies, but structural features of contemporary migration governance. It builds on and expands on Bellow's insights, which demonstrate. The article argues that three paradoxes identified in boat migration demonstrate the reality of externalization measures, this reinforces the negative image of migration and produces a set of tools and actions to shift the burden from destination countries to transit countries in order to avoid international obligations. First, following the logic of securitization theories, states have consistently presented migration as a threat to countries and their societies. However, in the case of boat migration, it is essential to present the tragedies these migrants encounter on their journeys, mixing the depiction of the migrant-victim with the narrative of the migrant-threat. Secondly, the article examines the design and practical application of search and rescue operations, which, despite their name, are not designed to rescue migrants at sea, rather, the goal is to find them before they reach their destination and bring them back from where they came from. They do not reach their destination and the destination countries do not accept refugees. The goal is to ensure that international obligations regarding refugees are not enforced. Overall, this brings us to the final paradox, namely the use of migration as a diplomatic tool. Foreignization practices are ultimately the result of negotiations between destination, transit, and origin states, which have different interests and goals from managing migration in one way or another. Destination states want to ensure that migrants do not reach their territories to avoid international responsibility. In exchange for managing this unwanted migration, they are seeking to advance national interests. This has been seen as an opportunity by transit and origin countries. By re-examining conflicts through the lens of externalization practices, human narratives, modes of action, and diplomatic strategies can be re-constructed in ways that reconstruct structural asymmetries. This paper has shown how these divides are intertwined. Taken together, the contradictions are not exceptions

within the migration regime, but tensions between the EU and its partners in defense and responsibility. These findings suggest that structural features that enable overcoming these contradictions are important. Addressing these contradictions requires moving away from instrumental approaches and towards the agency of migrants. Need to move towards rights-based frameworks that focus on dignity. First, migration governance should shift to a rights-based framework that places human dignity and international legal obligations above defense and security rationales. The externalization of border control to third countries with poor human rights records should be abandoned, and replaced with sustainable development, conflict prevention, and safe and regular migration pathways. Cooperation should lead to the creation of. Search and rescue operations truly serve humanitarian purposes and provide immediate rescue, asylum procedures, they should be revised to ensure that they ensure safety and security and disembarkation in areas where migrants' rights are fully respected. At the same time, depoliticize migration narratives, it is crucial to promote responsible political and media discourses that move beyond portraying migrants as both threats and victims, and instead acknowledge their agency and humanity. Transparency and accountability must be strengthened, ensuring that external agreements, border operations, and return procedures are subject to independent monitoring and judicial oversight. Furthermore, the expansion of safe and legal pathways for migration – such as humanitarian visas, resettlement programs, and labor mobility schemes – is essential to reduce reliance on dangerous irregular routes. Migration governance should also promote genuine international responsibility-sharing, so that the burden is not disproportionately placed on countries of origin and transit. Finally, Strengthening data collection and accessibility is essential to ensure that migrationrelated policies are based on reliable evidence and that victims of human rights violations have effective access to justice and redress. A major difficulty in monitoring boat migration is related to accessing reliable data. Public data on countries of origin and transport routes is sparse and fragmented, this makes it difficult for international organizations and NGOs to conduct comprehensive studies on the number of arrests and deportations carried out by national authorities. As a result, it seems reasonable to believe that these dangerous boat trips are much more likely than official sources indicate. With authoritarian or undemocratic regimes this shows that cooperation involves legal opacity, which hinders victims of violations from accessing justice or obtaining compensation. In particular, the need to protect the rights of vulnerable groups and ensure that countries of origin and destination comply with international human rights standards is emphasized. It is also crucial to develop mechanisms to ensure this. By developing more fair and effective migration policies, conflicting narratives and practices in migration governance can be addressed by adopting rights-based approaches or developing more effective migration policies. Future research might usefully explore how conflicting narratives and practices in migration governance can be challenged or transformed [26-37].

References

1. Gatrell, P. (2017). Refugees—What's Wrong with History?. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 30*(2), 170-189.
2. Damousi, J., Nelli, F., Austen, A. N., Toffoli, A., & Tomsic, M. (2022). Forced migration, oceanic humanitarianism, and the paradox of danger and saviour of a Vietnamese refugee boat journey. *The Historical Journal, 65*(2), 505-526.
3. Gammeltoft-Hansen, T. (2011). *Access to asylum: international refugee law and the globalisation of migration control* (Vol. 77). Cambridge University Press.
4. Frelick, B., Kysel, I. M., & Podkul, J. (2016). The impact of externalization of migration controls on the rights of asylum seekers and other migrants. *Journal on Migration and Human Security, 4*(4), 190-220.
5. Faist, T. (2019). Contested externalisation: responses to global inequalities. *Comparative Migration Studies, 7*(1), 1-8.
6. Ambrosini, M. (2018). Irregular immigration in Southern Europe: Actors, dynamics and governance.
7. Grandi, Filippo (2020) 'High Commissioner's Cloing Remarks to the 71st Session of the UNHCR Executive Committee', United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 9 October.
8. Aradau, C. (2004). The perverse politics of four-letter words: Risk and pity in the securitisation of human trafficking. *Millennium, 33*(2), 251-277.
9. Bigo, D. (2002). Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the governmentality of unease. *Alternatives, 27*(1_suppl), 63-92.
10. Al Jazeera (2012). 'Marine Le Pen: The threat of radical Islam', 17 December. Retrieved on May 15, 2024.
11. France24 (2018). 'Italy adopts controversial anti-migrant decree', 25 September. Retrieved on June 7, 2024.
12. BBC (2018). 'Italy migrants: Matteo Salvini calls for end to Sicily 'refugee camp', *British Broadcasting Corporation, 3* June. Retrieved on June 17, 2024.
13. BBC (2022) 'Giorgia Meloni: Italy's new PM takes aim at migrant boats in debut speech', *British Broadcasting Corporation*, 31 August. Retrieved on June 17, 2024.
14. Hollifield, J. F. (1992). *Immigrants, markets, and states: The political economy of postwar Europe*. Harvard University Press.
15. Martin, P. L., Cornelius, W. A., & Hollifield, J. F. (Eds.). (1994). *Controlling immigration: A global perspective*. Stanford University Press.
16. Hollifield, J. F. (2004). The emerging migration state 1. *International migration review, 38*(3), 885-912.
17. Castles, S. (2019). Why migration policies fail 1. In *Celebrating 40 Years of Ethnic and Racial Studies* (pp. 300-320). Routledge.
18. Basilien-Gainche, M. L. (2016). Leave and let die. The EU banopticon approach of migrants at sea. Boat Refugees' and Migrants at Sea. *A Comprehensive Approach Integrating Maritime Security in Human Rights, London: Brill*, 327-350.
19. Ceretti, V. (2023). *Italy-Libya Memorandum of Understanding: An affront to the fundamental human rights of migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers= Euro-Med Human Rights Monitor*.
20. Dembour, M. B. (2012). Interception-at-sea: Illegal as currently practiced-Hirsi and Others v. Italy. *Strasbourg*

Observers, 2.

21. Akehurst, Nathan (2022) 'The European Union is Deliberately Leaving Migrants Abandoned at Sea', *Jacobin*, 10 August. Retrieved on May 15, 2024

22. BBC (2010) 'Gaddafi wants EU cash to stop African migrants', *British Broadcasting Corporation*, 31 August. Retrieved on June 12, 2024

23. CIDOB (2020) 'Four years of the EU-Turkey deal', *Barcelona Centre for International Affairs*. Retrieved on April 1, 2025

24. El Qadim, N. (2018). The symbolic meaning of international mobility: EU–Morocco negotiations on visa facilitation. *Migration Studies, 6*(2), 279-305.

25. Qadim, N. E. (2014). Postcolonial challenges to migration control: French–Moroccan cooperation practices on forced returns. *Security dialogue, 45*(3), 242-261.

26. Adamson, Fiona B. and Tsourapas, Gerasimos (2019) 'Migration Diplomacy in World Politics', *International Studies Perspectives*, pp. 113-128

27. AFP (2022) 'La quasi-totalité de la "délinquance de rue" imputable "aux immigrés" ou "issus de l'immigration"? L'invérifiable affirmation de Marine Le Pen', *Agence France-Presse*, 16 June.

28. Bello, V. (2017). Migration, National Security, and Human Security: A New Migration Model to Combat Prejudice as a Challenge to Global Security. In *International Migration: Perception and Reality. An Analysis from a Security Perspective* (pp. 157–190). Spanish Institute for Strategic Studies.

29. Carrera, S., Cassarino, J. P., El Qadim, N., Lahlou, M., & Den Hertog, L. (2016). EU-Morocco Cooperation on Readmission, Borders and Protection: A model to follow?.

30. CDS (2021) 'La Strage del Mediterraneo', *Corriere della Sera and United Nations High Comissioner for Refugees*.

31. Crépeau, François (2015) 'Rapport du Rapporteur spécial sur les droits de l'homme des migrants, François Crépeau', *General Assembly of the United Nations, A/HRC/29/36*, 8 May

32. Cutler, Georgina (2023) 'Manhunt as six terror suspects who slipped into UK on small boats 'plotting attack', *GBS News*, 19 November. Retrieved on June 17, 2024.

33. Dearden, L. (2017). *French elections: Marine Le Pen vows to suspend immigration to 'protect France'. Independent.*

34. Gammeltoft-Hansen, T. (2016). The perfect storm: Sovereignty games and the law and politics of boat migration. Boat Refugees and Migrants at Sea: A Comprehensive Approach.

35. Genç, D. (2010). A paradox in EU migration management. *SEER: Journal for Labour and Social Affairs in Eastern Europe*, 181-192.

36. Hall, S. M. (2021). *The migrant's paradox: street livelihoods and marginal citizenship in Britain* (Vol. 31). U of Minnesota Press.

37. Hill, A. (2017). 'Hostile Environment': The Hardline Home Office Policy Tearing Families Apart. *The Guardian, 28*, 11-17.