**Defining Turkey's Kurdish Question:
Discourse in the US Congress, The European Parliament and
the Turkish Grand National Assembly, 1990-99**

Hamid Akin Ünver

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Government

University of Essex

Date of submission November 2009

Winner

2010 Malcolm H. Kerr Award for the Best
Dissertation in the field of Social Sciences

Middle East
Studies
Association

This Dissertation is Nominated by the
University of Essex, Department of Government
for the following ECPR Categories

- ❖ The 2010 Jean Blondel PhD Prize for the Best Dissertation by a Scholar in an ECPR Member Institution.
- ❖ The 2010 Stein Rokkan Prize for Comparative Social Science Research

**Defining the Kurdish Question:
Discourse in the US Congress, The European Parliament and The Turkish Grand
National Assembly.**

Chapter 1 -- Defining the Kurdish question: Setting the Scene

1. Power, function and policy asymmetries: The US Congress, the EU Parliament and the Turkish Grand National Assembly.....7
2. On the methodology of this work.....11
 - 2.1 *Methodology step 1: Data collection*.....14
 - 2.2 *Methodology step 2: Data evaluation*.....16

Chapter 2 – Theoretical overview: The State, the non-State and political language

1. Philosophical aspects: The consciousness of the State and of the non-State.....22
 - 1.1 *The State and power in politics: Machiavelli – Hobbes – Weber*23
 - 1.2 *Language of the ‘non-State’ and emancipation: Locke – Rousseau – Kant*....31
2. Theoretical aspects: How does the consciousness of the State and emancipation materialize in politics? Enter discourse analysis.....35
 - 2.1 *Limitation of the literature on ‘psychological factors’ in foreign policy*.....36
 - 2.2 *When words establish power relations: Critical discourse analysis and identity conflicts*.....40
 - 2.3 *On the methodology of the content chapters: The relationship between speech-act and discourse*.....43
3. Operational-methodological aspects: How does discourse affect policy? Agenda-setting, policy-advertising, ‘non-decision’ and indirect effects of speech on the wider discourse on the Kurdish conflict.....46
 - 3.1 *Discourse and ‘non-decision’: How the hegemonic discourse marginalizes counter-hegemonic discourses in the wider Kurdish conflict*.....51
4. Summary: Interactions between discourse, agenda-setting and non-decision: How does the above discussion fit into the thesis’ empirical work?.....54

Chapter 3 – EU Parliament discourse on the Kurdish question in Turkey

1. Introduction63
2. Types of discourses adopted in the European Parliament debates regarding the Kurdish question in Turkey69

2.1 Human rights discourse	69
2.2 Democracy/democratization discourse	82
2.3 Excessive force	88
2.4 Ethnic conflict/peace process/identity/autonomy	95
2.5 Role of the military	98
2.6 Discourses that converge with that of the Turkish state	101
3. Discourses adopted by the members of the European Commission and Council of Europe	106
4. Discourses of intra-EP criticism	113
5. Conclusion	120
5.1 How did discourse affect policy in the EP with regard to the Kurdish question?	124

Chapter 4 – US Congress discourse on the Kurdish question in Turkey

1. Introduction	126
2. Types of discourses adopted in the US Congress on the Kurdish question in Turkey	131
2.1 Human rights discourse	131
2.2 Democracy/democratization discourse	141
2.3 Excessive force	148
2.4 Identity/autonomy/cultural rights	153
2.5 Discourses that converged with that of the Turkish state	158
3. Discourses of the State Department, Department of Defense and US military	160
4. Discourses of intra-US criticism	166
5. Conclusion	170
5.1 How did discourse affect policy in the Congress with regard to the Kurdish question?	176

Chapter 5 – Turkish Grand National Assembly discourse on the Kurdish question

1. Introduction	179
2. Types of discourses adopted by the parliamentarians in the Turkish Grand National Assembly	184
2.1 Human rights discourse	184
2.2 Democracy/democratization	192
2.3 Excessive force	200

2.4 Security discourse	206
2.5 Economic-developmental discourses.....	209
2.6 Legalistic discourses.....	213
2.7 Autonomy-ethnicity-culturalist discourses.....	217
3. Discourses of intra-Turkish criticism	221
4. Criticism of the US, EU and other foreign entities: the ‘dark powers’ discourse.....	227
5. Conclusion.....	234
5.1 How did discourse affect policy in the TGNA with regard to the Kurdish question?.....	240

Chapter 6 – Analysis: Impact of ideology and agenda on legislative perceptions of the Kurdish question

1. The European Parliament	247
1.1 Agenda: country-affiliation	247
1.2 Ideology: group activity	254
2. The United States Congress	260
2.1 Ideology: Democrats vs. Republicans	260
2.2 Agenda: caucus affiliation	265
3. Turkish Grand National Assembly	274
3.1 Ideology: party-affiliation	275
3.2 Agenda: constituency	282
3.3 Continuity and change in Turkish state/government discourse.....	284
3.3.1 Security discourse.....	285
3.3.2 Educational-developmental discourse	289
4. Comparative analysis of the European Parliament, US Congress and TGNA.....	295

Chapter 7 – Conclusion: Connecting the findings with the theory

1. Concluding Summary	303
2. The significance of this study.....	313
3. Epilogue.....	314

Bibliography

Appendix

CHAPTER 1

Defining the Kurdish Question: Setting the Scene

Kurdish question, without doubt, is one of the most complicated and protracted issues of the Middle East and the Caucasus. Although Kurdish people span across three other neighboring countries – Iran, Syria and Iraq – the great majority of the Kurds live in Turkey¹, rendering the country with a unique position in the larger Kurdish conundrum. The real difficulty in Turkey in addressing this question comes from the existence of competing and mutually exclusive definitions of this problem, each associated with a corresponding belief on how this issue can be solved. Ironically however, calling the Kurdish question as the ‘Kurdish question’ itself is regarded as an ideological position by the Turkish state.² For example if one says that there is a ‘Kurdish problem’ in Turkey, it is – often misleadingly – inferred that s/he believes in the cultural and ethnic separateness of the Kurds which is – mostly misleadingly – inferred as ‘supporting’ Kurdish separatism. On the other hand, if one says that ‘there is no Kurdish problem’, s/he is then

¹ A controversial issue in and of itself, providing the exact number of Kurds in Turkey is difficult due to various political reasons. For a long time, the Turkish government did not make any specific Kurdish population census, since the official position did not emphasize ethno-linguistic differences in Turkey, asserting the supra-identity of Turkish-ness. The most recent official move to come up with an approximate number of Kurdish citizens was the directive by the National Security Council of Turkey dubbed as ‘The Report on the Distribution of the Ethnic Groups in Turkey’ in June 2008. According to the report, the approximate aggregate of the Kurdish people in Turkey – including Krmanji, Zazaki and Gorani Kurds – was 12 million 600 thousand. However, the report also highlighted that around 2 million Kurds ‘did not accept their ethnic heritage’ as a result of assimilation policies and identified themselves as ‘Turks’. The report itself is confidential, but some parts of it were leaked to the media. More on this can be found in the Turkish newspaper *Milliyet*’s online edition: *Milliyet* (June 6, 2008) ‘Türkiye’deki Kürtlerin Sayısı’ [The Number of the Kurds in Turkey] retrieved February 16, 2009 from <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/default.aspx?aType=SonDakika&ArticleID=873452>

² See for example the statement made by the then chief coordinator for anti-terrorism, retired general Edip Başer: ‘There is no Turk-Kurd problem’, adding that only Western countries call the terror problem as the ‘Kurdish question’. More on this can be found at CNN-Turk online edition: CNN-Turk (June 9, 2007) ‘Başer: Türk-Kürt sorunu yoktur’ [Baser: There is no Turk-Kurd problem] retrieved February 16, 2009 from <http://www.cnnturk.com/2007/turkiye/06/09/baser.turk.kurt.sorunu.yoktur/359260.0/index.html>

regarded as a far-right nationalist, aiming to oppress the cultural identity of the Kurds. Predictably, this sensitivity surrounding the very definition of the Kurdish question has made it a taboo topic in Turkey for many years, often with a governmental check on the terms and words used to discuss this topic. This uncertainty and vagueness surrounding the definition (not to mention the perspectives on the very existence) of the Kurdish issue has been manifesting itself either as the complete denial of the Kurdish question, or 'separatism' and even 'treason'. Even today, if we were to ask several people in Turkey "what is the Kurdish question?" we would get many different interpretations and definitions of the issue, ranging from "it is a problem of democracy"³ to "it is a threat to territorial integrity"⁴.

This doctoral dissertation is a study of these discursive constructions and perceptions; more importantly, a study of the reasons and factors behind differing interpretations of the problem. Using the Kurdish conundrum in Turkey as a case, this study also seeks to provide an analytical framework for the analysis of the factors behind domestic and foreign discursive constructions of other intra-state conflicts. From there, this work aims to contribute to the literature on the discourses of intra-state conflict.

The starting inquiry of this work is: **"What leads to different interpretations and**

³ See for example the statement made by Algan Hacaloğlu, the deputy chairman of the Republican People's Party (CHP): 'The Kurdish problem is one of democracy and development. The state has [to have] no ethnicity, no race'. Republican People's Party (CHP) (October 28, 2008) 'CHP Genel Sekreter Yardımcısı Algan Hacaloğlu Van TV'de "Kürt sorunu bir demokrasi ve kalkınma sorunudur. Devletin etnisitesi, devletin ırkı yoktur" dedi' [CHP Deputy Chairman Algan Hacaloglu, during an interview with Van TV, stated "The Kurdish problem is one of democracy and development. The state has no ethnicity, no race"] retrieved February 16, 2009 from <http://www.chp.org.tr/index.php?module=news&page=readmore&news_id=5583&sid=67c5bcd92c6e6a61f6862cde5812166c>

⁴ See for example the statement made by Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu, the chairman of the Great Union Party (BBP) in *Haber Aktuel* (n.d.) 'Türkiye'de Kürt sorunu yok, terör sorunu var' [There is no Kurdish problem, but terror problem in Turkey] retrieved February 16, 2009 from <http://www.haberaktuel.com/news_detail.php?id=2911&uniq_id=1234984820>

discursive constructions of the Kurdish question?” From a traditional perspective such an analysis can look into two types of such construction: how does the public define the Kurdish question and how does the state construct this problem? An analysis of the public discourse in this framework generally looks at how ‘the person on the street’ defines a certain problem and then makes inferences on the reasons and factors behind those definitions. This method involves polling (for the frequency of discourses) and larger-scale statistics, though it is also very susceptible to selection bias and it is practically impossible to infer the reasons behind every individual discourse if we sample a large section of the population.⁵ As for the state discourse, the general methodology used within the literature is to either analyze official declarations or conduct private interviews. In this method, most discourses elicited will be ‘guarded’ – that is there will be a considerable degree of censorship (in the case of official statements) or self-censorship (in the case of interviews), which takes away the spontaneity behind a discourse (which exposes a belief system), reducing them into functional speech-acts (which conceals a belief system). Moreover, in both of these cases, the discourses are produced as a result of a process initiated by the researcher; a process that is neither political nor related to decision-making.⁶

The level of analysis of this study therefore, is neither public discourse nor official statements; instead we look at ‘the best of both worlds’: the legislative discourse. By ‘legislature’ we mean a deliberative assembly (parliament or congress) with the power to pass, amend and repeal laws; and in our case, we are mainly concerned with cross-party groupings within such an assembly that share a common view. By ‘legislative discourse’ therefore, we can understand the

⁵ For an extended discussion on the limitations of polling within this context see: Weissberg, Robert (2002) *Polling, Policy and Public Opinion: The Case Against Heeding the “Voice of the People”* (New York: Palgrave)

⁶ An extended critique of elite interviewing can be found in: Breakwell, Glynis M, Sean Hammond and Chris Fife-Schaw (1995: *Research Methods in Psychology*. (London: Sage) and Frey, James H. and Sabine M. Oishi (1995): *How to Conduct Interviews by Telephone and in Person*. (London: Sage)

arguments and speeches made during a legislative session, including the primary speaker and the response of other legislators, often determined by their agenda and ideology (party affiliation) during the debate. By comparison to the public and state discourses, looking at the legislative discourse brings several advantages;

- Legislators are elected directly by the people. Therefore, a particular legislature shows us a good political cross-section of a country's electorate. They ideally (though not always) represent a particular political position, as well as their constituency. From this perspective a legislator's discourse is often both regional (in terms of constituency) and ideological (in terms of party affiliation)
- As opposed to the polling and interviewing methodologies used with the aforementioned approaches, discourses in a legislative setting are initiated as a part of a political-legislative process. From this perspective, the discourses are 'internally initiated' and are inherently 'political' and relate to a decision-making process
- The statistical sample derived from a legislature (number of legislators) is more manageable than all-out public polling; yet still the type and frequency (in percentage) of discourses are representative of a public discourse analysis.
- Both in public and state discourses, there is very little, or no counter-discourses challenging them; at least, such challenges take place over a very long period of time. In a legislative setting however, a particular discourse is immediately challenged by a counter-discourse and every discourse type has to 'survive' against others in a politically Darwinist setting. Although a legislature does not always challenge the hegemonic discourse (i.e. the homogeneity in mobilization behind the hegemonic discourse in the US Congress following 9/11 attacks), it can

nonetheless be introduced as a setting in which this is more likely to happen.

- Similarly, a legislative setting is one of the very few forums in which the hegemonic discourse (stance of the state and government) is pitted against a wide array of counter-hegemonic discourses. In that sense, a legislature gives the counter-hegemonic discourses a chance to weaken the hegemonic discourse and in some cases, help alter the political power relations in a country, although this is not always the case.

- While legislators ideally (but not always) represent ‘the people’, they tend to be better informed and ideally more educated on a given topic, than their average voter. This enables a legislator to defend the case of his/her constituents, with their words, but with more knowledge.

Therefore studying legislative discourse brings many methodological advantages. With respect to the primary case study of this work – Turkey’s Kurdish question – we are primarily interested in what makes a particular legislator define this question the way s/he does. In other words we look behind the type of a particular definition made by a legislator and try to understand why s/he has made such a discursive construction. For this, we look at two independent variables that act as the primary dividing lines in a legislature, namely a legislator’s party-affiliation (ideology) and their agenda⁷. Within this context, the research question of this work can be formulated as **“To what extent does a legislator’s ideology and agenda affect the way in which s/he defines and talks about the Kurdish question in Turkey?”** Out of this question three hypotheses – that will be tested through this work – come out:

⁷ I define agenda differently in each legislature. For the European Parliament agenda is defined as a legislator’s country, for the US Congress this is defined as Congressional caucus memberships and for the TGNA agenda is defined as representing the emergency-regions. A more detailed theoretical discussion on the influence ideology, space/territory and agenda on discourse will be provided in the theory chapter

1- Legislators who are members to a politically liberal party, define the Kurdish question along the lines of democracy and human rights, whereas those who side with more conservative parties do so along the lines of security and terrorism

2- If a legislator comes from a district in which the Kurdish question is a major issue, s/he will define the problem along the lines of democracy and human rights, whereas if a legislator's constituency has no Kurdish awareness, s/he will construct the problem along the lines of security and terrorism.

3- If a legislator is a member to a commission or caucus that has an agenda related to or involving the Kurdish question, s/he will define the problem along the lines of democracy and human rights whereas if a legislator is not a member to such a commission or caucus, s/he will define the problem as one of security and terrorism

For this analysis, three legislative settings are chosen. These are the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA), the US Congress and the European Parliament, due to the fact that Turkey, United States and the European Union have been the most involved parties in the Kurdish problem in Turkey. The rationale for the selection of these three legislatures will be provided within the historical/contextual debate in the next chapter (Chapter 2).

In this Chapter, I will present power, function and policy asymmetries between these three legislatures and introduce my methodology.

1. Power, function and policy asymmetries: The US Congress, the EU Parliament and the Turkish Grand National Assembly

As the focus of analysis of this work is legislative discourse in the US, EU and Turkey, it is necessary to layout the differences in procedure and function within the legislatures of within these bodies. Here a discussion on the procedure, function and power asymmetries between these three legislatures will be laid down, with a special emphasis on the effect of such asymmetries on the floor discussions.

The US Congress is the only bicameral legislature (the Senate and the House of Representatives) of the three legislatures analyzed, whereas both the EU Parliament and Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) are unicameral. All three however, are comprised of legislators chosen through direct elections. Population allocates the 435 seats in the US House of Representatives among the US states, where every legislator represents one district for two years; in the Senate on the other hand, 100 seats are allocated where every state has two senators regardless of their population, each serving for a six-year term. The European Parliament on the other hand – together with the Council of the European Union – forms the highest legislative body within the EU, although its capabilities are limited to those allowed by the member states to the European Community. The EP consists of 785 Members of the European Parliament (MEPs), who serve as the second largest democratic electorate in the world (after India) and the largest ‘trans-national democratic electorate’ in the world (342 million eligible voters as of 2004). The TGNA too, is a unicameral body, which possesses sole legislative powers conferred upon by the Turkish Constitution. 550 members of the parliament are elected for a five-year term based on a D’Hondt

party-list proportional representation system from 85 electoral districts representing 81 administrative provinces of Turkey (Istanbul is divided into three, Ankara and Izmir are divided into two electoral districts due to their high populations). Unlike the US Congress and the EP, TGNA operates on a ‘10% wall’, which prevents parties that win less than 10% of the general votes to win seats in the TGNA. Aiming to prevent political fragmentation, the ‘10% wall’ caused only two parties in 2002 elections and three parties in 2007 elections to win parliament seats.⁸

In terms of power and capabilities, the US Congress holds all legislative power in the United States. The House and the Senate work closely in the legislative process, since legislation cannot be done without the approval of both houses. However, both the House and the Senate has unique powers conferred upon by the Constitution: the Senate is the sole legislative body that can ratify treaties and approve top presidential appointments, whereas the revenue-raising bills has to originate in the House, which also has the sole power of impeachment. The Senate on the other hand, can only try the impeachment cases originating from the House. While the European Parliament is a unicameral legislature, it is not the sole legislative organ of the EU; together with the Council of the European Union, the EP forms the bicameral legislative body of the Union. While the legislative power is distributed equally between both chambers, none of them has the legislative initiative (except the Council has some power in inter-governmental affairs), which is reserved for the European Commission (the executive). Therefore, while the Parliament can

⁸ These figures are compiled from the following sources:

For the US Congress: Tiefer, Charles (1989) *Congressional Practice and Procedure: A Reference, Research and Legislative Guide* (New York: Greenwood Press)

For the EU Parliament: The European Parliament website information on the composition of the legislature (accessed February 19, 2009):

<http://europa.eu/institutions/inst/parliament/index_en.htm>

For the Turkish Grand National Assembly: *The Constitution of the Republic of Turkey*, articles 75 – 101. An English version is available online at the Directorate General of Press and Information, Office of the Prime Minister (accessed on February 19, 2009):

<http://www.byegm.gov.tr/mevzuat/anayasa/anayasa-ing.htm>

amend and reject legislation or make a proposal, it is the Commission that drafts the bill before it can come into effect. Yet, the real power of the EP lies in its indirect influence, through non-binding resolutions and committee hearings that are open to the media with the presence of a large community of Brussels-based journalists and media members, rendering the EP debates central in the global inquiry on 'what the Europe thinks'.⁹ Also, the EP exerts considerable weight on the external relations of the EU by approving developmental and financial grants. With regard to TGNA, its basic functions are to enact, change and repeal laws. It is also the primary body that approves the annual budget and the draft law on the final accounts, as well as ratifying international agreements, proclaiming amnesties and pardons, decide upon the execution of death sentences and declare war. Additionally, the Council of Ministers also has to acquire the authorization by the TGNA to issue governmental decrees.

The United States Congress stands out as the most powerful of the three legislatures analyzed, both in terms of its role in checking the executive power and maintaining military forces.¹⁰ The influence of the Congress on the executive branches has varied from one period to another; the main factors generally being the leadership and organization within the Congress and the personality of the President.¹¹ In terms of foreign policy, the Congress can either respond to Presidential initiatives or initiate a decision-making process on its own through resolutions and policy statements, legislative directives, legislative pressure, funding denials, informal advice and policy oversight. The strongest Congressional tools on Turkey's Kurdish question have been military aid – sale denials and political resolutions that condemned Turkey in its dealings with the

⁹ Morgan, David (1999) *The European Parliament, Mass Media and Search for Power and Influence* (London: Ashgate) pp. 2-3

¹⁰ See for example US Constitution, article 39 on the 'War Powers of the Congress'

¹¹ Lindsay, James 'The Shifting Pendulum of Power: Executive-Legislative Relations on American Foreign Policy' p. 166

Kurds; two areas of legislative influence that left Turkish decision-makers frequently angry and the US executive branch frustrated in the 1990s. The European Union's main leverage points over external relations (Turkey in particular) on the other hand, have been putting pressure on the European Commission on Turkey's accession process, through issuing resolutions and formal opinions before the members of the global media stationed in Brussels, manipulating the agenda of the legislative debates towards political ends. Additionally, the European Parliament also has considerable influence over accession partnership loans and grants, however none of the tangible and monetary influence had more impact on the EU – Turkey relations than the EP's huge impact in shaping debate and the European discourse on Turkey, especially along the lines of 'oppressor' and the 'oppressed'. The Turkish Parliament's influence over Turkey's relations with the US and the EU too, have been two-fold: First, it had the authority to further or end the tenure and presence of the NATO force stationed in Turkey, close the US airbase in Incirlik and denounce the no-fly zone established and executed by the United States and the United Kingdom in order to protect the Kurds in northern Iraq against Saddam's attacks. All three policy items have been vital for the United States and to a lesser extent, the EU in furthering their strategic interests in the Middle East and through much of the 1990s. In many ways the TGNA held a strategic leverage point against its counterparts in Washington and Brussels and took the United States and the European Union 'hostage' through its key role in ending or continuing these military assets. From this perspective, it is well arguable that especially the US President, military and foreign service struggled very hard to retain those assets, often entering into direct political confrontation with the US Congress. A second strength of the TGNA has been its power to shape the discourse on the 'West', influencing the perception and 'how people talk about' the United States and the European Union in Turkey. The Assembly's indirect influence over pro or anti-American and European discourses

became much stronger after the Assembly debates were broadcast live through 'TBMM-TV', launched in January 1994.

2. On the methodology of this work

This doctoral study looks at the legislative discourse instead of media or state discourses for the following reasons. First, a foreign ministry or state/government statement might give a good impression on how a country's policy preferences are, but it is monolithic and often lacks variety, since it often becomes subject to careful censorship and re-writing. From this perspective, governmental statements are carefully worded speech-acts that aim to minimize 'reading between the lines' in order to expose as little belief and value statements as possible; therefore, they have little value for the type of discourse analysis that this study is interested in.¹² Media discourses on the other hand, do provide more variety than the official statements, however media discourses are supervised this time, by the director of publications or broadcasting and are highly vulnerable to 'editorialization', which generally kills the 'social' character of a discourse, ending up becoming the 'policy' of that particular media corporation or those of its executive committee.¹³ Moreover a single media discourse generally does not interact with its rival discourses (such as the discourse of other newspapers or broadcasting corporations) becoming nothing more than unchallenged speech acts, looking more like propaganda rather than part of a debate.¹⁴ In the limited cases where they do interact with other rival media discourses however, the process takes days, even weeks, like a snail-mail discussion. The parliamentary discourses on the other hand interact within a matter of minutes; a fact which makes such arguments interact in a more dynamic way and in a

¹² On this, see: Burton, Frank and Pat Carlen (1979) *On Discourse Analysis, Government Publications, Ideology and the State* (Oxford: Taylor & Francis) pp. 34-39

¹³ Talbot, Mary (2007) *Media Discourse: Representation and Interaction* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press) pp. 27-28

¹⁴ Giles, David (2003) *Media Psychology* (London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates) p. 211

more ‘heated’ fashion, not suffering from the ‘latency’ or ‘editorialization’ which is the case with media discourses, or ‘censorship’ which is the case with official statements. Therefore, the essential characteristic of a discourse; the support-opposition dynamics are far more visible in a legislative setting, offering a much better sample and set of independent variables than the media or government discourses.¹⁵

From the point of view of language use, the literature on political discourse differentiates between internal and external political communication, based on the setting and the communicative partners involved. Internal political communication would refer to all forms of discourse that concern the functioning of politics within political institutions, such as the governmental bodies, parties or other organizations.¹⁶ The texts in this context discuss political ideas, beliefs, and practices of a society or some part of it. The types of discourses analyzed in this dissertation are ‘internal’ in two ways: first, they are ‘domestic’ in direction (the target audience is domestic in terms political self-identification¹⁷ and second, they are ‘institutionally internal’, except in cases of inter-institutional communication (parliamentary exchanges with state/bureaucratic branches).

A linguistic analysis of political discourse in general and of political speeches in particular, can be most successful when it relates the details of linguistic behavior to political belief systems.

¹⁵ Bayley, Paul (2004) *Cross-cultural perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing) p. 87 and Steiner, Jurg (2004) *Deliberative Politics in Action: Analyzing Parliamentary Discourse* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) p. 165

¹⁶ Chilton, Paul Anthony and Christina Schaffner (2005) *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge) p. 92

¹⁷ In the case of the European Parliament, the political self-identification becomes rather ‘fuzzy’ since it is comprised of MEPs from different EU member countries. However, the direction of the speeches can be accepted as ‘internal’ within this respect since the Parliamentary speeches are made to an audience representing a ‘European community’.

This can be done from two perspectives: one can start from the linguistic micro-level and ask if specific structures – word choice, a specific syntactic structure – serve a particular purpose. Or, as done in this dissertation, one can start from the macro-level – the communicative situation and the function of a text (context) and ask which linguistic structures have been chosen to fulfill this function. For both perspectives, the political situations and processes can be linked to discourse types and levels of discourse organization by way of a connecting element: that of strategic functions (arguments). The most important of such strategic functions and argumentative methods are coercion, resistance, opposition-protest, dissimulation and legitimization /de-legitimization. Therefore, the primary concern of this study is this group of strategic functions: support-opposition, legitimization/de-legitimization and emphasis/de-emphasis.¹⁸

Based on these criteria, a discourse analysis can look into all levels and aspects of language, into pragmatics (the interaction amongst speakers and hearers),¹⁹ semantics (meanings, the structure of the lexicon), syntax (the internal organization of sentences),²⁰ phonology/phonetics (intonation, stress patterns, pauses).²¹ Here, we are concerned with the second level; semantics and lexicon. Lexicalization is a major and well-known domain of ideological expression and persuasion as the well-known ‘terrorist’ versus ‘freedom fighter’ pair suggests. To refer to the same persons, groups, social relations or social issues, language users generally have a choice of several words, depending on discourse genre, personal context (mood, opinion, perspective), social context (formality, familiarity, group membership, dominance relations) and socio-cultural

¹⁸ For more on the strategic functions of a discourse, see: van Dijk, Theun (1997) *Discourse as Social Interaction: A multidisciplinary introduction* (London: SAGE) pp. 205-230

¹⁹ See for example: Cutting, Joan (2002) *Pragmatics and Discourse* (London: Routledge) and Conolly, John, Roel Vismansm Christopher Butler and Richard Gatward (1997) *Discourse and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar* (Berlin: de Gruyter)

²⁰ Seuren, Pieter (1985) *Discourse Semantics* (Oxford: Blackwell)

²¹ Gibbon, Dafydd and Helmut Richter (1984) *Intonation, Accent and Rhythm: Studies in Discourse Phonology* (Berlin: de Gruyter)

context (language variants, sociolect, norms and values).²² Adding onto the individual analysis of a discourse in terms of its meaning and structure, this study makes a contribution to the field of discourse analysis and brings the time and frequency dimension, to show how (if) those discourses have changed over time in terms of context and rate of recurrence. This also helps us to see which particular events have been picked up on by the parliaments and triggered debates within it.²³

Therefore, ‘discourse’ as defined for the purposes of this dissertation is a) a strategic function (argument), and b) a context within which an argument is constructed. Within this framework, parts and phrases of a parliamentary speech are considered ‘discourse’, if they are arguments (criticism-defense / support-opposition) or and if those arguments are made within a specific context (human rights, democracy, ethnicity...) Such discourse materializes in politics through agenda-setting, policy-advertising and non-decision theories that will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3 on theory and methodology.

2. 1. Methodology Step 1: Data collection

Based on the definition of ‘discourse’ mentioned above, the analysis of this work included first, through entire debate records of the parliamentary sittings from January 1990 to December 1999: the most painful and difficult episode of the modern Kurdish problem in Turkey. With regard to electronic search function, the following queries are searched for within the body of the transcripts:

²² Brinton, Laurel and Elizabeth Coss Traugott (2005) *Lexicalization and Language Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) p. 11-21

²³ Time-frequency analyses are dealt with in the analysis chapter #6

"TURKEY" and "KURDS"
 "TURKEY" and "KURDISH"
 "TURKISH" and "KURDS"
 "TURKISH" and "KURDISH"

The overwhelming amount of search results were then individually read and sorted according to relevance. Debate sessions that were considered 'relevant' after conforming to the following criteria:

- 1- The topic of the debate is the situation of Kurds in Turkey
- 2- The topic of the debate is on the human rights and/or democratization situation in Turkey, that also makes references to the situation of the Kurds in Turkey
- 3- The topic of the debate is on the Iraqi Kurds, but references were made to Turkey's Kurds, or the Turkish state.
- 4- The debate is on an internal matter (budget appropriations, policy formulation...), but at least one legislator makes at least one extended intervention – approximately 200 words or an intervention solely directed towards the situation of the Kurds in Turkey.

The main sources for the legislative debates are as follows:

European Parliament:

European Parliament website (1998-1999)
 Library of the European Union - Delegation of the European Commission to the United States, Washington DC (1996-1998)
 European Parliament Archive and Documentation Centre (CARDOC) Luxembourg.

United States Congress

Lexis-Nexis Congressional online query system (1995-1999)

Library of the Congress, Washington DC (1991-1995)

Turkish Grand National Assembly

Assembly website; archive section (1994-1999)

TGNA Archive Library, Ankara (1991-1994)

2. 2. Methodology Step 2: Data evaluation

Chosen material was then subject to a second tier of evaluation; this time sentences and phrases within the debates were evaluated according to their 'discursive value', which is comprised of:

- strategic function (argument, assertion, proposal)
- evaluation of a strategic function (criticism-defense or support-opposition)
- context and theme (frequently recurring subjects, contexts and argumentative positions)

As with the last criterion, the discourse types or 'contexts in which parliamentarians talk about the Kurdish question' observed across all three parliaments are:

- human rights
- democracy/democratization
- excessive force/violence
- direct criticism of the Turkish army (as opposed to other elements of the security forces)
- Turkish territorial integrity
- intra-institutional criticism (i.e. European Parliament criticism of the Council)
- condemnation of the PKK

Including all of these discourse types, Turkish parliament also has unique discourse types such as educational-developmental discourses, criticism of foreign countries, legalistic discourses, ethnicity discourses and security discourses. Three of the chapters of the dissertation focus on these discourses types in-depth, analysing sub-discourses and variants within each of these categories through direct references to the debates. The dissertation will be the first study on the identification and categorisation of the discourses on the Kurdish question. In the analysis chapter

(#6) these discourse types will be analysed quantitatively.

The following is a sample speech evaluation, from Claudia Roth's statement during the European Parliament debate on March 10, 1994 as a response to the arrest of the Kurdish members of the Turkish Parliament.

Roth (V). – (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the military in Turkey have no further need of a putsch. The putsch has already been carried out. The Parliament has effected a putsch against itself by waiving the parliamentary immunity of Kurdish Members. It has stripped itself of its legitimacy. We see now that membership of a parliament no longer counts for anything. Those who voice criticism in Parliament are simply handed over to the police.

Criticism of Turkish democracy (Dem1)

Political matters are no longer discussed in Parliament. The general chief of staff mutters under his breath, 'there are traitors in the House'. Parliament, which is supposed to be sovereign, acts on orders from above. Members of

Criticism of Turkish military (TRmil)

Criticism of Turkish democracy (Dem1)

Criticism of Turkish democracy (Dem1)

the DEP Party were the last partners Turkish politicians had in their attempts to find a peaceful solution to the Kurdish issue. And now these last partners have been sent on their final journey to the scaffold. Parliament has abandoned control to the military planners in the general staff and stripped itself of its powers.

Dem 1

criticism of Human Rights practices (HR1)

Following the waiver of their immunity, the eight elected Members of Parliament, many of whom were old friends of ours, were arrested in front of the Parliament building and dragged away by state policemen as terrorists. This means that the Kurdish issue has finally been handed over to people with experience of these matters. I am referring to the death squads who murder scores of people in the Kurdish areas every day, military personnel who set fire to villages and drive farmers out and policemen who torture people to death in torture chambers. The PKK guerillas will not simply stand by and let this happen. They will be planting bombs as they are sucked into the terrible spiral of violence.

criticism for excessive use of force (ExF)

TRmil

criticism of PKK terrorism (PKK-t)

ExF, HR1

ExF, HR1

My Turkish friend, Ömer Erzeren, said in an article, 'Turkish politicians will succeed in creating a Yugoslavian situation in Turkey. In fact they are doing all they can to push the country towards civil war – step by step. The PKK will not lag behind. Ultimately we will have only two murderous parties. In the end, these crazy people will succeed in turning this country into a blood-bath'.

(oppression) Excessive Force ExF

PKK-t

After analysing the speeches, the collected discourse types adopted in that particular sitting are sorted in number according to parties (and countries -EP- or caucus affiliations -US Congress). Here's a sample 'discourse activity' chart of the Motherland Party of the Turkish parliament from May 25, 1995 to April 21, 1996.

	HR	Dem	Ethn	Law	Sec	Ed-Dev	Foreign	iTRc	SF/VG	ExE
25 May 1995					1			2		
30 May 1995										
07 June 1995		1			2			2		
21 June 1995					1			1		
23 June 1995										
27 June 1995					5	1 1	4	8		
11 July 1995	1			1		2		2		1
01 October 1995										
03 October 1995										
10 October 1995										
13 October 1995					3			2		
27 October 1995		1		1	1		2		1	
28 October 1995	1			3	1		6	6	1	
11 March 1995										
13 November 1995										
16 April 1996										
17 April 1996					1					
18 April 1996		1		1		1	1			
20 April 1996							3			
21 April 1996						1				

The colour-coded discourse activity graph helps identifying strategic functions mentioned in the theory party, which are support/opposition and legitimization/de-legitimization. With this particular case red indicates criticism; pink indicates legitimization/emphasis and cyan indicates de-legitimization/de-emphasis. The reader will be able to find more detail on how this data is collected and coded in the Appendix section.

Although I have introduced my practical methodology here, this method rests upon four separate theoretical pillars that explain the role of language in politics from different, yet relevant perspectives. These are:

- 1) **Discourse theory:** How ‘statements’ and ‘utterances’ constitute sequences and ‘habitats’ that signify repeatable relations to objects and subjects. Within the Kurdish case, such ‘habitats’ and ‘sequences’ have been polarized along two main axes throughout the 1990s; one conveying a more restrictive-control-oriented sense of the conflict, whereas the other one emphasizing liberties and emancipation. These two poles are also discussed in Chapter 3, where I explain that such poles of consciousness is the central schism in politics; one being the State consciousness, whereas the other has been the consciousness of the ‘non-State’.
- 2) **Speech-act theory:** How individual utterances reflect the wider discursive ‘habitat’ and how unuttered or indirectly uttered statements are transformed to meaning. This theory is critical in terms of the main methodology I use through the empirical chapters and inform the reader about the way in which I analyzed the legislative texts and transcripts in question.
- 3) **Agenda-setting/policy-advertising theory:** This theory explains ‘why do we care about what people say in a legislature?’. This theoretical strand conveys the reader how certain discursive habitats establish hegemony over others through the control of the legislative floor, hence influencing ‘what people hear’, establishing invisible rules over ‘what can be said and not said’. This is especially important with regard to the legislatures whose floor sessions are broadcast live, where the legislators can have considerable effect on how their constituents speak about the Kurdish question, affecting wider social discourse.
- 4) **Non-decision theory:** Linked to the agenda-setting theory, this approach explains how the control of the floor by a particular discursive ‘habitat’ establishes rules and norms about ‘how to talk about’ the Kurdish question, causing rival habitats to refrain from competing and challenging the hegemonic discourse.

These four theoretical approaches explain how utterances at the legislative floor creates the wider discourse on the Kurdish question and how such discourse creates invisible policy areas and power relations with regard to the problem at hand. These theories will be discussed in Chapter 3.

The rest of this dissertation is comprised of five other chapters. The next chapter (Chapter 2) is a presentation of the theoretical background of this study: linguistic relativism, where I will provide a discussion of the discourse theory, speech-act theory and agenda-setting/policy advertising theories and how they relate to the following chapters. Additionally, the theoretical chapter will focus exclusively on power theory, looking at Hobbesian and post-Hobbesian variants and how executive-legislative discourse tensions affect such understandings of power. Chapter 3 focuses on the European Parliament and how members of the European Parliament (MEPs) have discursively constructed the Kurdish question in their debates. Chapter 4 deals with the US Congress discourse on the Kurdish question, looking at the Senate and the House of Representatives debates together. Chapter 5 brings Turkish Grand National Assembly into the picture and seeks to identify how Turkish parliamentarians have perceived the Kurdish question with special emphasis on party identification and government – opposition dynamics. Chapter 6 brings together data collected from the preceding three chapters and analyzes them using quantitative methodology (statistics, cross-tabulations, time-frequency graphs) in a comparative fashion. Chapter 8 will wrap up the findings and provide conclusions.

CHAPTER 2

Theoretical overview: The State, the non-State and political language

“If language is not correct, then what is said is not what is meant; if what is said is not what is meant, then what must be done remains undone.” – Confucius

“People know what they do; frequently they know why they do what they do; but what they don’t know is what what they do does”. – Michel Foucault

The Kurdish question in Turkey has many competing definitions, most of which are often mutually exclusive. This means that, a person who defines the Kurdish question as one of ‘human rights’ or ‘a problem of democracy’ will generally oppose to the definition of this problem as one of ‘separatism’ or ‘terrorism’, whereas in return, the definition of the Kurdish question as one of ‘terrorism’ categorically dismisses and trivializes democracy and human rights definitions of it. Moreover, all of these definitions are linked to a corresponding belief on ‘how the Kurdish problem can be solved’ that are also mutually exclusive, ranging from establishing Kurdish as the second official language in the predominantly Kurdish cities, to extending emergency measures and curfews in the same provinces. Among these competing definitions and ‘prescriptions’ several of them can be characterized within the context of the ‘consciousness of authority’ (state-government discourse or hegemonic discourse) whereas some others can be dubbed as the ‘consciousness of opposition’ (counter-hegemonic discourse). As Chapter 5 on the Turkish Grand National Assembly will show in detail, a particular legislator’s discourse on and definition of the Kurdish question shifts not according to his-her party ideology, but whether that party is a part of the government or opposition. In many ways, with regard to the Kurdish conflict in particular and many other intra-state conflicts in general, it is possible to observe distinct languages of

‘authority’ and ‘opposition’ in strict separation from each other. Here, with regard to the Kurdish problem in Turkey, as well as other intra-state conflicts, **we argue that, while foreign observers’ discourse on such conflicts take shape along ideology-political agenda axis, the discourse within the particular country that suffers from the conflict takes its form along the lines of hegemony and opposition.**²⁴

This chapter is divided into two sections. In the first section we will deal with the theory of the State – power and hegemony and then the theory of social politics – liberty and emancipation. I argue that the discourse on Turkey’s Kurdish question (in Turkey and also in the US and Europe) takes shape along these two consciousnesses; that of the State and that of emancipation and by looking at the classical literature on these two types of political consciousness, it will be much easier to make sense of why the legislators talk about this question the way they do – often unwittingly. In the second section we will be looking at how these two consciousnesses are operationalized through speech, which in the longer run constructs the body of linguistic norms that affect policy-making, agenda setting or policy discourse on the Kurdish question.

1. Philosophical aspects: The consciousness of the State and of the non-State

As the thesis of this work stipulates that *a political agent* (in our case, a legislator) *adopts a more emancipatory discourse as s-he functions within the realm of the ‘political’ and adopts a more restricting stance as s-he moves towards the realm of the ‘politics’ or ‘state’*, this chapter will first look at the theoretical development of these two types of political consciousness: restriction and emancipation in politics. In the later chapters, it will be easier to see these two types of political stances in play throughout the legislative debates. In chapters 3, 4 and 5 we deal

²⁴ This is one of the main hypotheses tested in the analysis chapter

with the interaction between the ‘state’ discourse and its rival discourses in the European Parliament, US Congress and the Turkish National Assembly. Irrespective of the political community that a legislature represents (be it ‘American’, ‘Turkish’ or ‘European’) I argue that legislators talk through specific consciousness points (I call them ‘the consciousness of authority’ or that of ‘non-authority’) that follow an observable pattern. Even though agents who speak through such points of consciousness change over time, these points themselves never change and can be observed through chronologically and spatially distinct events. The first of these two points of consciousness is the ‘authority’, ‘power’ or ‘the State’, which speaks the language of order and discipline. We will first look at how power and the State have been theoretically constructed in political history along the lines of Machiavelli – Hobbes and Weber; then we shall look into the second point of consciousness which is the ‘non-authority’, ‘resistance’ and ‘freedom’, which speaks the language of emancipation and see how it is formed along the lines of contractualist and liberal thinkers.

1.1. The State and power in politics: Machiavelli – Hobbes – Weber

I argue that a legislator adopts a more restrictive-limiting discourse as it functions in the realm of the state and authority. This is more a result of the nature of power, than particular ideological beliefs that a legislator may have, and in this section I discuss the theoretical construction of the ‘authority’ and what it regards as important. Without this theoretical background, it will be impossible to make sense of Turkish state approaches to the Kurdish question; both the US Congress and the EU Parliament had trouble understanding the motives behind this approach through the 1990s. An inquiry on the nature of hegemony in politics becomes rather void when an operational definition of the ‘state’ is not made, since hegemony operates from the ‘altar’ of

power, which brings questions of obligation and *raison d'être*. In many ways, the state speaks through the consciousness of having power and authority (and sometimes, responsibility), irrespective of the institutions and agents functioning under it. Indeed, trying to define the state through its components requires a certain degree of selectivism; as Bartelson warns:

“the concept of the state cannot be fully determined by the character of its semantic components or by its inferential connections to other concepts, since it is the concept of the state that draws these components together into a unity and gives theoretical significance to other concepts on the basis of their inferential and metaphorical connections to the concept of the state, rather than conversely.”²⁵

In many ways when one thinks about states, s-he tends to take them at face value. They are simply thought of as entities signified by names such as the ‘Turkish state’ or ‘American decision-makers’, as if such entities are monolithic, closed systems that have perfect communication within them, always acting like a single unit. This monolithic approach considers the ‘state’ like a massive ship, operated by many people with different ranks and duties, yet has a single direction and a single purpose. This taken-for-granted analogy of the state as a monolithic entity is a result of the historical construction of the state as a transcendental, unreachable and unquestionable entity, able to intervene into everyday lives of its citizens, but far from those citizens’ reach, operated by ‘special’ people with a certain degree of opaqueness that feeds the illusion of sacredness and enigma of power. On this Bob Jessop says:

“Everyday language sometimes depicts the state as a subject – the state does, or must do, this or that. Sometimes it treats the state as a thing – this economic class, social stratum, political party or official case uses the state to pursue its projects of interests. But the state is neither a subject nor a thing. So how could the state act as if it were a unified subject and what could constitute its unity as a ‘thing’?”²⁶

The existence and functions of a state are almost always justified by depicting it as an order

²⁵ Bartelson, Jens (2001) *The Critique of the State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) p. 2

²⁶ Jessop, Bob (2008) *State Power: A Strategic-Relational Approach* (Cambridge: Polity) p. 3

imposed upon a perceived disorder – that the society is inherently anarchic, and states are needed to impose a certain kind of order upon them. Indeed, what makes a state ‘sovereign’ has been traditionally depicted as the human necessity to be ‘guided’ by a superior power that can maintain order and avoid violence.

In many ways, the modern understanding of ‘the State’ and authority retains many elements of Thomas Hobbes’ *Leviathan*. Also it is well arguable that the Turkish state – unwittingly – had acquired a Hobbesian character in the 1990s towards the Kurdish question.²⁷ Hobbes’ understanding of the state was the ultimate authority and nodus of coercion,²⁸ which exerted sovereignty based on contract²⁹ (although Hobbes cannot be regarded as a ‘contractualist’ in the sense it is most commonly understood and his understanding of contract was not similar to the ‘social contract’ of Rousseau or Locke) where the state is given legitimacy and authority by the society so that it can exert central authority and prevent anarchy and civil war.³⁰ It must also be highlighted that Hobbes had authored the *Leviathan* during the English civil war between 1642 – 1651; a setting of anarchy similar to that experienced in Turkey’s southeast in the 1990s, which might give a better understanding of the reasons behind the unwittingly Hobbesian discourse of the Turkish state. From that perspective the Hobbesian definition of the *Leviathan* did come into expression as the Turkish state during the 1990s, while many legislators had unwittingly adopted a

²⁷ This will be discussed in depth in Chapter 5.

²⁸ “For the laws of nature, as justice, equity, modesty, mercy and, in sum, doing to others as we would be done to, of themselves, without the terror of some power to cause them to be observed, are contrary to our natural passions [...].” Hobbes, Thomas (1976 – reprint –) *Leviathan* (New York: Forgotten Books) p. 116

²⁹ “The mutual transferring of right is that which men call contract”. Ibid. p. 91

³⁰ “That the condition of mere nature, that is to say, of absolute liberty, such as is theirs that neither are sovereigns nor subjects, is anarchy and the condition of war: that the precepts, by which men are guided to avoid that condition, are the laws of nature: that a Commonwealth without sovereign power is but a word without substance and cannot stand: that subjects owe to sovereigns simple obedience in all things wherein their obedience is not repugnant to the laws of God [...]”. Ibid. p. 241

Hobbesian definition of ‘how the state should be’ as a response to the Kurdish question. Of course, Hobbes’ assumptions on the human nature play a big role in his definition of the role and legitimacy of the state; to him, the human nature was essentially “poor, nasty, brutish and short”³¹ and without a Leviathan, human nature would bring a state of chaos – *bellum omnium contra omnes*³² and it was only through the Leviathan that the ‘brutish’ human nature could be suppressed: hence the legitimacy of the state. Hence, Hobbes argued that ‘lesser individuals’ should cede their rights to the state willingly in order to get protection, where this willingness is signified by a hypothetical contract, which in return, is the materialization of the legitimacy of the state.³³ Within this definition, Hobbes argued that any abuses committed by the state, were not ‘injustices’ per se, but ‘iniquity’ that will have to be overlooked since the state in question is there through the will of the person who claims injury.³⁴ This was certainly the sense of Turkish nationalist consciousness as channeled into the TGNA debates through the 1990s via the Nationalist Action Party (MHP) and True Path Party (DYP). Thomas Hobbes had also constructed a sovereignty definition along the lines of absolute monarchy which is the centre of every type of enforcement (legal, religious, military...) and where the sovereign must be the highest authority not bound by any laws³⁵. This was one of the most frequent criticisms directed towards both the

³¹ Ibid. p. 86

³² “Hereby it is manifest that during the time men live without a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called war; and such a war as is of every man against every man”. Ibid. p. 86

³³ “The other, is when men agree amongst themselves to submit to some man, or assembly of men, voluntarily, on confidence to be protected by him against all others”. Ibid. p. 119

³⁴ “[...] because every subject is by this institution author of all the actions and judgments of the sovereign instituted, it follows that whatsoever he doth, can be no injury to any of his subjects; nor ought he to be by any of them accused of injustice. For he that doth anything by authority from another doth therein no injury by him y whose authority he acteth: but by this institution of a Commonwealth every particular man is author of all the sovereign doth; and consequently he that complaineth of injury from his sovereign complaineth of that whereof he himself is author, and therefore ought not to accuse any man but himself; no, nor himself of injury, because to do injury to oneself is impossible. It is true that they that have sovereign power may commit iniquity, but not injustice or injury in the proper signification”. Ibid. p. 122

³⁵ “For the sovereign is absolute over both alike; or else there is no sovereignty at all, and so every man may lawfully protect himself, if he can, with his own sword, which is the condition of war”. Ibid. p. 143

Turkish state discourse and practice towards the Kurds through the 1990s, where the state had equipped itself with every possible enforcement tool into the region, attempting to exert the highest level of control. Most specifically, the ‘emergency rule super-governors’ (discussed in more detail in chapter 5) in charge of the most violent cities of the south-east, had followed a different set of laws, rendering the position of the super-governorate less vulnerable to constitutional checks and balances and were also able to project the fullest extent of the state’s security apparatus into the region, unwittingly following the Hobbesian prescription of state power.

Together with Hobbes, Machiavelli had also established the fundamentals of state power in classical literature; it was these two scholars that have made the ontological shift from ‘what ought to be’ to ‘what is’ in political analysis. The ‘continuity of the state’ (*devletin bekası*), which is historically set as the *raison d’être* of Turkish state (*raison d’état*), was first introduced as *sacrosanct* in Machiavelli’s writings. He asserted that the ‘Prince’ could act against the preset norms of conduct (religion, tradition, ethics) if the continuity of the state is in danger,³⁶ a suggestion that the Turkish state had unwittingly followed (and the executive branches in the United States and Europe apparently ‘understood’) through much of the 1990s. In many ways, the source of Machiavellian governance and state shares Hobbesian elements of an evil human nature³⁷ according to which the state would have to formulate policies and put its continuity before

³⁶ “It must be understood that a prince, and especially a new prince, cannot observe all those things which are considered good in men, being often obliged, in order to maintain the state, to act against faith, against charity, against humanity and against religion”. Machiavelli, Niccolo (1964 - reprint) *The Prince* (New York: St. Martin’s Press) XVIII, p. 69

³⁷ “[...] it is necessary to whoever disposes a republic and order laws in it to presuppose that all men are bad, and they always have to use the malignity of their spirit whenever they have a free opportunity for it”. Machiavelli, Niccolo (1883 – reprint) *Discourses on the First Decade of Titus Livius* (London: K. Paul, Trench & Co.) Book I, p. 15

anything else.³⁸ This is concept of continuity (*devletin bekası*) is perhaps the most important independent variable explaining the discourse and practice of the Turkish state, as it had structured all of its policies and utterances concerning the Kurdish question around the primary goal of protecting the safety and continuity of the state. This protection of course, was extended to all symbols and representatives of the state, setting the protection of the state personnel (security forces, teachers, civil servants...), state buildings and vehicles as the primary goal in all events regarding the Kurds in the southeast.

The next step from the Hobbes-Machiavelli node of state-centric theory that explains Turkish state approach towards the Kurds has been the Weberian theory as stipulated in *Politik als Beruf* (Politics as a Vocation) lecture he gave in 1919. Here Weber makes his most influential definition of the state as a monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force (*Gewaltmonopol des Staates*)³⁹ and politics as “any activity in which the state might engage itself in order to influence the relative distribution of force”⁴⁰ establishing power and force as the *raison d’être* of a state. Human nature was also a central assumption in Weberian politics. Weberian state was powerful – like Hobbes’ – and should have controlled three types of power as determined by the relationship between the governor and the governed: namely charismatic power (dynastic, religious), traditional (feudal-monarchic) power and legal (bureaucratic-constitutional) power, all of which explain a different aspect of state sovereignty.⁴¹ Weber had also made one of the most widely cited definitions of domination and authority (*Herrschaft*), which was closely linked to power (*macht*); two central

³⁸ Ibid. Book I. pp. 49-40

³⁹ “Nowadays, in contrast, we must say that the state is the form of human community that lays claim to the monopoly of legitimate physical violence within a particular territory – and this idea of ‘territory’ is an essential defining feature”. Weber, Max (2004 – reprint) *The Vocation Lectures: Science As a Vocation, Politics As A Vocation* (Indianapolis: Hacknett Publishing) p. 33

⁴⁰ Ibid p. 33

⁴¹ Ibid. p. 34

terms in Weberian politics. Weber's understanding of power was 'the ability to accomplish a goal, despite resistance and get others to do what one wants them to do', whereas authority of domination defined a situation in which individuals are perceived by the general population to be the rightful and legitimate bearers of power.⁴² In other words, while Weberian *macht* was the ability to coerce actors to do something, *Herrschaft* contained the additional quality of consent – 'bedrock' of politics in democratic and non-democratic regimes alike.⁴³

The Hobbes-Machiavelli-Weber axis defines the consciousness of power, as I will discuss throughout this dissertation. This consciousness explains Turkish state behaviour towards and its discourse on the Kurdish question in Turkey, as well as the responses of the European and American executive organs. Such a power/state consciousness has several characteristics: First, it perceives itself as the legitimate wielder of power and the hub of everything that relates to control and coercion. Second, such a perception is structured upon an imaginary understanding of a mutual contract (again, not to be confused with Lockean or Rousseauian social contract), from which the state exerts coercion 'for the people'. This notion is further reinforced by democratic elections and boasting an image of a state based on free will, yet the same state also considers itself 'above party politics', remaining effectively outside the realm of 'the political', but still benefiting from the democratic legitimacy in question only for the political party system that it so intently tries to stay away from. Third, the primary external aim of this consciousness is to avoid civil war and disorder and to suppress it as soon as possible no matter the costs and consequences;

⁴² Ibid. p. 34

⁴³ Ibid. p. 35

if misconduct and excesses happen during this process, they are justified for the sake of the continuity of the state. Fourth, while the state structures itself on the will and consent of the people, it is also highly suspicious and pessimistic about the character and nature of these citizens. The same citizens are considered valiant and good when rendering the state with a legitimacy to enforce power, but through the rest of the time, they are “solitary, nasty and brutish”; hence the state’s perceived responsibility to ‘herd’ the flock so that they don’t become *homo homini lupus*. Fifth, the state has no higher (i.e. divine) power to answer to (especially true in regimes that followed a 19th century German nationalist-secularist state building process like Turkey) and is both ‘absolute’ and ‘perpetual’. Sixth, the state’s primary reason of existence is survival and continuity (*devletin bekası*), which is above any other function and role that the state might exercise. This is the rock around which the codex of the state’s ‘interests’ is structured and the state can disregard ethical, religious or traditional values and virtues if these interests are in danger. Seventh, the state does not pursue best possible alternative among options, and instead focuses on trying to avoid the worst-case scenario since any situation or institution has evil concealed in it that will render the best option less than the best option. Finally, the state consciousness operates in a Westphalian system (despite the end of the Cold War), where it is respectful of other states’ sovereignty and territorial integrity. From that perspective, states are empathic and understanding of the driving forces behind other states’ actions and do not object to other states’ behavior that falls into any of the seven categories above. A state behavior is objectionable only when it fails to provide protection for its citizens.

1.2. Language of the ‘non-state’ and emancipation: Locke – Kant

The above section was an overview of the ‘consciousness of power’ as I will discuss

throughout this doctoral work. Such a consciousness is behind what I will refer as the ‘state discourse’ and is important to understand and define this consciousness before one can understand how a state talks about certain issues and why; most notably if the question is one of a violent domestic conflict. In this section, I will provide an overview of the non-state, counter-hegemonic or emancipatory consciousness in politics, in order to understand the dynamics behind such discourses.

Language of the ‘political’ is the articulation of the governed (as opposed to the governing); the society and/or the consciousness that does not accept and identify with and/or resist the hegemonic discourse and the language of the state/sovereign. The idea of counter-hegemony starts with the ‘invention’ of citizenship and the subsequent introduction of the concept of ‘private sphere’ and private ownership, which is independent of, and autonomous from the affairs of the sovereign, where individuals can enjoy a certain level of freedom. The collectivized version of the private sphere then evolved into ‘civil society’ in the writings of Rousseau, Locke and Kant, laying the foundations of the ‘liberal’ or emancipatory rhetoric in politics. In many ways, the language of counter-hegemony resists the ‘pastor-shepherd’ analogy made by Foucault, in critique of the state-centric approaches to politics.⁴⁴ An overarching stance of this philosophy is that the state is not an end in itself, but is purely functional; it has to serve the common good of the society and should be carefully checked so that it does not come into a power-abusing status quo. This line of argument can be clearly observed as a distinct pattern in the counter-hegemonic discourses within the Turkish parliament, as well as the EU Parliament and the US Congress. Proponents of this view have frequently argued that the Turkish state practices towards the Kurds in southeast

⁴⁴ Foucault notion of ‘pastor-shepherd’ analogy has been best interpreted in the introduction of: Carrette, Jeremy R. (ed.,) (1999) *Religion and Culture by Michel Foucault* (Manchester: Manchester University Press) pp. 122-123

Turkey have been state-centric, in such a way that the Turkish state had put the well-being of its own elements (such as the security forces) than that of the local citizens.

It is therefore important to understand that citizenship historically had an important self-governance element to it, which was repeatedly suppressed by the hegemony, reducing citizenship to a legal term that implied protection by the state. In other words citizenship, in its original form implied self-governance and self-rule, whereas states had later altered the original citizenship definition to functional-legal terms, most notable of justifications being ‘preventing anarchy’. This of course, has been an observable pattern in Turkish state statements, invariably justifying any policy and practice with regard to the Kurds as ‘preventing lawlessness and anarchy’. Similar to state theory, civil-liberal scholarship as the literature discusses today had the considerable portion of its theoretical underpinnings in the 17th-18th century European political philosophy. Here I will refer to the scholarship of what is called the ‘contractualists’ John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Immanuel Kant.

John Locke had structured his notion of the state on the social contract framework and conceded that the primary duty of the state was to protect the citizens.⁴⁵ However, Locke made a clear distinction between the protection by the king in exchange for relinquishing self-rule rights and protection by the king as the duty of the sovereign even though the citizens had exercised self-rule.⁴⁶ Also Locke’s social contract was based on a more different understanding of human nature

⁴⁵ “The king binds himself by a double oath, to the observation of the fundamental laws of his kingdom – tacitly, as by being a king, and so bound to protect as well the people as the laws of his kingdom [...]”. Locke, John (1980 – reprint) *Second Treatise of Government* (London: Hackett Publishing) XVIII, p. 101

⁴⁶ “[...] for I do acknowledge, that the special and greatest point of difference that is between a rightful king and an usurping tyrant, is this, that whereas the proud and ambitious tyrant doth think his kingdom and people are only ordained for stisfaction of his desires and unreasonable appetites, the righteous and just king doth by the contrary acknowledge himself to be ordained for the procuring of the wealth and property of his people”. Ibid. XVIII. p. 102

than Hobbes', which is a 'natural community' in which everyone recognizes their natural rights and duties from which an agreement can be made with regard to governance, as opposed to a highly anarchic setting with a potential to lead to civil war.⁴⁷ In this 'natural community' the people – Locke argued – should not be passive in terms of waiting the state to respond to civil conflicts, but had the duty to form a 'civil society' that would hold the state in check and utilize its legislative organs in the solution of such civil conflicts.⁴⁸ Locke had also argued that political obligation was individualist and consent-based. In that sense people had the obligation to bear allegiance to a government, not by birth, but once they actually give their consent. Express and tacit consent are actual, not hypothetical.⁴⁹ This issue has been a very critical aspect of emancipatory critics of the Turkish state practices towards the Kurds, often alleging the Turkish government to impose a hypothetical citizenship and requirement of obedience upon the Kurdish citizens. Also, unlike Hobbesian power, Locke had felt a need to restrain the governmental authority. In his terms, the state should have to be restrained by a fundamental law; the Legislature, which, in turn, would have to be restrained by the very laws, it makes: "[the authority] is not, nor can possibly be, absolutely arbitrary over the lives and fortunes of the people"⁵⁰; a point, which was frequently made by the European leftists against Turkey's Kurdish policy. Furthermore, power in Lockeian sense is a litmus test for the intentions of the ruler. In his logic, if a 'Prince' believes that he doesn't have enough authority or power, then what he is doing is not for

⁴⁷ "The first is to do whatsoever he things fit for the preservation of himself, and other within the permission of the law of nature: by which law, common to them all, he and all the rest of mankind are one community, make up one society, distinct from all other creatures. And were it not for the corruption and vitiousness of degenerate men, there would be no need of any other; no necessity that men should separate from this great and natural community, and by positive agreements combine into smaller and divided associations". Ibid. IX. P. 67

⁴⁸ "But though every man who has entered into civil society, and is become a member of any common-wealth, has thereby quitted his power to punish offences, against the law of nature, in prosecution of his own private judgement, yet with the judgement of offences, which he has given up to the legislative in all cases, where he can appeal to the magistrate, he has given a right to the common-wealth to employ his force [by] his representative". Ibid. VII. p. 47

⁴⁹ This is elaborate in depth in Ibid. I. § 3

⁵⁰ Ibid. XI. p. 70

the good of all people, since it doesn't require a lot of coercion to engage in policies that are beneficial to all: "Whatsoever cannot but be acknowledged to be of advantage to the society and people in general, upon just and lasting measures, will always, when done, justify itself".⁵¹ This was also a frequent idea behind the criticisms directed towards the Turkish state, accusing it for exerting unnecessary and excessive force upon the local Kurdish citizens.

Therefore, the civic-contractualist consciousness has the following elements: First, it regards the state or hegemon, in strictly functional terms; that is, the state should fulfill a function – be it protection, supervision of laws or act as a community of experts – without any restriction of social liberties and with the ultimate aim of providing a greater extent of freedom than the society may have without a state. Therefore in contractualist terms, the state serves the 'common good' of the society and not the other way around. Second, this consciousness idealizes that relationship between the state and society as one of cooperation – unlike statist consciousness that accepts the society as a 'flock' that needs to be 'herded'. In other words, the state and society must cooperate in egalitarian terms in order to establish a functional relationship with the aim of addressing the conflicts within the society. Third, the state exists only because the society gives legitimacy to it through mutual consent; without it, the state is meaningless and dysfunctional, and if the state pursues policies that favor its own existence, then the system turns into tyranny and cause state excesses. Four, power is only meaningful as long as it serves the interests of the liberty and freedom of the society and is a litmus test for the intentions of the ruler. Such exercise of state power will be minimal, if used correctly; if the state finds itself aiming to acquire more and more power to the extent that it limits the freedoms and liberties, then the aim for which such power is needed, is not in the interests of the 'common good'. Fifth, the will of the state should not be

⁵¹ Ibid. XIV. P. 83

enforced or coerced upon the society, but should play a guidance role, a policy option which the society may or may not approve; such guidance is only legitimate if the general will of the society expresses its consent upon it, since ‘common good’ can only be achieved in an inclusive-democratic society. Sixth, the civic consciousness does not share the statist view that the human nature is inherently ‘bad’. There are varying alternative interpretations to this in the literature, but this consciousness does not adopt the pessimistic notion of humanity; rather it either sees it as ‘good’ (as in Locke) or ‘chaotic, but manageable’ (as in Kant).

2. Theoretical aspects: How does the consciousness of the State and emancipation materialize in politics? Enter discourse analysis

The sections above discussed the first tier of theoretical body relevant to this dissertation; how the State and the non-state are constructed in the literature, how each consciousness prioritizes social and political events and the assumptions/expectations on which these consciousnesses are structured. These poles then, in practice, have established the main consciousness points through which the legislators have spoken about Turkey’s Kurdish question. The following sections will deal with how these consciousnesses manifest as speech and how those speeches establish linguistic norms and rules of communication. The following section will deal with the limitations of the ‘psychological factors’ in policy analysis, how discourse analysis can fill in these gaps and how invisible communicative norms established by discourse leads to agenda setting and decision-making.

2.1 Limitation of the literature on 'psychological factors' in foreign policy

This dissertation is a study of the relationship between political linguistics and political behavior. Although an overarching theory that covers all aspects of the work produced here is difficult to provide, it is arguable that this study rests upon the theory of linguistic relativism – also known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis – which asserts that there is a systematic relationship between lexical, syntactic and grammatical categories of the language a person speaks and how that person both understands the world and behaves in it.⁵² This hypothesis postulates that the nature of a particular language influences the habitual thought of its speakers: that different language patterns yield different patterns of thought.⁵³ The idea challenges the possibility of perfectly representing the world with language, because it implies that the mechanisms of any language (including political language) condition the thoughts and beliefs of its speaker community.⁵⁴ Linguistic relativism as used in this study rests on four other theoretical pillars, which are namely post-modern linguistic (or discourse) theory, speech-act theory, agenda setting/political advertising theory and power theory of Bachrach and Baratz.

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis manifests itself in international relations theory as a sub-branch of the 'psychological factors' in decision-making. Mainstream literature on foreign policy analysis mentions non-tangible and 'auxiliary' effects on policy making as 'psychological factors'. This

⁵² The founding texts of the hypothesis are: Sapir, Edward and David G. Mandelbaum (1985 – reprint) *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture, and Personality* (California: University of California Press) and Whorf, Benjamin and John B. Carroll (1956) *Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf* (Massachusetts: MIT Press)

⁵³ “The understanding of a simple poem, for instance, involves not merely an understanding of the singly words in their average significance, but a full comprehension of the whole life of the community as it is mirrored in the words or as it is suggested by their overtones. Even comparatively simple acts of perception are very much more at the mercy of the social patterns called words than we might suppose.” Sapir, Edward (1985) *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir*. p. 162

⁵⁴ “We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way – an agreement that holds throughout our speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language.” Whorf, Benjamin (1956) *Language Thought and Reality*. p. 213

literature looks into two types of influences behind decisions: belief systems⁵⁵ and psychological mechanisms⁵⁶ (perception, misperception, irrational consistency and so on...). The most recent critique of the traditional literature of the traditional study of the psychological factors in foreign policy is provided by Henrik Larsen in his 'Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis: France, Britain and Europe'⁵⁷ where he identifies three kinds of limitations of the existing literature on foreign policy. First, he criticizes the general tendency to focus on the individual decision-maker. Then, he criticizes approaching beliefs in a 'positivistic' way and third, he points that beliefs and psychological mechanisms are evaluated under the assumption that "language is a transparent medium which does not have its own dynamics". These criticisms are discussed in detail in the following paragraphs.

The literature focusing on the individual's weight in foreign policy making⁵⁸ takes the top echelons of a political system (mostly the leader) as its independent variable, using tools they dubbed as the 'operational code' or 'cognitive mapping' to come up with a snapshot of beliefs involved in the decision-making process. Larsen criticizes this body of literature for his belief that while these scholars focus on the role of the individual in decision-making, they make very little connection between what kind of societal beliefs and norms does a leader reflect, which severs the

⁵⁵ See for example: Goldstein, Judith and Robert Keohane (1993) *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change* (Ithaca: Cornell University) and Holsti, Ole (1997) *Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press)

⁵⁶ See for example: Vertzberger, Yaacov (1990) *The world in their minds: information processing, cognition and perception in foreign policy decision making* (California: Stanford University Press) and Sylvan, Donald and Steve Chan (1984) *Foreign policy decision making: perception, cognition and artificial intelligence* (Oxford: Praeger Publishing)

⁵⁷ Larsen, Henrik (1997) *Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis: France, Britain and Europe* (London: Routledge)

⁵⁸ See for example: Hollis, Martin and Steve Smith (1991) *Explaining and Understanding International Relations* (Gloucestershire: Clarendon Press) p. 74, Smith, Karen (1998) *The Making of EU Foreign Policy: The Case of Eastern Europe* (London: Macmillan) p. 31 and Vogler, John (1989) 'Perspectives on the Foreign Policy System: Psychological Approaches' in Mark Clarke and Barry White (eds) *Understanding Foreign Policy – The Foreign Policy Systems Approach* (London: Edward Elgar) p. 139

tie between social and elite cognition.⁵⁹ In support of Larsen, this doctoral study emphasizes the neglected connection between social discourse and elite discourse; how the discourses of elected legislators interact with that of the state and bureaucracy.

Another focus on personality-based decision-making analyses has been the belief system of the elites. On this, Holsti argues that the belief system “[...] may be thought of as a set of lenses through which information concerning the physical or social environment is received”.⁶⁰ Fitting this debate within the structure-agency debate, Boulding argued in favor of methodological individualism by pointing to the determining effect of the beliefs of the elites: “The image structure lies wholly within the individual comprising the organization. It does not lie within the relationship between these individuals [...]”.⁶¹ Yet within this perspective, the elite group is not seen as reflecting widely held societal and political beliefs; it appears as if elite beliefs are taken for granted and as monolithic factors that are not affected by the structure. However, such approaches only focus on individual cases where individual's perception might have played a key role, whereas they don't register numerous patterns of decision-making over an extended period of time. This is what Larsen criticizes as the 'individualization of social perception'. He explains that it is “not that these approaches are useless, but that their use is restricted to particular structural situations in which individuals' (or non-accountable or isolated groups) points of view might play a role (as opposed to widely held beliefs)”.⁶²

⁵⁹ Larsen, Henrik (1997) *Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis*. p. 4

⁶⁰ Holsti, Ole R. (1969) ‘The Belief System and National Images: a Case Study’ in S. G. Walker (ed) *Role Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis* (Durham: Duke University Press) p. 544

⁶¹ Boulding, Karl (1969) ‘National Images and International Systems’ in James Rosenau (ed.) *International Politics and Foreign Policy* (New York: The Free Press) p. 424

⁶² Larsen, Henrik (1997) *Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis*. p. 5

A second line of Larsen's criticism on the traditional approaches to the effects of psychological factors and beliefs on foreign policy decision-making has been that the elites were often seen as distinct from an objective 'reality'. In traditional literature, the question of 'how things are' is taken as monolithic, without any reference to how the decision-makers perceive the same event(s) differently. On this Sprout and Sprout commented: "[...] in policy-making, as we have stressed before, what matters is how the policy-maker imagines the milieu to be, not how it actually is".⁶³ Holsti also mentioned: "Unless they coincide in some way with commonly-perceived reality, decisions based on these images are not likely to fulfill expectations".⁶⁴ Larsen's response to this body of literature has been a critique of its focus -again- on the effect of 'images' on particular isolated events. While it is apparent that there is a two-way relationship between structure and agent (or social beliefs and decision-makers) to be able to fully observe how each of them affects one another, one should rise above individual events and look at longer-term processes during which the interaction really takes place.⁶⁵

A third line of criticism of the traditional literature by Larsen is its assumption that language is transparent; that it is a tool without any variance or dynamics within itself. On this Larsen comments: "If, however, language has its own dynamics and is therefore not transparent, this would imply that the researcher could not 'read' the beliefs and the psychological mechanisms directly from the sources without giving any consideration to the language".⁶⁶

⁶³ Sprout, Harold and Margaret Sprout (1969) 'Environmental Factors in the Study of International Politics' in James Rosenau (ed.) *International Politics and Foreign Policy – A reader in Research and Theory* (New York: The Free Press) p. 49

⁶⁴ Holsti, Ole R. (1969) 'The Belief System and National Images: a Case Study' p. 544

⁶⁵ Larsen, Henrik (1997) *Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis*. p. 5

⁶⁶ Ibid. p. 9

These three critiques of the traditional literature on foreign-policy decision-making leads us to another alternative; 'discourse analysis' as brought forward by the post-structural linguistics.

2.2 When words establish power relations: Critical discourse analysis and identity conflicts

Traditionally, policies are created through a deliberative process, involving policy discourse produced by: “the interactions of individuals, interest groups, social movements, and institutions [as] problematic situations are converted to policy problems, agendas are set, decisions are made, and actions are taken.”⁶⁷ Therefore, politics is an essentially linguistic act where realities (or 'images') are materialized through words. These words inevitably reflect the larger set of beliefs underlying them and when observed over an extended period of time, discourse can give the researcher a better understanding of the realities and beliefs of the decision-makers and of the structure from which these decision-makers come from and/or represent. Therefore an answer to the traditional literature on 'psychological factors' can be given by the post-structural linguistics, looking at more general subjects through the lens of political discourse.

Traditional literature on meaning and interpretation developed around the works of Edmund Husserl's phenomenology⁶⁸, Martin Heidegger's existential phenomenology⁶⁹ and the older study of hermeneutics whose modern contributors being Hans-Georg Gadamer (*Philosophical Hermeneutics*), Paul Ricoeur (*Memory, History, Forgetting*) and Andres Ortiz-Oses (*Communication and inter-human experience*). In its most basic form, phenomenology attempted to create conditions for the objective study of topics usually regarded as subjective: consciousness

⁶⁷ Rein, Martin and Donald A. Schon (1995) *Frame Reflection: Towards the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies* (New York: Basic Books) p. 145

⁶⁸ As in *Logische Untersuchungen*, 1900: Husserl, Edmund (2001 – reprint) *Logical Investigations* (London: Routledge)

⁶⁹ As in *Zein und Zeit*, 1927: Heidegger, Martin (1996 – reprint) *Being and Time* (New York: SUNY Press)

and the content of conscious experiences such as judgments, perceptions and emotions. Phenomenology deals directly with what I have previously referred to as the ‘consciousness’ of the State and ‘consciousness of the non-state; that regardless of actors and institutions operating within those ‘points of being’, the consciousness imposes itself upon such actors and institutions, making up the main polar opposites in political realm.

As a critique of the phenomenological (social world as a product of the universe of meaning) and hermeneutic (interpretation of meaning, or text) approaches, the critical linguistic approach asserts that we cannot arrive at meaning without first going through language. In other words, for the linguistic approach, there is no image without words and words are the closest we can come to meaning. For Saussure, the relationship between the meaning (signified) to the words (signifiers) was an inevitable one and the very existence of many different languages can be given as a proof of this assertion.⁷⁰ This, according to Saussure, is made valid through difference within words and their relative meaning to other words. Indeed, from Saussure's point of view, the word itself is nothing more than sounds produced by the vocal chords or certain patterns of ink on a piece of paper. Our capacities to make sense of them are largely driven by their relative meaning to other words – words gain their value from what they are not.⁷¹ Foucauldian linguists also acknowledge that words derive their meaning from differences between each other, however they also add that words derive their meaning also from social values given to them and rules determining the ways

⁷⁰ “A language is a system based upon psychological contrasts between these auditory impressions, just as a tapestry is a work of art based upon the visual contrast between strands of different colours. What is important for an analysis is the effect of these contrasts, and not the processes by which the colours were obtained in the first place”. Saussure, Ferdinand de (1959) *Course in General Linguistics* (New York: Philosophical Library) p. 124

⁷¹ “In all these cases what we find, instead of ideas given in advance, are values emanating from a linguistic system. If we say that these values correspond to certain concepts, it must be understood that the concepts in question are purely differential. That is to say they are concepts defined not positively, in terms of their content, but negatively by contrast with other items in the same system.” Ibid. p. 115

in which words can be connected.⁷² The rules within this context are not grammatical or syntactical, but social. This system of values and rules in a linguistic context is defined as 'discourse' by the Foucauldian linguistics.⁷³ Further according to Foucault we find 'discursive formations' around certain societal themes such as sexuality, ethnicity, identity, grammar etc. Indeed, the idea behind the thesis of this dissertation is that human rights, democracy, security, identity etc. are all part of a larger discursive formation revealing social power relations, creating identities of oppressed and oppressor within Turkey's Kurdish context. On this Foucault states:

*"Whenever between objects, types of statement, concepts or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations) we will say, for the sake of convenience that we are dealing with a discursive formation – thus avoiding words that are already overladen with conditions and consequences ... such as 'science', 'ideology', 'theory' or 'domain of objectivity' [...] The rules of formation are conditions of existence in a given discursive formation."*⁷⁴

While the relationship between a discursive formation and discourse is not clear, for the purposes of this study it will be defined as a historical instance of a discursive formation. While discursive formation is a more general, timeless concept, discourse is a historical sub-group within a discursive formation; therefore it is principally restrained by time. Another distinction has to be made with regard to the relationship between ideology and discourse. Foucault takes ideology as a part of discourse or the discursive formation, which in return, are penetrated by the mechanisms of the discourse, cutting across traditional political ideologies.⁷⁵ But Foucault also mentions a 'discursive practice' which according to him is "the body of anonymous historical rules, always determined in time and space, that have defined a given period and for a given social, economic,

⁷² See for example: Foucault, Michel (2002 - reprint) *Archaeology of knowledge* (London: Routledge) and Norris, Christopher (1982) *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge)

⁷³ As theoretically established in: Foucault, Michel (2002 – reprint) *Archaeology of knowledge* pp. 23-34

⁷⁴ Ibid. p. 38

⁷⁵ Ibid. p. 38 and pp. 184-186

geographical or linguistic area, the conditions of operation of enunciative function”.⁷⁶ For the purposes of this study, such discursive practices are defined as the way discourses are projected onto the society and how it’s socially reified. Inevitably, such projections are done through arguments of social actors, political parties and legislative representatives.

2.3. On the methodology of the content chapters: The relationship between speech-act and discourse

Speech-act theory introduces the concepts of 'illocutionary' or performative acts which regard communication as a factor affecting belief and construction of personal reality. A term dubbed by John L. Austin, illocutionary act concept asserts that speech is actually a performance undertaken towards what Austin calls 'conventional consequences' such as arguments, commitments or obligations.⁷⁷ From this perspective, speech-act theory parts with discourse theory as the latter takes speech as a dependent variable – affected by structure – and the former takes it as an independent variable – affecting structure. Speech acts therefore, distinguish between two types of communication: speech in order to express reality and speech in order to affect or alter it. In other words as Kent Bach argues:

*Some officially judge something to be the case, and others, actually make something the case. Those of the first kind include judges' rulings, referees' calls and assessors' appraisals and the latter include sentencing, bequeathing and appointing. Acts of both kinds can be performed only in certain ways under certain circumstances by those in certain institutional or social positions”.*⁷⁸

Austin identifies three processes of action beyond speech itself. The first is the act of utterance itself. However he also argues that utterance has three additional qualities, which he dubs as

⁷⁶ Ibid. p. 117

⁷⁷ Austin, John L. (1975) *How to do Things With Words* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press) p. 23

⁷⁸ Bach, Kent (1979) *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts* (Cambridge: MIT Press) p. 69

‘locutionary’, ‘illocutionary’ and ‘perlocutionary’, acts respectively.⁷⁹ To illustrate this point with relevance to the topic of this doctoral study, for example, when a Turkish parliamentarian utters the words ‘There is no such thing as a Kurdish problem (A1). This is a problem of terrorism (A2)’ he informs the audience that the assertion A1 is – in his view – is empirically not true, whereas the A2 assertion – again, in his view – should replace the initial assertion since it carries a greater truth value. Of course the parliamentarian doesn’t recognize - because of his/her subjective immersion into the context – that the truth-value being asserted is not ‘reality’ but ‘perception’. Maybe less directly – given the appropriate context – this may also be inferred as telling other parliamentarians to vote in favor of a security measure. With an inferential and contextual reading, parliamentarians must infer that given A2 is true, then they are asked to support a bill or resolution in favor of increasing troop count in the emergency measure provinces. It also aims to knock down other definitions of the ‘problem in the south-east’ (since within this context, it is not defined as the Kurdish problem) such as human rights, democratization or excessive force and establish the supremacy of one verbal construction of the nature of a conflict over other constructions.

Speech-act theory looks at micro-level communication (speech, dialogue) as opposed to discourse theory, which deals with macro-level communication. In that respect the speech-act theory is more technical than discourse theory, since it looks into lexical, syntactic and grammatical structures of communication. The importance of the speech-act theory for the purposes of this study comes from its study of the three levels of speech: directness-indirectness, literal-nonliteral meaning and explicitness-inexplicitness based on the context of communication. For example, when a Member of the European Parliament (MEP) tells: ‘It is in the Turkish army

⁷⁹ Austin, John L. ‘Performative Utterances’ in Robert Stainton (1999) *Perspectives in the Philosophy of Language: A Concise Anthology* (New York: Broadview press)

where real power lies' it can be regarded as a direct, literal and explicit observation: that Turkish military has the real power. But from the perspective of democratic standards, it becomes an indirect, non-literal and inexplicit criticism where an accusation of Turkish democratic system is made over the excessive weight the armed forces exert on the functioning of representative system and party politics. From that perspective, indirectness, non-literality and inexplicitness become important illocutionary tools in a communicative setting where restraints on speech are heavier. This has been an important pattern in especially Turkish Parliament debates where construction of the 'Kurdish question as the Kurdish question' was immediately inferred as recognition of Kurds as a separate entity within Turkey; a threat against the unitary character of the nation and territorial integrity.

This doctoral study contributes to the theory of post-structuralist linguistics proposing the idea that there is a two-way relationship between speech-acts and discursive structures. Previous literature on political linguistics looks at language either in terms of time (short-term event -speech act- versus longer-term phenomenon -discursive structures-) or power relations (structure-agency debate). Moreover even in the literature on belief and language, body of beliefs or images are either taken as a dependent or independent variable, without sufficient discussion of the relationship between speech-act and discourse. This study therefore, attempts to establish the link between speech and discourse, arguing that speech and discourse are mutually dependent structures. Therefore I argue that, although speech-acts do not immediately lead to policies, they affect discourses and linguistic constructions of 'images' over an extended period of time and create belief systems and norms out of which decisions arise in the long run. From this perspective, a speech-act - during the time and space of utterance – contains in itself three versions

of subjective time: past (being affected by discourse), present (competing against other discourse-candidates) and future (affecting discourse). Even though a particular speech doesn't become policy in the long run, it becomes a part of a discursive structure. That discursive structure on the other hand will either become the hegemonic discourse out of which policies arise, or become a counter-hegemonic discourse, trying to overthrow the hegemonic discourse. In the latter case, the speech-act will still affect policy by causing the hegemonic discourse to define itself along the lines of what the counter-hegemonic discourse is *not*, leading to policies in reaction to it.

3. Operational-methodological aspects: How does discourse affect policy? Agenda-setting, policy advertising, 'non-decision' and indirect effects of speech on the wider discourse on the Kurdish conflict

While I have attempted to bridge the theoretical gap between discourse and speech in the above sections, it is still necessary to ground that discussion into empirical research and into the practical functioning of politics. In order to do this, one's focus must be the democratic institutions in which verbal political deliberation takes place. Indeed, one aspect of the study of politics is identifying the effects of such deliberations on policy outcome and on the larger distribution of political power. Two important concepts come out in the study of verbal deliberation in democratic institutions: agenda control and policy advertising. Both of these theories will be discussed in the following pages, as they both explain the content chapters of this doctoral study from different perspectives.

According to McKelvey, primary objective of agenda control is to study voting

‘intransitivities’. In his 1976 study,⁸⁰ he established a model in which proposals are considered in a known, deterministic order established in advance of all voting. McKelvey then demonstrated that the ultimate outcome for any two policies P1 and P2, there is a finite agenda that starts with P1 and implements P2. Therefore, he asserts that the ultimate outcome is completely determined by the agenda. The literature following McKelvey's findings attacked his hypotheses in three different ways. First line of critics argued that agenda setting is not a deliberative process, but is rather determined by a single individual.⁸¹ This was particularly true in the US Congress (especially the Senate) through the 1990s, as the Kurdish question was brought before the floor by a very small number of legislators, enabling these people to determine the legislative agenda with regard to the Kurds. The second line of critics stipulated that agenda is determined as the result not of a collective bargaining process but of the strategic interaction among smaller number of elites.⁸² This was most relevant through the 1990s’ Turkey, where the governing party’s elites had the ultimate control over the Kurdish agenda. Finally, third line critics argued that ideas don't become policies just because they are on the agenda; policy-potential of a proposal is determined by its inherent quality. In other words third line critics disagree with the agenda setting theory for its treatment of any proposal as equals, that are certain to become policy once they are on the agenda.⁸³ This was certainly true for the Turkish social-democratic party, whose proposals for the amelioration of the Kurdish question rarely became official policy and were mostly marginalized as ‘PKK propaganda’.

⁸⁰ McKelvey, Richard (1976) ‘Intransitivities in Multidimensional Voting Models and some Implications for Agenda Control’ in *Journal of Economic Theory*, vol. 12 issue 3, December 1976 (Ithaca: Cornell University)

⁸¹ See for example Ibid, and also Austen-Smith, David and John Duggan (eds.) *Social Choice and Strategic Decisions* (New York: Springer), and Bloch, Francis and Stephane Rottier (2000) *Agenda Control in Coalition Formation* (Milan: Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei)

⁸² See for example: Austen-Smith, David (1987) ‘Interest groups, campaign contributions, and probabilistic voting’ in *Public Choice*, vol. 54 pp. 123-40 and Banks, Jefferey S. and Frank Gasmi (1987) ‘Endogenous Agenda Formation in Three-Person Committees’ in *Social Choice and Welfare*. Vol. 4 pp. 133-52

⁸³ See for example: Ferejohn, John A., Morris Fiona and Richard McKelvey (1987) ‘Sophisticated Voting and Agenda Independence in the Distributive Politics Setting’ in *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 31, no. 1

From an agenda-setting perspective, legislatures are critical; hence setting and controlling the agenda about the Kurdish question in Turkey was done mainly through the Turkish Grand National Assembly. There is an initial status quo policy, generally one inherited from previous rounds of deliberation. Then an individual makes a proposal, which is later put to vote; they are permitted to condition both their proposals and their votes on all preceding events, including other proposals and votes. From the perspective of post-modern linguistics, each proposal carries a discursive 'counter-hegemonic' value, whereas the status quo policy is dubbed as the 'hegemonic discourse'.

Guy Peters agrees that the mere introduction of a topic into the legislative agenda and its transition from an idea into a legislative hearing carries great value.⁸⁴ Peters identifies between relatively important and unimportant agenda items where the latter might be passed without much deliberation, whereas the 'important' agenda must go through 'agenda accretion'. With more important and critical topics, the background of the agenda must be prepared by winning public opinion, adjusting elite perceptions and constructing new political coalitions. This brings a great weight of party politics into the sphere of legislative agenda-setting theory, since party leaders can use their control of the agenda to ensure party cohesion despite diverse policy preferences amongst their members.⁸⁵ Of course, the Kurdish question went through considerable agenda accretion in the Turkish parliament as it was considered perhaps the most important policy and agenda item. It was also brought before the floor in order to maintain and secure party discipline and electoral

⁸⁴ Peters, Guy (1998) 'The Structure of Government: Issues of Concepts and Theory' in Collin Campbell and Guy Peters (eds.) *Organizing Governance: Government Organizations* (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press)

⁸⁵ Cox, Gary and Matthew McCubbins (2007) *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp. 46-51

cohesion. The idea is that high transaction costs associated with the use of praise or criticism to discipline party members can be avoided through the control of the legislative agenda to filter out proposals and bills that threaten to divide the party and to only put forward bills and proposals for which there is sufficient support among the rank and file legislators. Of course this assumes that the party leaders control the legislative agenda so that they can ensure that issues only arise on which their party members have similar policy preferences, and so will naturally vote together on these issues. Further according to Cox and McCubbins, policy outcomes will be different if agenda-setting is controlled by a single party or a coalition, rather than if the agenda is set freely by the individual members of the parliament. If the agenda is controlled by a particular party, the party leadership will not allow bills to be submitted to the floor, which move policy outcomes further from their own policy preferences than the policy status quo. Such a party is dubbed as an 'agenda cartel' by Cox and McCubbins under which, policy outcomes will only be moved towards the policy preferences of the particular party or parties that control(s) the agenda. Such an agenda cartel was most visible in the US Congress, where specific caucuses established a monopoly over the content and tone of the bills and resolutions regarding the Kurdish question, marginalizing and suppressing legislators with other views.

Agenda-setting works in tandem with policy advertising in legislatures. In the case of legislative politics, advertising is a method to promote candidates or ideas. Kaid defines policy advertising as “the communication process by which a source (usually a political candidate or party) purchases the opportunity to expose receivers through mass channels to political messages with the intended effect of influencing their political attitudes, beliefs and/or behaviors”.⁸⁶ While

⁸⁶ Kaid, Lawrence L. (1981) 'Political Advertising' in Derek Nimmo and Kyle R. Sanders (eds.) *Handbook of political communication* (Beverly Hills: Sage) p. 250

media broadcasts play the role of such 'mass channels' in non-legislative political advertising, within a legislative setting, this function is served by the floor or podium. In explicit terms, by speaking at the floor of a legislature, a legislator establishes or promotes an agenda and/or tries to influence other legislators' ideas and agendas through argumentation. Second, a floor serves the legislators to reveal their agenda to their constituencies either through media broadcast or legislative transcripts. Within this context, floor serves as a tool for a legislator to show his/her constituency that their agenda is being pushed into the legislative debate. Therefore, discussions on a legislative floor are different than debates within committees or subcommittees as the former is more 'public' and carries an advertising value. Further, political advertising becomes a political bargaining process itself even before a legislator speaks at the floor. There is a bargaining process within and between parties as well as between parties and the speaker of the parliament and as a result, a party's power in political advertising is directly linked to its ability to control the access to the floor. Here, I will argue that the floor of the Turkish parliament was controlled by the Turkish state (most notably the military) by indirectly using the governing party's agenda control capabilities. In this sense, through the mid- to late- 1990s, we can observe that the True Path Party (DYP) led by Tansu Çiller, performed such a function, channeling the sense of the military into the parliament and rendering it the hegemonic discourse, simultaneously using its agenda control powers to establish an agenda cartel and forcing other parties to function within which Bachrach and Baratz calls as 'non-decision'.

Agenda-setting and policy advertising concepts are the case-relevant groundings of the political linguistics as used in this study. In this chapter, I have attempted to provide a discussion of the limitations of traditional linguistics, the role of discourse theory, my argument on how

speech-acts – often regarded as separate from discourse – connect with wider discursive structures, my elaboration on how speech (during utterance) carries three versions of time – past, present and future – and finally how establishment and control of the political agenda interacts with political advertising, together with the wider debate on the interaction between discourse and speech. However, discourse and speech has another influence on institutional power and decision-making, which is what Peter Bachrach and Morton Baratz call as ‘non-decision’.

3.1 Discourse and ‘non-decision’: How the hegemonic discourse marginalizes counter-hegemonic discourses in the wider Kurdish debate

One of the most important contemporary debates on power shape along the agency-structure debate: behaviorists focus their arguments around the hypothesis that individuals are the true sources of power and through that, shape the system or structure – structuralists on the other hand assert that power is essentially a systemic phenomenon and individuals act within a set of rules and norms that set up the structure. This distinction is also very important in the study of Turkey’s Kurdish question, as it offers competing explanations about whether the Kurdish problem has structural solutions, or whether the solution depended on individuals. (for example; leader of the PKK, chief of staff of Turkey) Behaviorists depart from the Hobbes – Weber axis that constructs power as a causal and intentional phenomenon and instead, argue that power is purely causal, where one act of an individual alters the act of another. Therefore, from a behaviorist point of view, power exists only when it is exercised and it affects something; the agency-centered scholarship does not deal with power when it is not exercised, or when it is latent. This latent power in politics is central to this doctoral study. Most specifically, we are interested about the

power of political language, not in the way that it gets a certain person do something, but in the way that it feeds and reinforces the latent and non-exercised power, through establishing the cognitive framework within which people perceive certain issues.

Peter Bachrach and Morton Baratz introduce the term ‘non-decision’ in order to criticize of both the behaviorist and the pluralist schools, arguing “[...] there are two faces of power, neither of which the sociologists see and only one of which the political scientists see”.⁸⁷ They agree and concede that ‘visible’ interactions contribute to our understanding of power, yet there is also an ‘invisible’ element to human interaction – undeclared norms and cost-benefit calculations – that although do not cause a person to react, their indirect power causes a person *not* to react; in other words coerce a person from taking action or making a decision. In ‘Two Faces of Power’ the scholars ask: “[...] can the researcher overlook the chance that some person or association could limit decision-making to relatively non-controversial matters, by influencing community values and political procedures and rituals, notwithstanding that there are in the community serious but latent power conflicts?”⁸⁸ In many ways this perspective criticized many precedent approaches for using power as a variable only where it is visible and suggested that power can also exert influence indirectly, in a latent and unobservable way. Also Bachrach and Baratz had criticized the scholarship on power for their focus on only ‘important’ or ‘key’ decisions and regard them as biased research arguing that such methods do not elaborate on “what issues are generally agreed to be significant [nor] how the researcher is to appraise the reliability of the agreement”.⁸⁹ Still, they do not disagree with the notion that power plays a considerable role in conflict situations, but

⁸⁷ Bachrach, Peter and Morton S. Baratz (1962) ‘Two Faces of Power’ in *The American Political Science Review*. vol. 56, issue 4. pp. 947

⁸⁸ Ibid. p. 948

⁸⁹ Ibid. p. 948

assert that power also plays its role in preventing potential conflicts from occurring and that power starts to function before an actual conflict. Therefore ‘two faces of power’ emerge: one is the kinetic power that ‘gets A to make B do something’ and also a latent power where ‘A creates or reinforces social and political values or institutional rules that alter the political power process in such a way that the whole process emerges as a norm and social image that indirectly benefits the cause of A’. This, according to Bachrach and Baratz is ‘non-decision’ and is connected to consensus and conflict situations as well as events and non-events or action and inaction. In their own words, a ‘non-decision’ of these scholars is “a decision that results in suppression or thwarting of a latent or manifest challenge to the values or interests of the decision-maker”. In many ways the scholars define ‘non-decision’ as a tool of the hegemon(ic discourse) in preventing latent or kinetic counter-hegemonic resistance from emerging, thereby ensuring the continuation of the status quo. Their rationale ‘deciding not to decide is a form of decision-making’ can also be extended into ‘deciding not to act/speak, is a form of action/articulation’, that aim to prevent invisible issues to manifest as agenda items. This was mostly relevant in the Turkish parliament and the US Congress, where some legislators’ excessive control of the agenda and hegemonization of their positions rendered alternative views marginal and created an exact situation of ‘non-decision’ as stipulated by Bachrach and Baratz.

The hegemonic discourse ‘otherizes’ counter-hegemonic discourses in two ways. First, they can ‘pigeonhole’ such articulation (be it a proposal, a petition or a slogan) arguing that they are ‘dangerous’ and ‘against existential interests’, thereby suppressing a counter-hegemonic articulation before it poses a significant challenge. Second, the actors identifying with the hegemonic discourse can ‘overreact’ to such articulation in an attempt to establish psychological

barriers to actors identifying with their counter-hegemonic counterpart. In this way, one can refrain from raising an issue because of the anticipated reaction of the hegemony, but also because such a move would be regarded as disloyalty and treason. Bachrach and Baratz's work on 'nondecision' connects the power theory to the discussion on 'agenda setting'-political advertising theories and manipulation of the political agenda as a way of maintaining or attacking the power status quo.

4. Summary: Interactions between discourse, agenda-setting and non-decision: How does the above discussion fit into the thesis' empirical work?

A theoretical survey of the relationship between speech and discourse was made in pages 43-44 and 47. Here, I will mention how individual speeches that make up discursive structures in the long run are related to the empirical chapters (3, 4 and 5) of this dissertation. Indeed, what differs speech from a discourse is that discourse is a larger pattern of rules, grammar and structure, which is made up of speech – in other words, discourse can be likened to an organism, whose atoms are speech-acts. Individual speech acts are not discourse. However, a meaningful sequence of speech-acts, which is observable over an extended period of time, can be studied as a discourse.

In the empirical chapters, I will be presenting sample speech-acts from three legislatures that are part of a longer-term discursive sequence. In other words, speech-acts presented in chapters 3, 4 and 5 are examples of the discursive sub-structures of what is generally referred as the 'discourse on the Kurdish question'. Through the empirical chapters, such speech-acts are categorized within the main discursive sub-structures according to following criteria:

- a. The **context** within which a particular legislator verbally constructs a particular policy item (i.e. “the Kurdish question is essentially a security and terrorism problem” or “underlying reason of the Kurdish problem is identity and ethnic rights”)
- b. A ‘strategic speech **function**’, which reinforces a particular verbal constructs and delegitimizes or trivializes competing constructions. (i.e. “Those who argue that Kurdish question is essentially an ethnic rights issue, how will you be able to speak to the families of the Kurdish people killed during the recent PKK attack?” or “If the Kurdish question is a terror problem, then why did a 13 year old Kurdish nurse was killed under custody; was she a terrorist?”)
- c. A **statement** of facts – generally in a selective fashion – which aims to promote and highlight a particular context or a function, but does not carry either an explicit contextuality or an argumentation, in and of itself. For example, the statement “35 schools, 21 mosques, 2 bridges and one electrical supply plant were destroyed by the PKK” comes out as a simple presentation of a particular set of data; however indirectly, this presentation of facts support the context of “Kurdish question is essentially a terror problem”. On the other hand, the statement “So far, more than 400 people disappeared under custody and around 100 people were victims to killings by unknown people” is also neither explicitly a context or a function, but it indirectly supports the ‘human rights’ and ‘democracy’ contexts.

The above criteria determine which speech acts are considered as being a part of a discursive sequence, for the purposes of my study. From this perspective, through 1991-1999 period, the

Kurdish question in Turkey was constructed in the European Parliament, United States Congress and the Turkish Grand National Assembly discourse within several recurring contexts, which elicited legislators' underlying beliefs on the essence of and the solution to the problem. These discursive contexts (made up of recurring speech-acts) that defined the essence of the Kurdish question and their corresponding 'solutions', stipulated that Turkey's Kurdish question was in essence;

- a. a **human rights** problem, which would be solved by building awareness within the police and military forces towards approaching non-combatants in a non-violent manner
- b. a **democratization** problem, which exposes Turkey's lack of democratic checks and balances and would be solved by improving institutions and undertaking reform
- c. an **excessive force** problem, which stems from disproportionate responses of the Turkish security forces against the Kurdish population, which would be solved if such forces could exercise restraint and caution.
- d. an **ethnic conflict**, which stems from the 'Kurdishness' of the Kurds and their separateness from Turkey, and this would be solved by granting ethnic and cultural rights to the Kurds and allowing autonomy to their region
- e. a conflict intensified by the **Turkish military**, its self-imposed role as the guarantor of democracy and involvement in politics. The problem would be solved if Turkish military could take a step back from politics and leave the domain to democratically elected representatives
- f. a conflict intensified by the violent **Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK)** terrorism, their attacks, bombings and killings in the Kurdish region. The conflict would be solved if PKK

would lay down their arms.

Although these six contexts were frequently used within all three legislatures analyzed, four additional contexts were exclusive to the TGNA, which constructed the Kurdish question as a problem:

- g. artificially created and fuelled by the ‘**dark foreign powers**’ aiming to partition and destroy Turkey through supporting the PKK against Turkish government. The conflict would be solved if foreign countries stopped aiding the PKK.
- h. which is created by the poor application of **law** and non-adherence to constitutional principles, which creates an environment of lawlessness that hurts region’s Kurds. It would be solved by conducting proper legal reforms and strengthening their enforcement.
- i. originating from a lack of **security** or mismanagement of the security forces in the region, which would be solved by allocating more financial, material and human resources to the disposal of the armed forces.
- j. lack of **education and development** in the region. From such lack of education, infrastructure, jobs and poor living standards, Kurdish question arises and it can only be solved through allocating more money for the schools, infrastructure, jobs and living standards for the region’s inhabitants.

Therefore, after reviewing all of the legislative debate transcripts in the EU Parliament, US Congress and TGNA through 1990 - 99, the above discursive contexts emerge as the contexts within which the Kurdish question in Turkey was constructed. In the empirical chapters I mention

all of these discursive contexts together with the individual speech-act examples that belong to these categories. The importance of this work is that it offers a new, complete and exhaustive analysis of what is vaguely referred as the ‘Kurdish question’; this study enables us to understand what exactly this ‘Kurdish question’ corresponds to in the policy realm and help us talk about and find solutions to this conundrum with greater precision.

The reason why I have elaborated so long on two types of ‘consciousness’ – that of the State and that of emancipation – early in this chapter, is that all these discursive contexts I have laid down and will be discussing at length in the next chapters, are in fact different facets of these two poles in politics. In many ways some of these contexts are strictly within the domain of either one of these poles, whereas some others constitute flashpoints between them. For example, as we will see in the coming chapters, that adoption of the security discourse (“Kurdish question is essentially a security and terrorism problem”) belongs strictly to the consciousness of the State, the political-right and/or political conservatism. On the other hand, the excessive force discourse (“Kurdish question stems from the unmeasured responses of the security forces”) belongs strictly to the political-left and/or liberal groups. In that sense, when a legislator utters: “Those who are in favor of extended rights to the Kurds, how will you explain PKK’s recent attack, which killed around 50 Kurdish villagers?” this comes strictly from the consciousness of the State and political conservatism, which dismisses the ethnic rights discourse and promotes security discourse. On the other hand when a legislator utters: “During the first three months of the cross-border operation, our military killed only 14 PKK members, but an unannounced 67 civilian deaths also took place

within the local brigade's range of operations", this comes from the consciousness of emancipation and 'non-State', which challenges the security discourse of the State consciousness and promotes the excessive force discourse.

In other words, all of these discursive contexts within which the Kurdish question was discussed through the 1990s, are in fact different aspects of the most essential polarity in political thought. Throughout this entire dissertation, discursive contexts, strategic functions and statements of facts analyzed, all come from either the Machiavelli-Hobbes-Weber axis, or from Locke-Kant-Rousseau axis. Particular contexts exclusive to one of these poles, as well as contexts that are adopted by both of them will be presented in detail in the rest of this thesis. One of the main purposes of Chapter 7 (analysis) is to identify the independent variables behind legislators' contextual constructions of the Kurdish question and how such independent variables intersect these two fundamental poles of political consciousness.

Agenda setting and policy-advertising for example have been the primary tools of leverage of the 'consciousness of emancipation' and non-State, in order to challenge the State and government discourses. The 'talking shop' analogy made with regard to the floor did in fact produce tangible results, especially within the Turkish Grand National Assembly, since it was the only avenue for the non-State to officially challenge the discursive construction of the Kurdish question by the State and the government. The most notable example of the power of agenda setting and the importance of the floor was perhaps publicization of the 'village burning' incidents, where some elements within the military branches had pursued a 'scorched earth' policy, destroying forests and villages in order to establish a large 'clear zone' that will render the PKK unable to hide or

resupply. As we will discuss in more detail in Chapter 6 on TGNA, initially the State discourse had referred to such burnings as the ‘doing of the PKK’. However, it was the consistent ‘policy advertising’ and excessive force discourses of the center-left MPs that had eventually lead to the establishment of a human rights fact finding mission in 1994 that had travelled to the conflict zone and confirmed that some military personnel was indeed responsible for such burnings. This of course, had rendered the state’s dismissal of security force violence less credible in the following years, culminating in the proposal to establish a ‘shadow’ human rights fact-finding commission that would conduct an independent monitoring of human rights situation, reflecting deep mistrust towards figures provided by the state officials. Therefore, it can be argued that it was the ability of the Turkish center-left parties to control legislative agenda in the mid-1990s, which caused the erosion of the state discourse on the Kurdish question.

Similarly, with regard to legislative decision-making, the agenda control of the Hellenic- and Armenian-caucus members of the US Congress had eventually transformed the Congress floor from a mere ‘talking shop’ into a powerful focus of leverage in U.S.-Turkish relations. The agenda control power of the members of these caucuses (as we will discuss in more detail in Chapter 5) had lead to serious cuts in US military aid and loans to Turkey, in return sparking intense criticism within the TGNA towards the United States. A similar trend can be mentioned within the European Parliament, where leftist groups’ control of the agenda had lead to a parliament-wide mobilization for the addition of conditions with regard to legal reform and democratization into E.U-Turkey customs union agreement in 1995, rendering Turkey’s Ciller government unable to maneuver in order not to amend the notorious anti-terror law, thereby directly affecting Turkey’s legal and political system.

The record of legislative non-decision on the other hand, has been generally mixed. Since, for the purposes of this dissertation, we define non-decision as *‘the prevalence of a discursive construction over others and its establishment as a norm, rendering supporters of competing constructions unable to speak against it’* we will later see that it was most prevalent within the US Congress than either the TGNA or the European Parliament. In the TGNA, the state discourse *was* in fact the norm up until mid-1990s when the state failed to acknowledge village burning incidents and such incidents were discovered through non-state channels. Up until 1994, we will later observe that the state discourse did enjoy prevalence over emancipatory discourses; however after 1994, we see state discourse taking a lot of flak during the other half of the 1990s. The European Parliament record was also somewhat mixed with regard to non-decision, since no discourse was considered ‘abnormal’ within this legislature, although we can observe a clear prominence of emancipatory discourses over state discourses within the EP. In the United States Congress however, emancipatory discourses were established as a norm, clearly suppressing what one might call ‘pro-Turkish’ discourses (ones that are supportive of the Turkish state). This pattern of ‘non-decision’ (or non-speech) was fed largely by the agenda control of the so-called ‘anti-Turkish’ members of the Congress, most of which were members of the Hellenic- or Armenian caucuses. As we will see in more detail in Chapter 5, ‘pro-Turkish’ discourses were far less than they were in the European Parliament, establishing a clear case of ‘non-decision’.

Although agenda-setting and non-decision are presented in this chapter in order to show the reader how discourse connects to action and policy (as an answer to the question: “What happens if a particular legislator speaks a certain way?”), the remainder of this thesis is concerned more

about how discourse types adopted by the legislators relate to the consciousness of the State and of emancipation. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 will go on to discuss the details of discursive contexts and their relation to agenda-control and non-decision, but more attention will be given to how they relate to two poles of political consciousness mentioned in this chapter.

CHAPTER 3

EU Parliament discourse on the Kurdish question in Turkey

"[...] who are Turkey's friends? Are they only those who are in favour of a Yes vote for the customs union today? And does that mean that those who, at the time of the vote, voice doubts and criticism about the social effects of the customs union on Turkey specifically, who point to the human rights situation and the Kurdish deputies in prison in Ankara, are in fact the opponents and enemies of Turkey?" – Claudia Roth

"There is a concentric anger [in the European Parliament], which is directed sometimes against one thing and sometimes against another. In relation to Cuba, which certainly behaves just as badly as some Turkish authorities, it is suddenly said: 'What delightful people, we should do something for them!' But in the case of the Turks we must be strict!"- Otto von Habsburg.

1. Introduction

As mentioned in the introduction chapter, Turkey's relations with Europe have been one of a 'love-hate' relationship. The 'love' signified Turkey's aspiration for modernization and advancement along the European lines since the mid-18th century and 'hate' signified Europeans' (most notably Great Britain and France) involvement with rebellions and unrest throughout the Ottoman Empire during the collapse period, eventually leading to the dismemberment and the fall of the state. These two 'poles' of consciousness (that of aspiring for European cultural and technological achievements and on the other hand, carrying a heavy baggage of grudges stemming from European involvement with Ottoman minorities since the 18th century) have been transferred from the late-Ottoman political institutions to their new Republican counterparts, more or less intact (if not amplified), establishing the foundations of modern Turkey's foreign policy, as well as its relations with Europe.

While all of the Allied powers had some role in the occupation of Anatolia and provocation of local populace against the Ottoman government, Great Britain was particularly

troublesome for the imperial decision-makers as it was the main power that forced Ottoman armies out of the Levant and north-east Africa, mobilized Arab tribes against Constantinople, enabled Greek and Serbian rebellions (that would probably be suppressed otherwise) to succeed through direct resistance financing and incited Kurdish rebellions in the early 20th century, most notable being the nationalist-Islamist *Sheikh Said* rebellion. Yet, in Turkish consciousness, the memory of such events remained as a doing, not of Great Britain in particular, but of Europe in general.⁹⁰ Therefore, although Britain – through its activities in the region through 18th and 19th centuries – has almost singlehandedly created the conditions for the collapse of the Ottoman Empire (and despite the fact that Germany was the main Ottoman ally through the same period), Turkish consciousness had indiscriminately perceived these actions as a ‘European betrayal’, which created ‘anti-Europeanism’ and to a large extent ‘anti-Westernism’ as we know it today.

While the Allied powers ensured the breakaway of all non-Turkic Ottoman *millet*s, Kurds remained the only large Muslim, non-Turkish group to remain within the borders of the new Turkish Republic, with other considerable portion ending up within Iraq’s borders. As the modern Turkish Republic takes its definition of ‘Turkish nation’ from the Kemalist ideology, which builds upon the writings of the Turkish nationalist writer Ziya Gökalp (also dubbed as the founder of modern Turkish nationalism) whose writings in return, were heavily influenced by 19th century German and French nationalisms, most specifically writings of Weber,⁹¹ early republican era was marked by a heavy emphasis of ‘Turkish-ness’ in defining the ideal citizen and this ‘Turkish-ness’

⁹⁰ I will refer to this tendency as ‘taxonomical generalism’. This concept refers to oversimplification of a phenomenon or event that was undertaken by a micro-level actor and associating those events or phenomena with the larger community (or culture) to which that micro-level actor belongs. Another example of taxonomical generalism might be ‘Turkish coffee’; while the coffee in question and the brewing method associated with it was invented in Damascus, Syria, and was introduced to the Ottoman palace by the Arab notables, this coffee was dubbed ‘Turkish’ even though there wasn’t anything particularly ‘Turkish’ about it other than Damascus being under Ottoman control during which the coffee was introduced to the European envoys.

⁹¹ For the interaction between Weber’s politics and Turkish nationalism, see Chapter 2.

was defined along the lines of a vague ethnic ‘Turk-ness’.⁹² The product of these two processes was the denial of the existence of ‘such a thing as Kurd’ throughout most of the republican period, which intensified the already existing situation in the Turkish southeast, creating the modern Kurdish question, as we know it today.

During the Cold War, European awareness of the Kurdish question was limited; even though it was known and Turkey’s approach was criticized, this was done *sotto voce*, in order not to alienate a valuable NATO ally that was performing a critical role by covering NATO’s southern flank. However, as the Soviet Union collapsed and the Gulf War started, the Kurdish question became one of the most important agenda items in Europe and Turkey was now vulnerable to criticism at the highest levels as its strategic value against the USSR was no longer relevant. Coupled with Turkey’s renewed efforts for EU membership in the late-1980s (which has an existential dimension for Turkey), European criticism on Turkey’s Kurdish question became one of the most important foreign policy variables for Turkish decision-makers.

The European Parliament (EP), among other European institutions, has arguably been the most vocal and frequent critics of Turkish democracy and practice of human rights. Despite many arguments related to EP’s lack of decision-making powers⁹³ on European foreign-policy considerations, the European Parliament enjoyed some success in gaining concessions from Ankara such as in 1995, over the ratification of the customs union, Tansu Çiller’s government was

⁹² This was dealt extensively in: Çağaptay, Soner (2006) *Islam, Secularism and Nationalism in Modern Turkey: Who is a Turk?*. (London: Routledge)

⁹³ See for example: NA. ‘Parliament wants more muscle in EU foreign policy’. *Euractiv.com*. September 26, 2007. Available online (accessed April 18, 2009): < <http://www.euractiv.com/en/energy/parliament-wants-muscle-eu-foreign-energy-policy/article-167119>> and NA. ‘A more effective EU foreign policy in prospect, but more parliamentary scrutiny needed’. *European Parliament Press Release*. May 7, 2008. Available online (accessed April 18, 2009): <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?language=EN&type=IM-PRESS&reference=20080505IPR28139>>

forced to steer a democratization package through the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) with amendments to Article 8 of the Law to Fight Terrorism, or better known as the 'anti-terror law'.⁹⁴

This growing European Parliament influence on Turkey's Kurdish question was in fact a product of an almost four decade old process through which Turkish Kurds have migrated in large numbers to Europe, benefiting from asylum policies (and also escape clauses) establishing politically conscious and activist communities in European Union capitals and succeeded in influencing their regional legislative representatives through electoral leverage. Turkey's 1980 military coup was especially important in this process as it had stifled leftist groups, unions and organizations, which were the main outlets of Kurdish political activism in Turkey. Therefore, through the eradication of all political-activist Kurdish outlets, post-1980s witnessed the radicalization of the Kurdish movement in Turkey through the PKK and causing another mass wave of politically conscious and frustrated Kurdish immigrants leaving Turkey for Europe. Unlike previous Kurdish immigrants, post-1980 Kurdish immigration was not only frustrated with Turkey, but was also angered and radicalized because of the mass acts of violence carried out by the coup administration, most specifically the infamous Diyarbakir prison massacre,⁹⁵ which took place after the coup and has a symbolic event for the Kurdish nationalist narrative. This anger and frustration of the Kurdish immigrants had manifested itself through the words of the Members of

⁹⁴ For more on this, see: Dorsey, James M. 'Talking Turkey: Tansu Ciller Ready to Face European Union and Turkish Voters'. *Washington Report on Middle Eastern Affairs*. December 1995. Available online (accessed April 18, 2009): <<http://www.washington-report.org/backissues/1295/9512037.html>>

⁹⁵ Diyarbakir prison massacres took place between 1980-1984 and had targeted specifically Kurdish prisoners. The event still serves as the *raison d'être* for the PKK, where the PKK leadership argues that the Turkish government has turned against its Kurdish citizens and violent resistance is the only way of responding. On this, see: Zeydanlıoğlu, Welat. (2009) 'Torture and Turkification in the Diyarbakir Military Prison' in Welat Zeydanlıoğlu and John T. Parry (eds.) *Rights, Citizenship and Torture: Perspectives on Evil, Law and the State*. (Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press)

the European Parliament (MEPs) that had adopted the post-1980 Kurdish-activist discourse due either to their constituency and/or party ideology. Following the post-1980 coup, many European capitals became centers of Kurdish political activism in response to the policy of perceived Turkish oppression. Especially in the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden, Kurdish institutions, printing houses, mass media and cultural centers have provided the Kurdish movement with instruments to defend and promote national consciousness, as well as establish and spread the prevailing ‘discourse’ with which they define the Kurdish question and Turkey’s approach to it. Over the last 20 years, the Kurdish problem became such a dominant issue surrounding E.U. - Turkey relations, that the European Union and to a greater extent, the European Parliament, eventually considered the Kurdish matter to be the ‘barometer’ of Turkey’s democratization and ability to assume EU membership.⁹⁶ Without doubt, the EP’s discourse on the Kurdish question was influenced by, and has influenced in return, how other European institutions ‘talk about Turkey’.

This chapter will provide an overview of these dominant discourses and modes of speech adopted in the European Parliament on the Kurdish issue in Turkey, providing quotes from the debate transcripts and presenting a historical survey of MEP (member of the European Parliament) arguments related to this problem. The first part will deal with the MEP discourses as stated in their floor debates. In the first part, the first subheading will discuss arguments that focused on the ‘human rights’ aspect of the Kurdish issue, where the reader will find MEP responses to torture,

⁹⁶ Yackley, Joseph. ‘Turkey, the EU and Democracy: How Public Opinion Divides Ankara and Brussels’. *International Relations and Security Network, Zurich*. August, 2008. Available online (accessed April 17, 2009): <<http://se2.isn.ch/serviceengine/FileContent?serviceID=10&fileid=2AE20601-3179-1191-011A-1B9EA76FEF86&lng=en>>

adverse prison conditions, freedom of speech and expression or refugee affairs. The second subheading will provide an overview of arguments focused on ‘democratization’, where MEPs referred to Turkish elections, party competition, constitutional amendments, disappearances or extra-judicial killings. The third subheading will discuss MEP reactions against what they perceive as ‘excessive use of force’ by the Turkish security forces such as expulsion of civilians from villages, police responses against demonstrators and so on. The fourth subheading provides a survey of discourses that referred to the Kurdish question within the context of cultural rights, autonomy or as a peace process. Fifth subheading looks at how the MEPs referred to the Turkish military, as well as points within which they criticized that institution. The final subheading enables the reader to see when and within which contexts had MEP arguments converged with that of the mainstream Turkish state discourse.

The second part deals with the discourses adopted by the members of the European Commission and the members of the Council of Europe, giving an opportunity how the discourses of bureaucrats and technocrats differ from that of the elected representatives. The third part provides an overview of ‘inter-EU criticism’; MEP complaints on the Commission or the Council, fellow MEPs, other European institutions or even their own respective countries’ policies on the Kurdish question. Finally the chapter ends with a chapter analysis and conclusion. A more in-depth and comparative analysis of the discourses in this chapter will be dealt with in Chapter 6, together with the discourses of the US Congress and Turkish National Assembly.

2. Types of discourses adopted in the European Parliament debates regarding the Kurdish question in Turkey

2.1. Human rights discourse

The Treaty on European Union asserts that democracy and human rights are the fundamental values of the European Union. Article F of the treaty states: “The Union is founded on the principles of liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law, principles which are common to the Member States”⁹⁷ highlighting the importance of individual rights as a factor of EU membership. After the creation of the Copenhagen criteria, these values became primary lenses through which the EP looked at Turkey.

As Arıkan pointed out, interestingly, Turkey applied for full membership to the EU the same year (1987) that the EU adopted human rights as a central pillar in its foreign policy.⁹⁸ Therefore from 1987 onwards, the EU’s criticism of Turkey’s human rights record intensified and had a spillover effect in other areas of cooperation such as education or agriculture. Indeed, Turkey’s major push for EU membership and the most violent phase of the PKK campaign (and Turkish response) overlapped in the 1990s. In many ways, the ‘side-effects’ of fighting the PKK produced exactly the opposite conditions than those demanded by the EU membership criteria. Because of pursuing two goals that required different methods and mental approaches, Turkey has found itself amidst severe limitations in pursuing either of these goals, which elicited a great deal of criticism both from the European Parliament in terms of democratization and improvement of

⁹⁷ Full text of the treaty can be accessed online at the *European Treaties Database*, managed by the British Management Data Foundation (accessed April 18, 2009): <<http://www.eurotreaties.com/maastrichtec.pdf>>

⁹⁸ Arıkan, Harun. (2002) ‘A Lost Opportunity? A critique of the EU’s Human Rights Policy against Turkey’. *Mediterranean Politics*, vol. 7. p. 28

human rights and also from the Turkish public against the EU as many Turks believed the membership process restricted Turkish military's capabilities in providing security in the region and limit PKK's reach.

Although Turkey's military presence in Cyprus was the main line of criticism of Turkey in the European Parliament since 1974, the Kurdish issue surpassed the Cyprus issue by the start of the Gulf War in 1991 and became the dominant case in the debates on Turkey's human rights record. At first, the European Parliament approached the situation in a cautious manner, appreciative of Turkey's role during the Gulf War in helping the Kurdish refugees coming from Iraq as a result of Saddam Hussein's campaign against them in the spring of 1991.⁹⁹ In a matter of days, around 1 million Kurdish refugees were piled on the Iraqi – Turkish border. In a motion for resolution¹⁰⁰ submitted on April 11, 1991, the Green group in the European Parliament had acknowledged Turkey's contribution by stating “whereas Iran and Turkey have so far taken in more than a million Kurdish refugees in an impoverished region that was already the most hard hit economically by the Gulf crisis” and “Welcome[d] the reception of Kurdish refugees by Iran and Turkey and calls on the two countries to continue to keep their borders open for possible refugees”. The same day, another motion for resolution¹⁰¹, this time submitted by the European Democratic Group (ED) group read: “[The ED group] Welcomes the relief efforts by the European Community, the USA and other states, notably Turkey and Iran”. This was one of the rare instances when the Green group or the European Democrats praised Turkey's attitude towards the

⁹⁹ This was briefly mentioned in Chapter 1. For more on this, see: Bird, Christiane (2004) *A Thousand Sighs, a Thousand Revolts: Journeys in Kurdistan*. (New York: Ballantine) pp. 52-60

¹⁰⁰ Extraordinary meeting of the European Council (Situation of the Kurds). D0647/B3-0560/91. Sitting of April 18, 1991.

¹⁰¹ Extraordinary meeting of the European Council (Situation of the Kurds). D0647/ B3-0556/91. Sitting of April 18, 1991.

Kurds, one may argue perhaps because of the consideration for the still relevant strategic value of Turkey during the Gulf War.

However, Turkey's approach towards the Kurdish refugees changed quickly after the realization that one million impoverished Kurds - a considerable amount being young male refugees - started to become an excellent recruiting ground for the PKK. Indeed, in a matter of months the PKK had significantly increased its recruitment and strike operations, establishing a *de facto* control over the predominantly Kurdish areas in the southeast.¹⁰² As a first response, Turkey had reinforced the Iraqi border, restricting access to Kurdish refugees and launched several air strikes on areas that are considered to be PKK bases in the southeast Turkish and Northern Iraqi mountains.¹⁰³ As a result of the air strikes, the EP abandoned its initial supportive stance and started to adopt a more cautious discourse towards Turkey on 12 March 1992¹⁰⁴, "stressing the responsibility of Iran and Turkey in helping relief agencies to reach those affected as easily and as quickly as possible". It is possible to infer that had there been complete cooperation on behalf of Iran and Turkey in terms of providing relief agencies access to the refugees, there wouldn't be any need for such a clause. Furthermore in the same resolution the EP was "deeply concerned also that the Turkish authorities have launched new air attacks against Kurdish villages in northern Iraq". In articles 10 and 11, the EP had also called on Turkey to cease its attacks on villages in northern Iraq, but also balanced the statement by calling the PKK to cease its acts of violence.

Although Kurdish question was a major reason for Turkey's bad human rights record and

¹⁰² On this, see: Boyne, Sean. 'Arguments in favour of Turkey's continuing support for Operation Northern watch'. *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*. Volume II - Number 4. December 1997-February 1998.

¹⁰³ For an extended account of this period, see: Kramer, Heinz (2000) *A Changing Turkey: the Challenge to the EU and United States*. (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press) pp. 37-55

¹⁰⁴ Humanitarian Aid to Kurds in Iraq. D1085/B30081/92. Sitting of March 12, 1992.

the EP discourse was generally constructed within the context of ‘abuses against Kurds’, there were also instances when the EP also highlighted abuses made against the citizens of Turkey without referring to their ‘Kurdish-ness’. On 11 February 1993, the Parliament adopted a “Resolution on human rights in Turkey”¹⁰⁵ which highlighted the human rights abuses recorded in Turkey. First, it expressed its awareness of “[...] Nazli Top, a 20-year-old nurse, who was apparently repeatedly tortured and beaten for four days at the anti terror branch of Istanbul Police Headquarters [...]” and that “[...] in 1992 alone some 20 journalists, including several Kurds, were murdered in Turkey [...]”. Adding to Turkish citizens of Kurdish origin, as a response to the growing number of PKK attacks, Turkey also closely monitored and in some cases imprisoned foreigners that were believed to be helping the PKK. Two of the higher profile cases could be the imprisonment of the German journalist Stefan Waldberg and American journalist Alizia Marcus. The resolution B3-0195, had also criticized Turkey's stance towards Waldberg, who was sentenced to almost 4 years' imprisonment on the grounds of ‘complicity with the rebellion’ and made it explicit that the EP “condemn[ed] the continued violation of human rights in Turkey and particularly the use of torture” and “call[ed] on the Turkish Government to ensure the safety of journalists in Turkey and to guarantee free reporting in the Kurdish areas”. Arrest of American and European nationals of course, intensified legislative awareness on Turkey’s Kurdish question.

Although European criticism of Turkish security forces’ was generally concentrated on their methods in the southeast, there were also criticisms of these forces’ practices in the major cities and towards Kurdish political parties. On 10 February 1994, during the debate on the upcoming elections in Turkey¹⁰⁶ Arthur Stanley Newens (UK – European Socialist Group)

¹⁰⁵ Resolution on Human Rights in Turkey. D2175/B3-0195, 0282 and 0285/93. February 11, 1993.

¹⁰⁶ Elections in Turkey. D2173/B3-0160/94. Sitting of February 11, 1994.

mentioned “[... the EP] must denounce atrocities whoever is responsible for them – the Kurdish Party, the HEP, has been banned in Turkey as a whole, its members and those of its successor party, the DEP have been attacked and in some cases killed [...]” adding the killing of a DEP official by being “[...] shot in front of his family in Ankara [...]” highlighting the fact that human rights is not only a concern in the mountains or villages in the south-east, but also for the Kurdish political party members in the nation's capital.

As mentioned earlier, the Social-Democrat People’s Party (SHP) was became the primary legitimate political outlet of the Kurds in the post-1980 setting. Turkish Social Democrats' attempt to reach a political consensus with the Kurdish parliamentarians proved promising at first as they established a coalition with the Kurdish ‘People’s Labor Party’ (HEP)¹⁰⁷, which got enough votes in the 1994 general elections to enter the parliament. However, the coalition suffered a heavy blow after several Kurdish deputies wore ties or headbands with the colors of the Kurdish flag – red, yellow and green – during the oath-taking ceremony in the parliament on March 2, 1994, which was perceived by other parliamentarians as a disregard for the territorial integrity of Turkey. The breaking point was the Kurdish deputy Leyla Zana's words in Kurdish after she took her oath in Turkish, which was a deliberate violation of the Turkish Constitution, as it permits only the use of Turkish language as the official language of such ceremonies.¹⁰⁸ Although Zana’s deliberate violation of the constitutional regulation was regarded as a ‘provocation’ even by the Social-Democratic party and years later, even Zana herself admitted that this was a ‘mistake’¹⁰⁹, the

¹⁰⁷ After repetitive closures, HEP changed its name to the Democracy Party (DEP), People’s Democracy Party (HADEP) and Democratic Society Party (DTP) through the 1990s.

¹⁰⁸ Zana’s exact phrase in Kurdish was “Ez vê sondê li ser navê gelê kurd û tirk dixwîm” meaning “long live the brotherhood of the Kurdish and Turkish peoples”.

¹⁰⁹ As reported by the former Social-Democratic party and Kurdish HEP deputy, Fehmi Işıklar. For an extended interview with Işıklar, see: Düzal, Neşe. ‘Leyla Zana ‘Hata Yaptık’ Diyor [Leyla Zana says ‘We made a mistake’]. *Radikal* newspaper online edition. January 1, 2007. Available online (accessed April 17, 2009):

damage was done and subsequently the police had arrested Kurdish deputies on their way out of the Parliament. Although Zana's words were peaceful, the symbolic implication of speaking Kurdish at the assembly was interpreted as a deliberate infringement of the constitution, and despite the fact that she was well aware that the offense was punishable by imprisonment,¹¹⁰ the European Parliament responded the police arrest of the Kurdish deputies with outrage. A prominent Turkish columnist Erdal Şafak would later interpret this event as: "The unnecessary provocation of Leyla Zana and her friends lost Turkey 10 years [in the peaceful resolution of the Kurdish question]".¹¹¹

In the months following the arrests, the MEPs were generally restrained in expressing their frustration, waiting for the court verdict on the Kurdish parliamentarians, following the arrest.¹¹² However towards the end of 1994, after the Turkish court convicted and ordered imprisonment of the Kurdish parliamentarians the EP had unanimously adopted a harsher and more critical tone.¹¹³ Wolfgang Kreissl-Dörfler (Germany – European Socialist Group) referred to the 1994 Amnesty Report and the report by the Turkish Human Rights Foundation in Ankara highlighting the "serious deterioration in an already critical human rights situation in Turkey". He pointed to the increase in number of the "prosecution of journalists", "people who have disappeared, or have been victims of attacks by 'persons unknown'" and claimed "Turkish Government is directly

<<http://www.radikal.com.tr/Default.aspx?aType=RadikalHaberDetay&ArticleID=801843&Date=19.04.2009&CategoryID=97>>

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Şafak, Erdal. 'İnönü'nün ardından [After İnönü]'. *Sabah* newspaper online edition. November 1, 2007. Available online (accessed April 17, 2009):

<<http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2007/11/01/haber,13722E347CD7469395540236E6423744.html>>

¹¹² For an example of relative restraint and caution on behalf of the MEPs, see debate: Turkey. D2258. Sitting of March 10, 1994.

¹¹³ Debate on the conviction of the Kurdish deputies. D0231. Sitting of December 15, 1994.

responsible for these murders”.¹¹⁴ Katerina Daskalaki (Greece – Union for Europe) adopted a harsher tone criticizing Turkey for having “razed to the ground [...] 50 villages”¹¹⁵ in the Dersim region and also for the death of two lawyers of the MPs from the DEP and the disappearance of the treasurer of the same party. Indeed, James Moorhouse (UK – Liberal Democrat Reform) also expressed his concern on the detention of the Kurdish parliamentarians since it “forms part of a wider onslaught of human rights in Turkey”, also mentioning that “dozens of academics, journalists, poets, human rights defenders and political activists have been tracked down [...]”.¹¹⁶ It is well arguable that the arrest of the Kurdish deputies was a milestone for the EP discourse on the Kurdish question as it unleashed the dormant and suppressed (because of Turkey’s strategic importance during the Gulf War and the Operation ‘Provide Comfort’ that followed the war) feelings about Turkey’s approach towards the Kurdish question since the start of the Gulf War.

While the situation in south-eastern Turkey was growing even worse and EP criticism was correspondingly getting harsher, Turkey – rather counter intuitively – decided to apply to the Customs Union, perhaps picking the worst time to pursue such a vocation. It was initially thought that joining an economic union with Europe would hasten Turkey's full membership, however Turkey’s increasingly harsher approach to the Kurdish question had rendered the Parliament extremely resistant to both Turkey’s EU membership or customs union vocation. The MEPs adopted discourses that often established direct links between Turkey's customs union bid and its human rights record within the context of the Kurdish situation. For example, during the debate on 14 February 1995,¹¹⁷ Pauline Green (UK – European Socialist Group) stated that the situation of

¹¹⁴ Ibid. B4-0515/94

¹¹⁵ Ibid. B4-0526/94

¹¹⁶ Ibid. B4-0530/94

¹¹⁷ Customs Union between EU and Turkey. D0311. Sitting of February 15, 1995.

the Kurdish parliamentarians would be an influencing factor in the customs union negotiations: “We were absolutely explicit we would not move forward on the customs union with Turkey unless something was done about the Kurdish members of parliament who were imprisoned”.¹¹⁸ Adding to this, Claudia Roth (Germany – Greens) claimed: “[the issue of customs union] should not be reduced to a problem between Turkey and Greece. It is all about democratization, respect for human rights and putting an end to a dirty war in Turkey.” and proposed a condition for the customs union:

“the release of the Kurdish members of parliament, the release of Mehdi Zana [...], an amnesty for those imprisoned for 'criminal opinions', the removal of all obstacles hindering the work of the human rights organizations, the lifting of all censorship on the anti-government media, the possibility for refugees to return to their ruined villages and the provision of material compensation for them, the setting-up of a committee of inquiry in the Turkish National Assembly to look into the various mysterious deaths and systematic torture in Turkey, and the alignment of the Turkish constitution with the provisions of international law”

Roth followed: “If we say yes [to the customs union] now, we shall be telling the Turkish people, the democrats in Turkey and all those in prison there that we put trade before human rights.”¹¹⁹

During the height of the insurgency and the lowest point in Turkey’s human rights record, the European Parliament decided to give its annual Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Expression to Leyla Zana who was in prison, as a show of solidarity with the Kurdish cause. Her release eventually became another issue within the context of the customs union. During the joint debate on 13 December 1995 Carlos Carnero Gonzalez (Socialist Group) made the connection between the customs union agreement and the release of Zana:

¹¹⁸ Ibid. B4-0171/95

¹¹⁹ Ibid. B4-0175/95

*“We are about to approve the Customs Union just when the winner of the 1995 Sakharov Prize for freedom of expression, our colleague Leyla Zana is in prison because, to put it bluntly, opinions cannot be freely expressed in Turkey because a wrong-headed notion of State security overrides citizens' rights [...]”*¹²⁰

On 17 January 1996, the EP awarded the prize to Leyla Zana, which was given to Mehdi Zana, who attended the EP ceremony on behalf of his wife, as she was still in prison in Turkey. The President-in-chair of the EP, Klaus Hänsch (Germany – Socialist Group) – in the only example of discourse adopted by an EP President on the Kurdish issue between 1991 and 1999 – focused exclusively on the human rights discourse, choosing a more elaborate set of words to describe the situation in Turkey: “[Leyla Zana's] protest against torture ultimately made her a victim of torture herself, and she has had to live through years of fear, deprivation and humiliation” and referring to the actions of Turkish security forces a week prior to the sitting: “[...] systematic atrocities in the south-east [...] give us a glimpse of horrifying depths of arrogance and inhumanity in the exercise of power.”¹²¹

Although mid-1990s was the worst period for Turkey both in terms of the severity of its Kurdish insurgency and also its poor human rights record, the European Parliament was unable to prevent or delay the signing of the customs union agreement with Turkey and eventually, the EU approved customs union with Turkey in 1995. The Parliament however, was successful in inserting a clause into the agreement (through pressuring the Commission) that had approved customs union “on the condition that Turkey improves its human rights record”. However, instead of improving, the situation in Turkey’s southeast worsened as the military launched the biggest ever cross-border operation into northern Iraq to combat the PKK in late-1995. One can well argue

¹²⁰ Sakharov Prize to Leyla Zana, Turkey. D0786. Sitting of December 11, 1995.

¹²¹ Sakharov Prize 1995 to Leyla Zana, Turkey. D0848. Sitting of January 17, 1996.

that if the Kurdish Parliamentarians' arrest in 1994 was a milestone for the EP discourse turning from cautious into overwhelmingly critical, the 1995 cross-border incursion was a milestone in the sense that the prevalent discourse in the EP was transformed from outright critical to outright hostile. Of course the prevalent belief that then Turkey's government headed by Tansu Ciller had 'betrayed' the EU through agreeing improving the human rights situation and then giving the green light to a massive scale military incursion was the main reason behind this discursive transformation.

In 18 September 1996¹²² Jean Willem Bertens (Netherlands – Liberal Democrat Reform) highlighted that although the EU pushed through the customs union, Turkey still did not improve on human rights: “Turkey no longer deserves the benefit of doubt” Bertens argued; following: “Turkish government has absolutely failed to keep its promises and that instead of the promised changes there is a deterioration in the situation”. He also highlighted that “A constantly more aggressive policy is being used against the Kurds [...]”. Yannis Kranidiotis (Greece – European Socialist Group) adopted a somewhat cultural/exclusionist approach “[...] principles that are for us fundamental values of our civilization have no such content in Turkey.”¹²³ James Moorhouse (UK – Liberal Democrat Reform) focused on the internal police practices in Turkey, depicting a case of torture where “a 16 year-old Turkish girl was detained in Turkey for 19 days” and suffered severe abuses in prison. He further criticized the arrest of Turkish writer Yaşar Kemal and his 20-month imprisonment because of his essay entitled 'Dark Cloud over Turkey' and claimed, “Since 1991, 87 people have been killed during raids on houses in [south-eastern] cities.”¹²⁴

¹²² Political Situation in Turkey. D1255/B4-0985/96. Sitting of September 18, 1996.

¹²³ Ibid. B4-0987/96

¹²⁴ Ibid. B4-0991/96

As Turkish operations against the PKK intensified and Turkish military had established a de facto presence in Iraqi territory through its bases in northern Iraq established during the 1995 and 1997 large-scale military operations, PKK-leader Abdullah Öcalan fled his base in northern Iraq and took shelter in Syria in early 1997. Turkish response was to first threaten the Syrian government, and then actually penetrate 5 miles into the Syrian territory with the tanks from the Adana armored division. Unable to offer any resistance, Syria expelled Öcalan, who first went to Russia, then Italy and then fled Italy to a then undisclosed location, creating the ‘Öcalan crisis’ of 1998 during which he constantly changed places. Although Turkey had repeatedly criticized Greece for its involvement with the Öcalan crisis and Greece officially denied any claims of involvement, the PKK leader was captured by the CIA on his way out of the Greek Embassy in Nairobi, Kenya and was handed over to Turkish secret service in a covert operation that is still criticized for its neglect of the international law. When he was brought back to Turkey, he was immediately arrested and detained; while the Nationalist Action Party of the governing coalition demanded his execution, other parties were more restrained, primarily because his execution would reverse the EU accession process set out by the granting of candidate status to Turkey in Helsinki Summit earlier in 1999 and also would create mass rebellions in the south-eastern provinces. Nonetheless, the EP – like the EU – was in disarray and shock, primarily because it was unable to protect Öcalan and also because now two EU members, Italy and Greece appeared guilty of harboring the leader of an organization that is accepted officially as ‘terrorist’. While some MEPs believed EU shouldn’t have involved in Turkey – PKK conflict, some criticized Italy for not holding onto Öcalan and some accused Greece for supporting a terrorist organization.

During the first debate following Öcalan's arrest¹²⁵ Jens-Peter Bonde (Denmark – Independence/Democracy) questioned how Turkey would treat him and told “[...] I have no confidence that Mr. Öcalan will get proper justice. I believe that even now he is being tortured” telling his personal experience:

“Once I was with a group of politician drawn from most Western European countries who accompanied two exiled politicians to Ankara. We were to be their shield. As soon as we arrived at the airport, they were arrested and sent directly for interrogation and torture. We tried to visit them in prison but we were not allowed in.”

and warned: “It is not possible to have normal relations with Turkey as long as it continues to torture, and as long as it continues to oppress the Kurdish people”. Antonio Graziani (Italy – Christian Democratic Group) called the Öcalan arrest as “illegal” and said “When a prisoner is shown off – proudly – in the conditions in which Öcalan was shown, every human right in the book is being flouted”.

While the EP was curious over what would happen to Öcalan, he was eventually charged with treason and was issued a death penalty by the Turkish Court of Security. This was major issue, since 1984 no death penalty had been exercised in Turkey. In the debate sitting of September 16, 1999 president of the Council Tarja Halonen highlighted the fact that no death penalty had been carried out in Turkey since 1984 and asserted “One of the common values of the Union is to refrain from carrying out the death penalty”. Hannes Swoboda (Austria – Socialist group) responded to this and claimed that the EU wasn't specifically interested in Öcalan: “[...] the Ocalan case is not just about one man threatened with the death penalty, but rather we repudiate

¹²⁵ Detention of Abdullah Ocalan and Kurdish question. D2401. Sitting of February 24, 1999.

death penalty in general.” This position was re-affirmed during the debate on earthquakes in Turkey and Greece¹²⁶ Gerhard Schmid (Germany – European Socialist Group) claimed “The death sentence upon Ocalan in one more proof that Turkey still does not comply with the EU's requirements of a candidate country” adding “[...] KLA must cease engaging in violence and terrorism in order to support a peaceful and political solution to the Kurdish question”. KLA is the acronym for Kurdistan Liberation Army, and is in fact, a reference to the PKK. This name wasn't even adopted by the PKK itself, and is rather an 'invention' of certain groups in the European Parliament, in a show of support and solidarity with the organization, rather than reciting a widely accepted name.

As a 'top-heavy' organization, the PKK entered a period of internal crisis after the capture of Öcalan and ceased its attacks against Turkey, following their leader's call to lay down their arms. Most of its militants retreated to the remote mountains deeper in Iraq. As a response, Turkish government took a series of gesture reforms in order to attract the support of Kurdish citizens. With the PKK no longer being a threat (at least periodically) Turkey's EU process took pace and entered a new era that lead to the opening of accession negotiations in 2004. On 6 October 1999, Hannes Swoboda (Austria – Socialist Group) – one of the most frequent critiques of Turkey's human rights record – signaled this new era and the improvement in Turkey's human rights practices: “[...] it was not only possible to achieve the release of Akın Birdal, even if only for health reasons, but there were also some legislative changes, which will hopefully put into practice. I do not want to exaggerate matters, I do not wish to paint a totally rosy picture, but there are changes which we must respond to.”

¹²⁶ Sitting of Thursday, 16 September 1999 – Strasbourg

2.2. Democracy/Democratization

Like human rights, democracy is established as one of the fundamental pillars of the EU's external relations. Taking a step further, the European Parliament actively tried to foster democratization in Turkey through its recommendations and consents of Council or Commission's direction. Democratization has been the second most frequent discourse adopted by the EP on the Kurdish issue. Although one might argue that democracy and human rights are inseparable in theory, the EP human rights and democracy discourses were discernable; while human rights discourse focused on mistreatment of individuals, democracy discourse focused on Kurdish representation in the parliament and their political activities. While the dominant discourse in the European Parliament on the Kurdish issue was one of human rights prior to 1994, as Turkey's local elections drew closer on 27 March 1994, MEP discourses formed a discernible pattern that focused on democratization. For example, while democratization was an infrequent argumentative position before, in the debate dated 10 February 1994 MEPs almost exclusively adopted the democratization discourse. Jan Willem Bertens (Netherlands – Liberal Democracy Reform) opened the debate:

“The so-called 'Kurdish problem' can only be resolved by democratic means within the Turkish state by recognizing the ethnic and cultural characteristics of the various ethnic groups, among other things. Turkey is firmly determined to continue its move towards a stable democracy”.

Helga Haller von Hallerstein (Germany – Christian Democratic Group) continued: “[...] my group acknowledges the efforts made by the Turkish Government to establish a modern and democratic state as conceived by Kemal Ataturk”. This note can be evaluated as a support for the secularist

groups in Turkey, since there were also debates within Turkey on whether some interpretations of Atatürk's legacy were essentially 'democratic' or if these interpretations viewed democracy only as a window dressing. Hence it can be argued that von Hallerstein's reference to democracy within the context of Atatürk gives support to such elements in Turkey; he continues: “[...] the Kurdish issue is a major obstacle and it can only be removed by political, democratic and peaceful means.” Arthur Stanley Newens (UK – European Socialist Group) considered the Kurdish question as a negative influence on Turkey's democracy: “[...] restoration of democracy in Turkey¹²⁷ [...] is now being threatened and undermined by the brutal conflict in the south-east of the country over the Kurdish question”. He warned: “[...] we should appeal to the government and the PKK alike to cease all military operations so that the conduct and organization of the electoral process is not disrupted”.

However during the plenary session¹²⁸ after the arrest of the Kurdish representatives a month later, Claudia Roth (Germany – Greens) criticized the Turkish parliament for relinquishing power to the police:

“The [Turkish] Parliament has effected a putsch against itself by waiving the parliamentary immunity of Kurdish Members. It has stripped itself of its legitimacy. We see now that membership of a parliament no longer counts for anything. Those who voice criticism in Parliament are simply handed over to the police”.

Arthur Stanley Newens (UK – European Socialist Group) adopted a similar tone: “We have also been disturbed at the numbers of unexplained deaths of journalists and others. The latest steps against the MPs show that freedom to argue the Kurdish case peacefully and democratically is not

¹²⁷ He refers to the military rule of the 1980 coup in Turkey that relinquished power to civilian authorities in 1983.

¹²⁸ Turkey. D2258. Sitting of March 10, 1994.

accepted when it becomes effective”. He also made an explicit reference to the connection between Turkish democratization and Turkey's EU candidacy: “[...] unless [the MPs] are freed and given the opportunity to carry out their work democratically, and unless the Kurds receive full rights, this will very, very seriously damage relations between the European Union and Turkey”. Jan Willem Bertens (Netherlands – Liberal Democrat Reform) was less eloquent – however, as much as his style was straightforward, this directness enables one to elicit his belief in the connection between the lack of democracy in Turkey and Kurdish support for the PKK:

“What on earth do they think they will achieve by this? Do they not want a democratic solution? Do they wish to deny the democratically elected representatives of the people the freedom to express their opinions? Do they want to drive the Kurdish minority into the arms of the more undesirable wings of the PKK?”

Bertens also made the same point with Newens in terms of Turkey's EU candidacy: “How are we to reconcile this action with the Turkish desire to become a member of the European Union?” adding “In the interests of parliamentary democracy in Turkey, and in the interests of a peaceful solution to the Kurdish problem, we join the prominent Turkish politicians who deplore these arrests [...]”. In fact, Bertens adopted a very skilled use of language in which he didn't say “the Parliament deplores these arrests” but they “join” - not to some fractions in the Turkish Parliament - but “the prominent Turkish politicians” who criticize the arrests. In this way Bertens did not adopt an exclusionist discourse against Turkey; although there is heavy criticism, the discourse still attempted to bring EP interests with that of Turkey.

The next joint debate¹²⁹ took place in the Parliament on 15 December 1994 on the occasion

¹²⁹ Debate on the conviction of the Kurdish deputies. D0231. Sitting of December 15, 1994.

of the trial and conviction of the arrested Kurdish MPs. Wolfgang Kreissl-Dörfler (Germany – Socialist Group) argued:

“[...] by waiving the immunity of the Kurdish members of Parliament and allowing them to be arrested, prosecuted and sentenced, the Turkish Parliament has breached the fundamental rules of parliamentary democracy and abandoned the possibility of finding a peaceful political solution to the Kurdish question”.

making a causal link between democracy and a peaceful solution to the Kurdish question. During the same debate Aline Paillier (France – United Nordic Green Left), who was in Ankara with the 8 Kurdish MPs through the trial, claimed that international unwillingness to act on behalf of Kurds was because of economic interests: “[...] because the cowardliness of the international community, if not its active collusion out of economic interests, allows a puppet democracy to leave [Kurdish MPs] behind bars”. Arthur Stanley Newens (UK – European Socialist Group) continued: “Anyone who has any doubt about the undemocratic and intolerant character of Turkish rule should reflect on the fact that Mehdi Zana [...] was sentenced to four years' imprisonment merely for giving evidence to this Parliament' Subcommittee on Human rights. Newens argued that:

“For years a ruthless campaign has been conducted to crush the rights of the Kurds and other minorities like the remaining Armenians, who even today are suffering new threats and depredations in Istanbul. Opposition newspapers have been attacked, journalists have been killed, dissidents in general have been harassed, terrorized and intimidated.”

Maartje J.A. van Putten (Netherlands – European Socialist Group) referred to the charges pressed against the 8 Kurdish MPs - wearing the colors of the Kurdish flag: yellow, red and green, after saying a few words of Kurdish after taking oath and participating in a demonstration at the United Nations building after police raided the party headquarters – and claimed “When I saw [the

indictment] I thought; there would not be one of us left in the Chamber, we would all have been arrested long ago, if we lived under a regime like that; this Parliament would not have survived”. Responding to Turkish claims that the Kurdish situation is difficult, which makes the application of democracy more difficult, Gianfranco dell'Alba (Italy – Non-attached) made a rare positive reference to the United States, quoting Roosevelt: “The more serious and difficult the situation, the more a country should fly the flags of freedom and democracy”.

During the debate on 11 December 1995,¹³⁰ Alonso Jose Puerta (Spain – United Nordic Green Left) brought forward the EP's decision to postpone the Sakharov Prize that was awarded to Kurdish MP Leyla Zana: “[...] Sakharov Prize should have been awarded to her, and presented to her in person, or to her representative – but preferably to Leyla Zana, who is in prison under the Turkish regime, a regime which is not a democracy”. Although frequently questioning Turkey's democratic credentials was a frequently used argumentative style in the EP, other MEPs believed that Turkey would have to be included (not excluded) into the European sphere of influence for improvements in its democratic credentials. For example draftsman of the Opinion of the Committee on Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs, Martin Schulz (Germany – Socialist Group) explained his belief that the customs union would improve democratization efforts in Turkey:

“For anyone who approves this customs union on the grounds that their approval opens up possibilities of influencing Turkey's internal stability and thus contributes towards strengthening democracy in Turkey and thereby helping to protect it from Islamization is, in my opinion, acting out of honourable motives and deserves respect.

Pauline Green (UK – European Socialist Group) also adopted a similar approach, where she

¹³⁰ Sakharov Prize to Leyla Zana, Turkey. D0786. Sitting of December 11, 1995.

explained “Those of us who vote in favour [of the customs union]” do so not because they think Turkey is a democracy or respects human rights, but because the EP “want to encourage the development of those initial steps taken by the present Turkish Government towards proper democratic evolution in favour of individual and minority rights”.

The MEPs didn't always specify the shortcomings and specific opportunities for improvements in Turkish democracy. In such a rare case, Gijs de Vries (Netherlands – Liberal Democrat Reform) weighed the positive developments:

- Constitutional liberalization
- Amendment of the 'anti-terror law'
- Freeing of 137 political prisoners
- PM Tansu Ciller's promise regarding the lifting of the state of emergency

and the negative developments:

- Turkey (among UN members) had the highest rate of disappearance cases in 1995
- Widespread torture, including children
- State security courts denying right to a lawyer, doctor and family presence

arguing: “The more intensive the dialogue, the greater the chances that democracy and human rights will be upheld in Turkey [...]”

Seeing 'the real situation' in Turkey with regard to the democratic inequalities between the ‘core’ and the Kurdish periphery was also an issue of criticism within the EP. It was Turkish policy to accommodate foreign politicians monitoring Kurdish situation, in Ankara – Hilton and rather than taking them to the south-east; foreign officials were briefed on the situation either in the Prime Minister's office or the Turkish General Staff headquarters. During the elections in 18

September 1996¹³¹ MEP Schulz criticized the President-in-Office, for his positive comments on Turkish democracy after a similar experience in Ankara. Martin Schulz (Germany – Socialist Group) argued that real human rights abuses couldn't be seen from Ankara but from the Kurdish areas:

“When will you go to Kurdistan [...] to see for yourself what is happening in that country? [...] as long as you just go on negotiating in your government palace, Turkey will look like a democracy. I know that. I too have been in the government palace. It is a lovely place. But I also know the other side of Turkey, the side of torture and contempt and violations of human rights.”

Democratization was once again an issue after Abdullah Öcalan's capture and the interim government called for early elections. In 24 February 1999¹³², Pauline Green (UK – European Socialist Group) argued that the arrest of Öcalan should enable Turkey to take democratizing moves: “As we approach elections in Turkey it could put an end to the harassment of HADEP and give them the chance to participate on an equal footing with Turkey's other parties” which elicited applause from the EP. A step in the said direction was taken later towards the end of the year.

2.3. Excessive force

Third most frequent discourse adopted by the European Parliament on the Kurdish question is the excessive force argument. Such arguments were specialized, in the sense that while human rights and democratization discourses were directed towards vague recipients such as the ‘Turkish state’ or ‘the government’, excessive force arguments had clearer recipients such as the Turkish military, police and secret services for their methods involving excessive violence, harsh measures and collateral damage involving civilians.

¹³¹ Political Situation in Turkey. D1255. Sitting of September 18, 1996.

¹³² Detention of Abdullah Öcalan and Kurdish question. D2401. Sitting of February 24, 1999.

In Spring 1992, due to the high tension in south eastern Turkey, Turkish security forces intervened and used force against Kurds celebrating the new year in Shi'a and Zoroastrian faith; *Newruz*, claiming that leftist groups had 'hijacked' the gathering and turned into a pro-PKK rally. The European Unitarian Left issued a harsh motion for resolution¹³³ where it "Condemn[ed] the military operations directed against the Kurdish population by a country which is a member of the Council of Europe, and of the CSCE and which has signed the European Convention on Human Rights and is applying for membership of the EEC". Exactly the same day, another motion for resolution¹³⁴ was proposed on the same occasion, this time by the Green group. The Green group's motion was much more detailed and elaborate than that of the Unitarian Left, mentioning the cities in which the firing incidents happened, estimated number of casualties and which international laws Turkey infringed upon. In the Greens' motion, while terrorism was acknowledged, it is particularly interesting that the terms 'PKK' and 'terrorism' were not used in the same paragraph.

"D. Aware that terrorist activities are being carried out by various groups in the Kurdish provinces and in such towns as Istanbul and Izmir,

E. convinced that the call by the PKK for a popular uprising and the occurrence of isolated acts of rebellion in Turkish Kurdistan do not justify bombardments and oppression of the Kurdish population by the Turkish State, to which civilians fall victim, under the pretext of combating terrorism"

According to this motion, while the "terrorist activities" are being carried out by "various groups", what the PKK does is a "call for popular uprising" and causing "occurrence of isolated acts of rebellion" which "do not justify bombardments and oppression to which civilians fall victim". With this, the PKK is also safely removed discursively, from its acts that target both Turkish and

¹³³ Kurds in Turkey. D1144 B3-0553/92. Sitting of April 9, 1992.

¹³⁴ Ibid B3-0573/92.

Kurdish citizens. Moreover as an issue linkage, the motion expressed: “G. alarmed by assessments that the Turkish security forces in the Kurdish regions are acting outside the control of Parliament of the Government”. It is not elaborated which particular ‘assessments’ are of concern or which specific ‘Kurdish regions’ are in question nor what particular practices of the security forces indicate ‘acting outside government control’. As a second issue linkage, the motion ties a domestic issue (Turkish security acts against the Kurds celebrating *Newruz*) into a foreign one: “concerned that as a result of the closure of the border with Iraq, urgently needed aid supplies are not reaching the Kurdish refugees in Iraqi Kurdistan”. Adding to this, another issue linkage “N. Deploring the fact that the meeting of the EC-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee which was planned for 23-25 March has now for the second time been cancelled by Turkey” was mentioned. This motion also criticized the United States for its presence in the F-16 fighter project with Turkey and called upon the US to review the decision, showing how a domestic act of excessive violence on the part of Turkish security forces could create an environment in the EP with regard to Turkey’s foreign relations, military acquisition projects and its relations with neighboring countries.

On 19 April 1993 Claudia Roth (Germany - Greens) submitted another motion for a resolution to the Parliament titled “on the scope for peace negotiations in Kurdistan”¹³⁵ as a response to the unilateral ceasefire declared by the PKK. The motion is worth attention as it gives the divergence both in discourse and the perception between the Turkish government and Roth. Roth referred to the PKK leadership as “Central Committee” (whereas within the Turkish discourse this is “terrorist organization leaders” or *terör örgütü elebaşları*) in capital letters, while referring to the organization as the “Kurdistan Liberation Army (KLA)” although even the PKK did not refer to itself like that, and naming Abdullah Öcalan as the “Secretary-General” of the

¹³⁵ On the scope for peace negotiations in Kurdistan. D1695 – B3-0575/93. Sitting of April 19, 1993.

organization (while Turkey called him the ‘arch-terrorist’ or *terrorist başı*). Moreover, the motion declared Turkish army presence in the southeast as “provocative”, urging the “Turkish Government to put an end to its scorched earth policy and the senseless destruction of Kurdish villages and dwellings”. The discourse of ‘provocation’ of course, was adopted frequently by the Turkish state in order to define PKK acts in the southeast. In many ways, this motion for resolution was a discursive ‘punishment’ of Turkey by tearing down the words and phrases it uses with regard to the PKK and reverses Turkish accusations of the organization, accusing Turkey with exactly the same charges Turkey accuses the PKK.

During the debate that took place in 10 February 1994¹³⁶ Mirelle C. Elmalan (France – United Nordic Green Left) indicated that “[The Turkish government] has had no inhibitions about shelling and destroying Kurdish villages, banning Kurdish parties, closing down newspapers and imprisoning journalists”. Elmalan also criticized both the PKK (referring it as ‘Kurdish groups’) and the Turkish army: “This house has a duty to condemn the terrorist activity of Kurdish groups but also, and above all, the Turkish army's bloody reign of terror”. Vassilis Ephremidis (Greece – United Nordic Green Left) followed “[...] the present Turkish regime is systematically engaged in a sort of genocide against the Kurdish population” constructing Turkish responses against the PKK within the framework of mass violence. Dimitrios Pagropoulos (Greece – European Socialist Group) adopted a similar tone: “That [Turkish security forces] arrested 8 people is nothing when they are killing hundreds every day.” Arthur Stanley Newens (UK – European Socialist Group) continued: “[...] Turkish authorities have used ruthless violence against villages where by their very nature many of the victims have been innocent civilians”. Karel Dillen (Belgium – Non-attached) followed with a more balanced, but harsh tone: “I take this opportunity to draw attention

¹³⁶ Elections in Turkey. D2173. Sitting of February 10, 1994.

to the intolerable nature of Kurdish terrorism and the equally intolerable terrorist-style Turkish response¹³⁷ in European countries”.

During the 15 December 1994 joint debate¹³⁸ Jannis Sakellariou (Germany – European Socialist Group), on the occasion of the conviction of the 8 Kurdish MPs of the Turkish Parliament claimed: “This parliament has repeatedly condemned all forms of terrorism, including PKK terrorism against defenceless civilian victims. We must therefore also condemn terrorism by the Turkish state”. These arrests were constructed within the context of many different discursive contexts. It is indeed interesting from the researcher’s point of view that a single legislature can refer to the same incident by different syntactic frameworks: human rights, democratization and state terrorism. Although excessive force argument was used against Turkish military or the police, there were some rare occasions when it was used within the context of democracy in Turkey. As a further example, during the same debate that took place on the conviction of 8 Kurdish parliamentarians, Katerina Daskalaki (Greece – Group Union for Europe) claimed “it is known that a new genocide is taking place in Turkey, that of the Kurds [...]” adding “[...] the imprisoned deputies were persecuted for doing their duty and expressing non-violent views in their parliament”. James Moorhouse (UK – Liberal Democrat Reform) also claimed that “The Turkish authorities have been resorting [...] to state terrorism”, while Arthur Stanley Newens (UK – European Socialist Group) continued: “[...] a cruel, relentless military campaign has been conducted in south-eastern Turkey to destroy villages and towns particularly around *Tunceli* and resettle survivors elsewhere”. While criticizing the PKK, Newens emphasized more on the Turkish violence: “[...] the scale of the terror unleashed by the Turkish armed forces cannot possibly be

¹³⁷ She refers to the incident that took place in the Flemish region of Brussels where Turkish groups attacked a Kurdish meeting.

¹³⁸ Turkey. D0231. Sitting of 15 December 1994.

justified [...]”.

In some other rare cases, MEPs attempted to mention Turkish attitudes towards other minorities to strengthen their arguments on the Kurdish question. Through the debates in 1995, Turkish *Alevi* population was also mentioned, together with the Kurds. During the debate on customs union on 14 March 1995¹³⁹ Otto von Habsburg (Germany – Christian Democratic Group) attracted the attention of the Commission, referring: “to the genocide of the Kurds and to the recent increased police activity against the Alevis”. He challenged: “What do the Commission and the Council need to do in order to put a stop to this genocide?”

While MEPs rarely used facts and statistics in their debates, Claudia Roth (Germany – Greens) can be regarded as a rare example of factual argumentation. While not blaming a certain side, on 13 December 1995¹⁴⁰, Roth referred to the toll of the conflict: “[...] has Turkey climbed out of the spiral of violence as it must, out of the dirty war that has now destroyed 3000 villages, driven out 3 million people and claimed thousands of lives [...]?” Although the words ‘terror’ and ‘terrorism’ were overwhelmingly used to refer to the PKK’s methods, there were some instances when these words were used against the practices of the Turkish security forces. During the debate that took place on 18 January 1996,¹⁴¹ Katerina Daskalaki (Greece – Group Union for Europe) called an intervention of the police forces as “reign of violence and terrorism” and condemned the “bloodshed”.¹⁴² Pauline Green (UK – European Socialist Group) highlighted a recent ceasefire proposed by the PKK and complained about Turkish response: “[...] its actions have been gross,

¹³⁹ Customs union with Turkey. D0380. Sitting of March 14, 1995.

¹⁴⁰ EC-Turkey relations – Human rights in Turkey. D0802. December 13, 1995.

¹⁴¹ Turkey. D 0852. Sitting of January 18, 1996.

¹⁴² She refers to the January 4, 1996 police raid to the Ümraniye E-type prison in Istanbul, in order to end what the Turkish officials had claimed to be a ‘case of uprising’, killing 3 and wounding 67 prisoners believed to be affiliated with the PKK and militant leftist groups.

vicious and deadly. There has been a vicious response to prison riots, the beatings, torture and killings of journalists in Istanbul, and no lessening whatsoever of tension and abuse in the Kurdish lands.”

Worries of excessive force were not limited to Turkey or Turkish security forces. The EP also criticized Turkish civilian violence in EU cities when the PKK leader Abdullah Öcalan had fled to Italy. On 16 July 1997¹⁴³ Gary Titley (UK – Socialist Group) conveyed his worries on a probable ‘mob violence’ during a Champions League football match between the Turkish Galatasaray and Italian Juventus: “If that becomes the occasion for mob violence against Italian citizens, I would submit that it would set back EU-Turkey relations”. On 2 December 1998¹⁴⁴ Gerardo Bianco (Italy – Christian Democratic Group) mirrored Titley's worries and criticized Turkey's attitude towards Italy for giving refuge to PKK leader Abdullah Öcalan: “[...] harsh and violent attitude will not resolve the matter either, and the terms in which Turkey has referred to Italy are not always palatable”. Roberto Speciale (Italy – European Socialist Group) argued the same position: “Turkey's recent attitude to Italy has [...] been a serious error of judgment on the part of the government and society at large, because [of its] aggressive, even violent attitude [...]”

While the EP was more critical towards the PKK in the early 1990s, it gradually adopted a balanced discourse where they criticized both the PKK and the Turkish military. However towards the end of the decade, MEPs started to emphasize Turkish military excesses over PKK violence. For example, during the debate on 6 October 1999, Baroness Sarah Ludford (UK – Alliance of Liberals and Democrats) claimed “The main cancer in the Turkish system is the repression of the

¹⁴³ Turkey and northern Iraq. D 1655. Sitting of July 16, 1997

¹⁴⁴ EU-Turkey relations. D 2283. Sitting of December 2, 1998

Kurdish people [...] The PKK has committed some atrocities but these have been far outweighed by those perpetrated by the Turkish army [...] Our mistake is to perceive Turkey more as a strategic military ally than as a political partner.”

2.4 Ethnic conflict / Peace Process / Identity / Autonomy

Through the course of the insurgency, the EP sometimes referred to the Kurdish question in Turkey within the context of either an ethnic conflict in which the emphasis was made on ethnic and cultural identity, or within the context of a peace process between two different factions – Turks and Kurds (rather than between the state and its citizens), similar to that of the Israeli – Palestinian conflict.

For example in some cases, MEPs conveyed their belief that the Kurdish question is mainly about different ethnicities and that, the Turkish conflict with the Kurds is all about their ‘Kurdish-ness’. In the joint debate in 10 March 1994,¹⁴⁵ Alexandros Alavanos (Greece – United Nordic Green Left) complained: “[...] elected representative and colleagues of ours are incarcerated as common criminals under threat of the death sentence. Why? Because they had the misfortune to be born as Kurds”. Here, as a deviation from previous discourses that asserted Turkish action against the Kurdish parliamentarians rooted from lack of democracy or respect for human rights, Alavanos adopted an ethnicist discourse that attempts to make the argument that the Kurdish question is not about democracy or human rights but about ‘being a Kurd’. Within this context, recognition of the Kurdish identity was a frequent request made by the MEPs. It is well arguable that many in the European Parliament believed that the Kurdish problem would be solved through Turkey’s granting linguistic and cultural rights to its Kurdish citizens. For example, a

¹⁴⁵ Turkey. D2258 - B3-0347/94. Sitting of March 10, 1994.

month later during the debate on the arrest of 8 Kurdish parliamentarians¹⁴⁶, Karel Dillen (Belgium – Non-attached) argued: “[...] Kurds should be entitled to their language, their beliefs, their identity. That is, after all, what the right to self-determination is all about”. The speech continued “[Both sides coming to their senses] requires that Turkey grant the Kurds the right to their own identity [...]”. Other than MEP discourses, adopted texts also conveyed the same message. The resolution that was adopted the same day recommended: “4. Calls once again on the Turkish Government finally to recognize the right of autonomy of the Kurdish people in Turkey”.

Cultural rights and autonomy discourse became a part of customs union negotiations too. However, Turkey’s main concern was that such a Kurdish autonomy would have adverse affects on territorial integrity, since territorial integrity was a value Turkey held dear, mostly because (as I have presented in the theory chapter) the country was established on the principles of French and German nationalist traditions, which assert the necessity of a motherland for the establishment of nation-hood. Very few MEPs knew or addressed this concern. However during the customs union debate on 14 February 1995¹⁴⁷, Pervenche Beres (France – Socialist Group) claimed: “[...] supporters of dialogue and a political solution to the Kurdish question exist in Turkey but are not heard. Our position, there as elsewhere, supports the recognition of cultural identity within respect for frontiers”. As much as it might be a few words, it is well arguable that European Parliament wouldn’t have alienated Turkey this much had it made more references to its recognition of Turkey’s territorial integrity.

In some cases, MEPs did not refer to autonomy or ethnic recognition, but treaded carefully

¹⁴⁶ Persecution of Kurdish parliamentarians. D2296. Sitting of April 18, 1994.

¹⁴⁷ Customs Union between EU and Turkey. D0311 – B4-0180/95. Sitting of February 14, 1995.

along the cultural rights discourse. For example on 13 December 1995¹⁴⁸, Pauline Green (UK – European Socialist Group) stated: “[The Kurdish question] can only truly end with a political settlement which recognizes the right of minorities in Turkey to exercise their language, culture and traditions.” Here, Green tied the ‘political solution’ of the Kurdish question to “language, culture and traditions”. There is no specific information as to what he would accept as the grant of these rights, nor is there any elaboration on how he believes that Turkey infringes upon these rights, however this argument explicitly conveys Green’s thoughts on the solution of the Kurdish problem along the lines of culture and language. A culturalist discourse was also adopted by a more senior official; on 17 January 1996¹⁴⁹, during the ceremonial speech, the President-in-chair Klaus Hänsch (Germany – Socialist Group) focused on the cultural rights discourse: “A state that makes it a criminal offence to use the language of one of its constituent peoples is destroying the richness of its entire culture and its very soul.”

The ‘peace process’ discourse adopted by the European Parliament had similarities to its discourse on the Israeli – Palestinian conflict. In some instances just as the MEPs argued in favor of engaging Hamas, they argued in favor of an engagement with the PKK; a suggestion that had sparked intense criticism within Turkey (as it did in Israel) accusing the EP to ‘negotiate with the terrorists’. A similar demand was made by, Jonas Sjöstedt (Sweden – United Nordic Green Left) a day later¹⁵⁰:

“[We ask] the new Turkish Government enter into negotiations with Kurdish representatives to seek a peaceful resolution of the Kurdish question. Such negotiations should also include the PKK. We condemn all forms of terrorism and

¹⁴⁸ EC-Turkey relations – Human rights in Turkey. D0802. Sitting of December 13, 1995.

¹⁴⁹ Sakharov Prize 1995 to Leyla Zana, Turkey. D0848. Sitting of January 17, 1996.

¹⁵⁰ Turkey. D0852 – B4-0076/96. Sitting of January 18, 1996.

separatism, but the PKK much be offered an opportunity for dialogue and for a peaceful settlement of the conflict.”

There were also instances when the Council or Commission too, referred to the identity aspect of the Kurdish question. On 16 July 1997¹⁵¹, President-in-office of the Council Wohlfart told his experience of some Turkish politicians denying the existence of Kurds: “[...] when I was visiting them they spoke of the Kurds as 'upland' Turks. [...] They are quite frankly denying the problem.”¹⁵²

Despite not going into the specifics of what constitutes as ‘cultural rights’ for the most part of the 1990s, the first mention of the specifics of what the EP regards as 'cultural rights' was in 2 December 1998¹⁵³ when Hannes Swoboda (Austria – Socialist Group) said: “[...] the Kurdish people must be able to uphold their cultural rights and in particular their language and its use in the media, books and so on.” However, construction of the Kurds, not as a minority in Turkey, but as the people of an unrecognized country, Kurdistan was made in 1999. MEP Koldo Gorostiaga Atxalandabaso (Spain – Non-attached) linked the Kurdish question to the Basque issue in Spain. During the debate on 6 October 1999, he said: “The European Parliament ought to realize that there is no Kurdish minority in Kurdistan, just as there is no Basque minority in the Basque country”

2.5 - Role of the military

Turkish Armed Forces as an institution came under intense scrutiny through the 1990s.

¹⁵¹ Customs union with Turkey. D1193. Sitting of July 16, 1997.

¹⁵² Several examples to the denialist approaches within the Turkish discourse will be given in the chapter on the Turkish Grand National Assembly.

¹⁵³ EU/Turkey relations. D2283 – A4-0432/98. Sitting of December 2, 1998.

The European Parliament frequently criticized its approach to the Kurdish question and its dominance in national decision-making process. Although the EP criticized Turkish security forces generally under the human rights and democratization discourses, there were instances when the MEPs referred directly to the army, in separation from the police forces and other enforcement agencies.

During the debate on the arrest of the Kurdish members of the Turkish National Assembly for example, Claudia Roth (Germany – Greens) argued that it was in fact the Turkish military that was behind these arrests:

*“The general chief of staff mutters under his breath, ‘there are traitors in the House’. Parliament which is supposed to be sovereign, acts on orders from above [...] Parliament has abandoned control to the military planners in the general staff and stripped itself of its powers”.*¹⁵⁴

She continued with a satirical critique of the Turkish security forces:

“[Kurdish Parliamentarians] were arrested in front of the Parliament building and dragged away by state policemen as terrorists. This means that the Kurdish issue has finally been handed over to people with experience of these matters. I am referring to the death squads who murder scores of people in the Kurdish areas every day, military personnel who set fire to villages and drive out farmers out and policemen who torture people to death in torture chambers”.

In the same debate, Stylianos Pagropoulos (Greece – European Socialist Group) also criticized the Turkish military: “[...] the ruling class, essentially represented by the military in Turkey, has become over-arrogant, a fact for which we ourselves and the 12 countries of the European Union are partly responsible.” Max Simeoni (France – Rainbow group) acknowledged the critical role of the military: “[...] behind Mrs. Ciller lies the real power, that of the military. The military authorities have just given us further proof that they are totally in control by

¹⁵⁴ Debate on the conviction of the Kurdish deputies. D0231. Sitting of December 15, 1994.

obtaining the lifting of the parliamentary immunity of seven Kurdish MPs belonging to the Democratic Party”.

On 16 July 1997¹⁵⁵, Jan Willem Bertens (Netherlands – Liberal Democrat Reform) made a link between Turkey's military presence in northern Iraq and its EU accession process: “It is to be hoped that the military, although they support a secular Turkey, will now once again withdraw from politics” adding “The withdrawal of troops from northern Iraq is only the beginning of a long process which Turkey must go through before it can accede to the Union.” Roth questioned the argument ‘military is the guarantor of democracy’¹⁵⁶:

“[the Kurdish question] is inseparably linked to this democratization: it cannot be delegated to the military even though certain people both here and in Turkey would have us believe that the military is the guarantor of democracy and the rule of law. Was it not specifically the last military cop in Turkey, in 1980, that left the present legacy of antidemocratic structures?”

During the debate in 6 October 1999, Bastiaan Belder (Netherlands – Independence/Democracy) made a link between the military approach to the Kurdish question and Turkey's EU accession: “It is precisely Ankara's unaltered, hard military line as regards the

¹⁵⁵ Turkey and northern Iraq. D 1655. Sitting of July 16, 1997

¹⁵⁶ Prevailing Turkish Armed Forces discourse on democracy has been that Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, during the foundation of the republic, had appointed the military as the sole guarantor of Turkish democracy. Democracy within this context was essentially a late-19th century French understanding of the concept that derives a lot from separation of the state and the religious institutions (*laïcité*, in French). Therefore, during the foundation of the republic, democracy was understood as secularism and the military was the guarantor of this definition of democracy against militant Islamism. Of course, as the 19th century definition of democracy evolved during the preceding century, Turkey was unable to make this transition mainly because this understanding of democracy was established as the *sacrosanct* element of the state as ‘Atatürkist principles’. As the European definition of democracy expanded and included principles such as freedom of thought, freedom of speech, ethnic expression and so on, Turkey could not make that leap as any proposed change on the rigid definition of democracy was considered as ‘trying to damage Turkish democracy’. Therefore through the 1990s, when the EU mentioned democratic shortcomings of Turkey, this claim would quickly get rejected by Turkey since, from the Turkish point of view, Turkey was already democratic because it was secular. For more on this, see: Aydin, Ertan and Yılmaz Colak. ‘Dilemmas of Turkish Democracy: The Encounter between Kemalist Laicism and Islamism in 1990s Turkey’ in David W. Odell-Scott (2004) *Democracy and religion: free exercise and diverse visions* (Kent: Kent University Press)

Kurdish question [...] that underlines how important it is for us to assess Turkey's compliance with the accession criteria". Later same year, Hartmut Nassauer (Germany – Christian Democrat Group) on 16 December 1999 claimed, “[...] Turkey is not even prepared to amend fundamental clauses in its constitution, such as the influence of the military. The expectations raised in Helsinki¹⁵⁷ are therefore bound to end in disappointment” making a reference to the constitutional status of the military.

2.6. Discourses that converge with that of the Turkish state

In some instances MEPs adopted discourses that converged with official Turkish state rhetoric. Almost always supportive of the Turkish state, such discourses focused on Turkey's territorial integrity, its right to combat separatism and terrorism or Turkey's strategic utility to the West. Discourses related to territorial integrity and condemnation of the PKK constitute the around 10% of the discourses adopted in the European Parliament (an expanded statistical discussion will be made in Chapter 6). Interestingly, most of such discourses did not come from the MEPs, but from the President of the Council or a member of the Commission; the executive organs of the EU. Discourses of those two institutions are mentioned later in this chapter.

During the debate that took place on 15 December 1994¹⁵⁸, Luigi Caligaris (Italy – Liberal Democrat Reform), after mentioning that the arrest of the Kurdish parliamentarians were unacceptable, pointed out to the Cold War role of Turkey: “[The Parliament] fails to take into account something important – namely the role played by Turkey towards the West during the past 50 years, constituting an advance frontier of the West towards the Soviet Union [...]”. He

¹⁵⁷ Refers to the Helsinki Summit in 10-11 December 1999 in which Turkey was granted candidacy for EU accession

¹⁵⁸ Debate on the conviction of the Kurdish deputies. D0231. Sitting of December 15, 1994.

mentioned the difficulty he perceives in Turkish experience: “Turkey is a country which [...] set out on the road to a democracy that does not meet our standard, and has thereby demonstrated its courage”. He also made a reference to the secularism in Turkey: “Since the time of [Kemal] Ataturk, Turkey has been the bastion of secular Islam in the face of fundamentalism [...]”. Finally he pointed out to the Turkish help during the Gulf War: “[...] Turkey was also the base from which the operations to save Iraq's Kurdish community from the Iraqi oppressors were launched”. He also warned the EP that it will be “counter-productive” to issue a harsh statements and severe Turkey's ties with the EU; contrary he argues “we should speed up its progress towards Europe, given that it has, in my view, had to wait too long”.

During the debate on 13 December 1995¹⁵⁹ on the customs union, MEP and Turkey rapporteur Konrad K. Schwaiger (Germany – Christian Democratic Group), after 7 paragraphs of criticism of Turkish democratic system ended by: “[...] Turkey plays a central stabilizing role in the economic development of the Mediterranean region and acts as a natural counterbalance to the medieval structures and behavior of its fundamentalist neighbors”. Green acknowledged Turkish steps towards amending the Constitution and despite much criticism he follows: “We note, however, that these changes mark the first time in her history that Turkey has changed her constitution by parliamentary means. And of course that is to be welcomed.” More specifically he acknowledged “the extension of voting rights and the right to political involvement of civil servants [...]” and “[...] more than 120 of the 146 eminent politicians, trade unionists, journalists, lawyers and authors have been released in the last 30 days [...]”. Wilfried Martens (Belgium – Christian Democratic Group) continues: “This country is one of the few states in the Islamic world which is building a secular democracy” and states “It is vitally important that Turkey should be

¹⁵⁹ EC-Turkey relations – Human rights in Turkey. D0802. Sitting of December 13, 1995.

strongly anchored in Europe. Not only for Turkey's sake, but in the vital interests of the European Union as well.” Following, Helene Carrere D'Encausse (France – Group Union for Europe) affirmed: “The Turkish democrats, fighting for the triumph of those very things in their country – democracy, human rights, Kurdish rights, settlement of the Cyprus question – tell us that the customs union will anchor Turkey in Europe and be the surest means of making our voice heard in Ankara.” Gijs de Vries (Netherlands – Liberal Democrat Reform) also reminds “Apart from Greece and Israel, Turkey is the only democratic country in the Eastern Mediterranean. Turkey is a partner in NATO with a market economy and a secular tradition in an unstable area of the world.” In the same debate, Claudia Roth (Germany – Greens) challenged the concept of 'pro-Turkish-ness' and makes one of the most interesting arguments related to this:

“[...] who are Turkey's friends? Are they only those who are in favour of a Yes vote for the customs union today? And does that mean that those who, at the time of the vote, voice doubts and criticism about the social effects of the customs union on Turkey specifically, who point to the human rights situation and the Kurdish deputies in prison in Ankara, are in fact the opponents and enemies of Turkey?”

She claimed Greens are the “genuine friends of the people in Turkey” - perhaps adding “people” there in order to avoid the interpretations that Greens are the friends of the state and establishment in Turkey – also challenges the cultural exclusionism against Turkey in the EU: “[...] is it ambiguous to say Yes to the customs union [...] because, so it is argued, there is no place among us for an Islamic country? For us there is no question but that Turkey is part of Europe [...]”. Catherine Lalumiere also highlighted Turkey's strategic and geographic importance, “history, its democratic weight and its economic potential [...]” and claimed “Turkey is facing terrorism from the PKK. It is unable to eradicate this gangrene which is eating away the country.” Magdalene Hoff (Germany – European Socialist Group) made a reference to West German policy, *Ostpolitik*,

towards in the 1970, under Willy Brandt: “I would argue that we should apply the same principle today which Brandt's government followed at the time. The same leitmotif of 'change through rapprochement' must apply to the relations between the European Union and Turkey.” Alfred Gomolka (Germany – Christian Democratic Group) responded to claims that Turkey is a dictatorship: “[...] I am one of the few people here who had to live under a Communist dictatorship [...] Turkey is light-years away from that kind of ideological totalitarianism.” He claims that if the EU rejected customs union, it would lead Turks to “[...] turn their minds away from Europe in disappointment [...]” and that “[...] rejection would lead to greater polarization of domestic policy, to a creeping radicalization.”

‘Pro-Turkish discourses’ weren’t limited to the MEPs. In the Sakharov Prize speech, President-in-chair of the EP, Klaus Hansch (Germany – European Socialist Group) asserted:

“I venture to say that we awarded the 1995 Sakharov Prize to Leyla Zana in the same spirit in which the customs union was approved by a majority of the Members of our House. Both of these steps were taken because we wanted to extend a hand of friendship to those in Turkey who are committed to democratic reforms, who seek conciliation within Turkey and who want to go on opening their country to Europe and its values.”¹⁶⁰

Adding, however: “We expect the next Turkish Government to sit down with all democratic Kurdish organizations committed to non-violent political solution.”

During the debate on 18 January 1996¹⁶¹, Otto von Habsburg (Germany – Christian Democratic Group) made one of the most interesting counter-arguments against criticism on Turkey. First he proposed his belief that the EP has double standards over the human rights

¹⁶⁰ Sakharov Prize to Leyla Zana, Turkey. D0786. Sitting of December 11, 1995.

¹⁶¹ Turkey. D 0852. Sitting of January 18, 1996.

situation in Turkey vis-à-vis other countries:

“When I see what happened a few hours ago in relation to Cuba, I must say that I am sometimes surprised. There is a concentric anger here, which is directed sometimes against one thing and sometimes against another. In relation to Cuba, which certainly behaves just as badly as some Turkish authorities, it is suddenly said: 'What delightful people, we should do something for them!' But in the case of the Turks we must be strict!”

Second, he highlights the PKK factor and makes a connection with the organization with the Russian leader Zhirinovsky. He conceded that while it is important for the EP to improve its relations with the Kurds: “[...] but that cannot be done via the PKK which, for the rest – and please note this – has allied itself with Mr. Zhirinovsky of Russia [...]”. Third, in yet another one of the most interesting counter-arguments in the EP, von Habsburg challenged Katerina Daskalaki (Greece – Group Union for Europe), who, had shown an alleged photo of a Turkish soldier during the prison riots that was holding a severed head:

“It is strictly forbidden to wear a beard in the Turkish army. That is part of Turkish army policy according to the tradition of Kemal Ataturk and is directed against Islamic fundamentalism. Just look at the picture! The soldier is bearded. If that is a soldier in the Turkish army I am very much surprised; I simply cannot believe that!”

claiming the EP “[...] can achieve very good results through cooperation with the laic forces in Turkey.”

In 18 September 1996¹⁶² during one of the most critical debates on Turkey's Kurdish policy, Werner Langen (Germany – Christian Democratic Group) highlighted Turkey's role in countering Islamism. Langen stated: “There cannot be stability and peace in the region without

¹⁶² Political Situation in Turkey. D1255/B4-0985/96. Sitting of September 18, 1996.

Turkey, only with Turkey. Nor can it be in the interests of our Greek friends to see Turkey as a factor of instability in an Islamic world, facing away from Europe.”

After the capture of Öcalan, Kurdish violence in the European capitals tilted the balance in favour of Turkey. During the debate on 24 February 1999, Jean-Claude Pasty (France – Group Union for Europe) highlighted Kurdish violence in Europe following Öcalan's capture, referred to “[...] violence which has occurred in Europe and the hostage-taking at various embassies by Kurds demonstrating against the arrest of their leader” and urged EU member countries to “crack down on international terrorism in our countries”.

3. Discourses adopted by the members of the European Commission and Council of Europe

Adopting a less critical and more encouraging tone towards Turkey, Council and Commission have endured severe criticism from the MEPs. While both of these institutions had more say over foreign policy matters – and hence, over relations with Turkey – the MEPs, especially the Nordic Left sustained pressure on members of the Commission or Council during the debates. One observable pattern in both Commission and Council discourses was that no matter how harsh their criticism of Turkey was, they almost always condemned PKK to establish a balance.

In the debate on 10 February 1994¹⁶³ on the upcoming Turkish elections, Commissioner Hans Van den Broek started out by criticising the PKK: “First of all we must continue to condemn strongly all acts of terrorism and attempts to achieve political aims by violent means, such as the

¹⁶³ Elections in Turkey. D2173. Sitting of February 10, 1994.

PKK does in Turkey”, balancing immediately by a criticism of the Turkish Armed Forces: “At the same time we must indicate in our regular talks with Turkey that there can be no military solution to the problem or ambitions of the Kurdish population in our view”.

In some instances, Commission attempted to work around the over-generalizations and pessimism of the MEPs. Closing the debate on 10 March 1994¹⁶⁴ for example, Commissioner Sir Leon Brittan responded to heavy criticism from the Parliament regarding the over-reaction of Turkey to the PKK violence:

“[...] apart from the particular area of the country where a violent dispute was taking place, many Turks, including members of the government, who were of Kurdish origin lived perfectly peacefully throughout Turkey. They also pointed out to me that the PKK was conducting a terrorist campaign of unusual virulence, with many victims, even by the standards of such terrorist campaigns elsewhere in the world.”

adding “[...] the right way to handle terrorism [is] not to be reluctant to accept the normal standards of human rights”. Commissioner Brittan addresses a wide spectrum of argumentative discourses and made connections between most of the discourse types explained in this chapter:

“It is for that reason among many that respect for human rights seems to me to be in the interests not only of those who are concerned about Kurdish rights but those who are concerned about democracy, those who are concerned about the end of violence and those who are concerned about the legitimate interests of the Turkish people as a whole and relations between Turkey and the European Union.”

As a deviation from MEP discourses that favoured severing ties between EU and Turkey because of the human rights situation, Commission advocated using the EU process to improve

¹⁶⁴ Turkey. D2258. Sitting of March 10, 1994.

Turkey's human rights record. Ending the debate on 15 December 1994¹⁶⁵, Commissioner Hans van den Broek affirmed the Commission's aim of “consolidating democracy” and “guaranteeing the principles of a constitutional state” and proposed “European integration also has a very important role to play in supporting the process”. Like his predecessors, van den Broek was careful in maintaining balance: “I also think it is important to go on making it clear to Turkey that we still utterly condemn terrorism by the PKK and we will have nothing to do with separatism”. Although he referred to Turkey's human rights record as “disgraceful”, he proposed that the customs union would bring Turkey closer to Europe, which “gives us a greater chance of having a positive influence than we seem to have had up to now.” He also corrected what he thinks a misconception on behalf of the MEPs that customs union will appease Turkey: “without wishing to give an exact date, continuing negotiations on a customs union will, on balance, increase rather than limit our chances of having some influence”.

While the Commission's discourses appear to be in favour of Turkey, Council attempted to find a balance between the discourses of the Commission and the EP. On 14 February 1995¹⁶⁶ during the debate on the Customs Union between EU and Turkey President-in-Office of the Council, Lamassoure made an overview of the related topics. It wasn't long before he adopted the ‘strategic position’ discourse: “[...] Turkey occupies a strategic position, both a pole of stability in this particularly troubled region and in addition, as a force for moderation in the numerous regional conflicts taking place on its doorstep.” After mentioning Turkish support during the 'Provide Comfort' agreement through lending its Incirlik airbase, he claimed “The collapse of the communist world since 1989 has strengthened the significance of Turkey's strategic position [...]”.

¹⁶⁵ Debate on the conviction of the Kurdish deputies. D0231. Sitting of December 15, 1994.

¹⁶⁶ Customs Union between EU and Turkey. D0311. Sitting of February 15, 1995.

Related with the Kurdish question, Alain Lamassoure preferred referring to it as “separatist ambitions in its south-east region, not to mention actual terrorism: a blind terrorism which strikes at the innocent, which resorts to taking hostages – nationals of the European Union have been victims – which assassinates Turkish diplomats in Europe.” He criticised Turkey in a similar tone: “[...] this struggle does not justify violation of human rights; it does not justify banning newspapers, destroying villages, jailing members of parliament simply for expressing opinion.”

Council and Commission discourses also deviate from MEP discourses in terms of their willingness to accept Turkey’s situation as a problem of the EU. While the MEPs often referred to the Kurdish situation as an issue that has to be dealt by Turkey, Commission and Council accepted the problem as EU’s responsibility. During the customs union debate on 14 March 1995,¹⁶⁷ Alain Lamassoure claimed: “I am not satisfied with the human rights situation in Turkey. [...] On the other hand, I recognize that there is now a real possibility of making progress on each of these great issues, difficult, sensitive, vital to Europe as they are and the question we face today is whether or not we are willing to make that progress”, taking focus of responsibility away from Turkey and towards the EU. Following, van den Broek of the Commission explained: “[...] we do face a choice here: whether we should allow a situation on which there has been no movement for decades to continue and react to abuses which we note but are powerless to change or whether we should try to make use of a new momentum, a new opportunity in an effort to bring things into a peaceful conclusion.”

In the customs union debate on 13 December 1995¹⁶⁸ President-in-office of the Council

¹⁶⁷ Customs union with Turkey. D0380. Sitting of March 14, 1995.

¹⁶⁸ EC-Turkey relations – Human rights in Turkey. D0802. December 13, 1995.

Carlos Westendorp highlighted Turkey's "fundamental geostrategic" importance, reminding, "[...] Turkey [...] is the European Union's number one trading partner in the Mediterranean, even ahead of Israel." He mirrored Lamassoure's sense of responsibility and emphasises the importance of EU progress in Turkey's democratization: "We are in duty bound [...] to help them in [democratization]. That hopeful, although still incomplete process of democratic reforms in possible [...] only by linking Turkey to the European Union and making progress with the Customs Union." Commission was also more cautious with PKK's declarations of ceasefire. Ending the debate on 18 January 1996¹⁶⁹ Vice-President of the Commission Sir Leon Brittan highlighted the PKK attacks; the assassination of Ozdemir Sabanci (who was a member of the leading Turkish business family) by a PKK hit-woman Fehriye Erdal and the suicide bombing by the PKK on a city bus, challenging the MEP arguments lauding the PKK ceasefire since these attacks took place "[...] just a few days after the unilateral ceasefire declared by that organization."

Council and Commission also informed MEPs on reform packages and liberalizations undertaken by the Turkish government. On 18 September 1996¹⁷⁰, President-in-office of the Council David Mitchell, presented Council's opinion on the "political situation in Turkey". He "welcomed" the constitutional changes and the amendments to the Article 8 of the anti-terror law. Often though, Council or Commission praise for Turkey weren't well received by the MEPs. His statement: "The Council recognizes the seriousness of the internal security problems which the sustained campaign of violence in the south-east Turkey poses for the Turkish authorities" elicited a protest from the parliament. Although the Council further asserted: "the situation in the south-eastern provinces should not be approached exclusively as a security problem" his optimism "We

¹⁶⁹ Turkey. D 0852. Sitting of January 18, 1996.

¹⁷⁰ Political Situation in Turkey. D1255. Sitting of September 18, 1996.

are encouraged [...] by the legislation [...] aimed at lifting the nine-year-old state of emergency [...]” elicited another protest from the Parliament. During this particular session, the sustained protest increased and after Mitchell's statement: “[Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Çiller] confirmed that the Turkish Government would give careful consideration to the declaration¹⁷¹” and the MEPs gave such a reaction that Mitchell complained to the President of the Parliament: “Mr President, it is very difficult to speak if Members interrupt.” after which the vice-President Fontana intervened: “[Certain MEPs] should at least be quiet and show respect for the presidency!”. Following Mitchell, Commissioner van den Broek asked for restraint over Turkey's human rights record: “The political situation in Turkey is complicated, and at present it is difficult to draw far-reaching conclusions about the direction Turkey will take as regards its foreign policy, and its relationship with Europe.” It is not certain whether the protests had any impact, but Council deviated from its position on 16 July 1997¹⁷² regarding Turkish military operations, where the President claimed: “[...] the Kurdish problem cannot be resolved by military means and can only be resolved politically” and called Turkish military operation “an invasion of northern Iraq” which, unlike last time, elicited an applause from the EP.

In his speech on 24 February 1999 President-in-office of the Council Ludger Volmer conveyed his belief that the PKK causes most of the defensiveness shown by the Turkish government: “The PKK is largely responsible for the fact that today Turkey still perceives almost any movement towards ethnic identity as a threat to its national unity and territorial integrity”, prescribing “If Turkey is to be in a situation in future where it can satisfy legitimate demands of ethnic groups and distinguish them from terrorist threats, the first need is to allay these fears”

¹⁷¹ This is the declaration in July 1996, stating that the relations between the EU and Turkey must be based on a clear commitment to the principles of international law.

¹⁷² Turkey and northern Iraq. D 1655. Sitting of July 16, 1997

pointing to the danger that “The major [...] obstacle to such a process is that a group that is prepared to use violence and all too often does so in Europe too is presenting itself as the legitimate representative of Kurdish interests”. Volmer also separated autonomy from separatism: “[...] every nation and every ethnic group has the right to cultural autonomy and to at least partial self-administration [...] But that right must be clearly distinguished from the right to national independence, which implies separatism” and expressed his hope that the “Turkish Government will grasp the opportunity presented by Ocalan's arrest and that it will perceive the difference between national separatism and cultural autonomy. Commissioner van den Broek referred to the violence in the European cities after the arrest of Ocalan: “[we condemn] acts of terror [...] but not only to measures which Turkey takes against extremists when they break the law but also to acts perpetrated by the Kurds, of the kind we have regrettably seen subsequent to Mr. Ocalan's detention [...]” and reiterated Commission's “[...] reaffirmation of the territorial integrity of Turkey [...]”. He continued: “We do not accept terrorism in our own countries either [...]”. Van den Broek ended the debate in a rather defeated tone: “[...] at the moment Turkey is not cooperating in the implementation of programmes at all, let alone wholeheartedly”

Commission has also been upbeat about any EU influence over Turkish legal reform. On 1 December 1999 Commissioner Gunther Verheugen highlighted a new Turkish law: “For the first time in history of Turkey, there will be a law which allows members of the civil service [...] to be brought to trial for violating human rights” arguing “[...] Turkish government does not want, under any circumstances, to take a decision on the execution; their strategy is rather to use the time gained by the proceedings in Strasbourg to abolish capital punishment in Turkey”. He also acknowledged double standards on EU's behalf: “We too are not always in the most credible

position, including vis-à-vis Turkey. I always find it very difficult to demand something of a country, to make demands on a country to which we have made promises which we have not honoured”. Responding to a question¹⁷³ during the same session, Verheugen conveyed Commission's sense that it: “continues to support a civil solution to the situation that prevails in the south-eastern part of the country” presenting an alternative to the claims that the Kurdish question involves the whole of the country.

4. Discourses of inter-EU criticism: MEP complaints directed towards the President, Council of Ministers and the Commission

MEP critiques of the EU or other European governments, institutions are interesting aspects of the debates. Generally the critiques were directed towards the Commission or the Council for not being firm enough against Turkey. Sometimes MEPs criticized their own countries or other EU member countries for a particular stance they took on the Kurdish issue.

However inter-parliamentary criticism was not confined to policy positions regarding Turkey; often a procedural or non-policy related issues could also spark outrage within the EP. For example, during the debate in 10 March 1994¹⁷⁴ Alexandros Alavanos (Greece – United Nordic Green Left), while complaining about the arrest of Kurdish members of the Turkish National Assembly, attacked the Member of the Commission: “[...] and I ask the Commissioner to put on his headphones. Please, Madam President, tell the Commissioner to put on his headphones...” Alavanos criticized the position of the Commission in a satirical manner: “Mr. Commissioner, we are of course debating an issue of secondary importance, one which does not matter much, namely

¹⁷³ H 0181/00

¹⁷⁴ Turkey. D2258. Sitting of March 10, 1994.

the arrest of Kurdish members of parliament in Turkey [...]”. Following Alavanos, Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (Belgium – Radical Alliance) criticized Council of Ministers: “What is the Council of Ministers doing about this? We now supposedly have a political union, but we discover that political union with regard to Turkey is worthless”. In the same debate Efstathios Lagakos (Greece – Christian Democratic Group) also attacked both the Council of Ministers and the Commission by:

“[...] we are asking both the Council and the Commission and indeed the Commissioner present here, to tell us how they intend to react, what they will do? Do they find that this case is different from human rights violations in other countries? Are we discriminating in some way? I do not think so, and that is why I am waiting anxiously to hear what the Commissioner will tell us.”

Quickly afterwards Vassilis Ephremidis (Greece – Nordic Left) blamed the Commission referring to the arrest of 8 Kurdish MPs of the Turkish Parliament:

“You should try to imagine a hangman's noose in here, because that is what there is in the Turkish National Assembly, and you, the Commission as a Body are morally responsible as also is that Council for what has been done and is about to be done, because you neglected to adopt the measures needed to bring Turkey to heel”.

Dimitros Nianias (Greece – Democratic Alliance) followed: “But the real tragic thing is [...] while on the one hand we pursue a humanitarian policy on behalf of human rights, on the other hand certain Commissioners, from the benches over there, come here and press Parliament to upgrade relations with Turkey”. Ioannis Theonas (Greece – United Nordic Green Left) also questioned the Council's decision to approve the Customs Union with Turkey: “Is that not a challenge towards Parliament and a reward for the criminal policy of the Turkish government against democracy

itself?”

Another one of the major MEP critiques of the Council or Commission was their perceived preference over economical matters over humanitarian ones. During the debate that took place on 14 February 1995¹⁷⁵ Jannis Skellariou (Germany – European Socialist Group), exposing Commission's preference of Turkey's market share over its human rights records, claimed: “Commissioner van den Broek supplied the reason later: there is a market of ECU 12.5 billion at stake. We know that. But we would prefer human rights to be respected” which elicited applause from the Parliament. Following this, Richard Balfe (UK – Christian Democrat Group) spoke to the Commissioner:

“[...] I would invite the Commission to distinguish between two groups of people in this House. There are those for whom whatever is said about Turkey it will never be enough and there are those, such as Mrs. Roth, who have a particular concern to get conditions before we put this agreement into place.”

Balfe also challenged the Parliament to “consult the list of people who voted for the protocol with Syria [...] and look at the human rights record there” or “look at the people who tried to keep off the agenda a debate on the death penalty in the USA”.

It wasn't only the Council or Commission that endured criticism by the EP. Often the MEPs criticized the Parliament itself for its lack of cohesion. During the debate on the customs union¹⁷⁶ Katerina Daskalaki (Greece – Group Union for Europe) complained about the discursive change in the Parliament: “[...] one cannot fail to note the surprising U-turn that has taken place in

¹⁷⁵ Customs Union between EU and Turkey. D0311. Sitting of February 14, 1995.

¹⁷⁶ EC-Turkey relations – Human rights in Turkey. D0802. December 13, 1995.

this very House [...] some who were unyielding about human rights [...] has made a 180-degree turn under pressure from major interests.” Marie-France Stirbois (France – Non-attached) attacked the rationale of the customs union: “Rooted in mercantilist ideology, [customs union] represents an economic and social aberration because it links people with very dissimilar standards of living” claiming that it will “destabilize Turkish society”. Yannis Kranidiotis (Greece – European Socialist Group) claimed that despite Turkey's human rights violations, if the customs union goes through it would “reveal hypocrisy on our side and risks undermining our credibility.”

A series of inter-EU criticism of different sorts was witnessed during the debate on 18 September 1996¹⁷⁷ where Pauline Green (UK – European Socialist Group) opened by expressing his frustration: “[...] I want to thank Mr van den Broek for the statement he made about Turkey in his usual measured tones. However, I must say I am shocked at the statement from Mr. Mitchell [of the Council]. While he was speaking I did not know whether to laugh or cry” which elicited applause from the Parliament. Following, Claudia Roth (Germany – Greens) referring to the principles of the European Parliament said, “[...] the supposed giant looks huge from afar. The closer you get the smaller it gets” and presented a three 'act' overview of EP actions against Turkey. In act one in which the EP is a 'giant': “It set out three conditions: democratization, release of the Kurdish deputies, and end to the war and a political solution to the Kurdish question.” in act two the “European Parliament's demands become softer. The conditions become weaker. Expressions of opinion die away. Shortly before vote Mrs. Çiller is presented as a guarantor of democracy [...]” and in act three “It does not take long at all for the alleged guarantor of democratic reforms to turn into the king-maker of this same Mr. Erbakan”. Concluding “We cannot accept the Council's strategy of 'Continue as you were! You have a carte blanche!’”

¹⁷⁷ Political Situation in Turkey. D1255/B4-0985/96. Sitting of September 18, 1996.

Vassilis Ephremidis (Greece – United Nordic Green Left) adopted a harsher tone: “[...] listening to the debate, one could suppose that Mr. Mitchell and the Council collectively are suffering from a serious defect of vision and hearing [...] Mr. Mitchell and Council are guilty of disgraceful hypocrisy, overpowering opportunism in favour of unclean interests served by Turkey [...]”

In certain cases, MEPs criticised other fellow MEPs. During the debate of the 1998 annual report on Turkey on 2 December 1998¹⁷⁸, Vassilis Ephremidis (Greece – United Nordic Green Left) criticised another MEP, the Turkey *rapporteur* MEP Swoboda on what he feels as certain “omissions” and after he conveyed his belief that the accession negotiations with Turkey legitimises “[...] the de facto dominant position of the Turkish military government in Turkey [...]” and in a rare occasion of interruption, the President cut him off the microphone. Following, MEP Dupuis, criticised certain EU member states: “I am slightly uneasy about [the report's] general criticisms concerning the rule of law in Turkey. More than one Member State [...] should be doing some very deep soul searching about the rule of law at the moment [...]”

After Abdullah Öcalan's arrest by Turkey, the frequency of inter-EU criticisms reached their peak. On 24 February 1999, Ephremidis again criticised Council and Commission for their positions on the arrest of Abdullah Öcalan: “[Commission and Council say] that Mr Ocalan lacks credibility and that he is unworthy of representing the Kurdish nation and therefore should be branded as a terrorist” he also refers to Turkish government as “military rule of the torturers” and claimed “You, your fathers, your brothers and sisters, fought against the Nazi invader and you were called terrorists and were executed. The same happened with Mr. Mandela and Mr. Arafat [...]”. He was cut off by the President while he was asking for assurances regarding three other

¹⁷⁸ EU-Turkey relations. D 2283. Sitting of December 2, 1998

Kurdish women who were in the Greek Embassy in Nairobi.¹⁷⁹ Gianfranco dell'Alba (Italy – Non-attached) criticised Italy for its inability to contain the Ocalan crisis when he took refuge there: “Italy should have accepted the rules of the terrorism convention and shouldered its responsibilities by judging Ocalan itself. This has not happened and I believe that Europe must acknowledge that it was at fault in order to act as a lesson for the future.” Marco Cellai (Italy – Non-attached) criticised Greece: “It would indeed be a cause for concern if a Member State such as Greece really had been supporting the PKK [...] on the grounds of a deep-seated and, these days, incomprehensible antagonism towards the Turkish people”. Hannes Swoboda (Austria – Socialist Group) criticised the Council: “I would like to see the foreign ministers or the Council get round to speaking unequivocally instead of producing documents that merely reflect their inability to reach a common position”

On 17 November 1999 there was an interesting exchange between Greek MEPs and President of the Council Kimmo Sasi. Alexandros Alavanos (Greece – United Nordic Green Left) submitted a question: “Does the Finnish Presidency consider [Turkey's obligations concerning] opening of talks on the democratic and cultural rights of the Kurds?” Sasi responded “[...] discernable change in attitude in Turkey with regard to legal and constitutional reform, human rights and the Turkish Kurds are very welcome steps forward [...]”. Alavanos called the response “ambiguous and somewhat schizophrenic in nature” asking for the specifics of improvement. Sasi somewhat avoided the question, claiming that “[...] a constructive attitude to Turkey is likely to be a much better policy for the Union than would be the case if Turkey turned its back on the Union entirely [...]”. Konstantinos Hatzidakis (Greece – Christian Democratic Group) called on this and

¹⁷⁹ Abdullah Ocalan was captured by the CIA and handed over to the Turkish special forces on his way from the Greek Embassy in Nairobi to the airport.

repeated Alavanos' question on the specifics of improvement in Turkey. Sasi still avoided the question: “[...] I wish to say that Turkey at present does not meet the Copenhagen criteria [...] Turkey still has a rather long way to go before concrete negotiations on membership can begin”. Konstantinos Alyssandrakis (Greece – United Nordic Green Left) told that he “[...] would not describe the response as being schizophrenic in nature” but he still insists on “How has Turkey's position changed exactly?” Sasi avoided giving specifics again: “[...] Turkey certainly has implemented action this year to try and improve human rights [...]” and claims “[...] I believe that cooperation is a better way to build peace than an unwillingness to practice cooperation.”

Rarely, Kurdish issue was used by the MEPs to support their arguments related to other debates that had very little to do with the Kurdish problem. During the debate on 18 November 1999, the Kurdish question became a topic of a seemingly internal discussion on EU security. Alain Krivine (France – United Nordic Green Left) slammed the *Eurodac* project which attempted to increase protection against refugee overflow into the EU by establishing a database of fingerprints of the immigrants as young as 14 years old. Krivine asked: “Who here would dare take the fingerprints of a fourteen year-old kid?” and quite surprisingly tied this to the Kurdish question: “Is this so surprising for a liberal Europe which arms the Ankara dictatorship with combat helicopters, while at the same time rejecting Kurdish refugees?”

Also, in some cases MEPs did not refrain from criticising their own countries over the Kurdish question. On 1 December 1999 for example, Francesco Enrico Speroni (Italy – Union for Europe and Nations) criticized his own country over its stance on the Öcalan capture:

“[...] Mr Ocalan, among other things, was politically handed by the D'Alema government – a black mark against Italy's name – but on the other hand, it was precisely from the Italian Penal Code that Turkey borrowed article 155 of its own Penal Code, which permitted Mr Ocalan to be condemned –

article 155 of the Turkish Penal Code was copied from article 241 of the Italian Penal Code – and therefore I was not in the least surprised by the position of the Italian government on this case either”

There were also certain cases of criticism directed towards other countries for their military sales to Turkey. More often than other EU members, these critiques came from Greek MEPs. On 1 December 1999, Efstratios Korakas (Greece – United Nordic Green Left) submitted a question in which he asked whether the decision to sell 1000 'Leopard' military tanks to Turkey would hinder Turkish democratization moves towards the Kurds. He said “Knowing that Turkey is fighting against the Kurds, not only on its own territory but also in illegal incursions into the territory of another independent country, Iraq [...]”. This was responded by Commissioner Gunther Verheugen by “The European Union's position on the export of weapons is contained in the rules established [...] in 8 June 1998 [...] It does not fall within the competence of the Council to criticize them in any way”

5. Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of the repeating patterns of discourses in the European Parliament between January 1991 and December 1999 related to the Kurdish question in Turkey; namely, the discourses of human rights, democracy / democratization, excessive force, ethnic conflict / cultural rights / autonomy and role of the Turkish military. The chapter also dealt with EP discourses that converge with that of the Turkish state, EU Commission and Council discourses and inter-EU criticism.

Within the time frame analyzed, the Kurdish issue has been most frequently discussed within the parameters of ‘human rights’ in the European Parliament. With a total of 186

references, the human rights discourses constitute 34.9% of the total number of repeating discourses in the EP. Human rights discourses mainly covered Turkish police and military conduct towards civilians. The second most frequent discourse adopted by the Parliament viewed the Kurdish question within the context of Turkish democratization. Being adopted 152 times, the democratization discourse constituted 28.5% of the repeating discourses on the Kurdish question and focused on restrictions on the Kurdish parties – DEP and HADEP – as well as advising for a political solution to the conflict.

The European Parliament was generally careful in condemning the PKK while criticizing Turkish security practices. In general, the European Parliament adopted critical discourses towards Turkish security forces (without distinguishing between the police, military or gendarmerie) 103 times, making it the third most frequent discourse adopted by 19.3%. This may at first appear higher than cases in which the Parliament criticised the PKK (referring to it as a ‘terrorist organization’ or condemning its methods) which constitute 9.4% of the discourses. However discourses that criticized Turkish military directly for its abuses of human rights or excessive use of force have been much lower (1.5%) than those criticized the PKK. The European Parliament also appeared uninterested in discourses that highlight Turkey’s territorial integrity; the ‘pro-territorial integrity’ discourse was adopted 4 times through the 1991-1999 period. This however, shouldn’t be interpreted as EP’s denial or rejection of Turkey’s territorial integrity.

Compared to the MEPs the Commission and Council can generally be seen as favoring Turkey on the Kurdish issue. While they criticized PKK terrorism (18 in total) much more than Turkish army abuses (3 in total) they were less critical and more encouraging in their human rights –

democracy discourses. Moreover, although the Council and Commission) adopted discourses that condemn PKK terrorism (8 and 10 times respectively, they did not specifically target Turkish military and conveyed their worries on excessive force in general wording.

Kurdish issue was frequently brought to attention together with Turkey's other major foreign policy issue; the Cyprus – Aegean problem with Greece and the genocide allegations - Karabagh problem with Armenia. Rarely, other human rights concerns were also attached to the criticisms such as the persecution of the *Alevi*s and Chaldean Christians. Pointing to Turkish behavior towards these problems were generally brought up in a 'laundry list' way and followed a Aristotelian logic such as *'If Turkey massacred Armenians, it will massacre Kurds too; they also do not respect human rights in Cyprus or persecute Alawites of Chaldean Christians in their own country'*. Such a reasoning generally overlooked security challenges Turkey faced, such as the PKK and dismissed, trivialized public and government worries over lack of security as 'blind nationalism'. However, the Council and Commission were more aware of the severity of the security challenges and could see human rights abuses and extra-judicial acts within the context of insurgency. That said, it would also be an over-generalization if criticisms of the MEPs were monolithic, 'anti-Turkish rhetoric'. In most examples, the MEP discourses of criticism pointed directly at the shortcomings of Turkey along its EU membership. In other words, most MEPs argued and debated in a heated fashion because they wanted to see Turkey as an EU member. Although it is also true that certain MEP criticisms stemmed from strategic reasons (such as Greek members of the Nordic Left, whose overwhelmingly critical discourses showed very little variance), other MEP criticisms would have provided guidance to Turkish democracy had the security condition been less problematic.

The difference in discourses between the Parliament and the Council – Commission stem from the age-old tension between the elected representatives and the executive bureaucracy; the Roman Senate and the Consul. Although an apparent reason for this difference is the *raison d'être* of the parliaments and bureaucracies – where parliaments emphasize liberties, freedom of speech and individualism and the bureaucracies emphasize state security, manageability and *realpolitik* – another, less explicit reason for this difference is the essence of politics: the struggle *against* power in order to *assume* power. The difference between the European Parliament and Council – Commission doesn't arise from the fact that the Parliament was more sensitive towards ethnicity, but it comes down to the fact that the Parliament had been in a constant push for more say over European external affairs. Therefore, by adopting a different discourse than the bureaucratic branches, the European Parliament attempted to gain a foothold on arguably the most important item in on EU's external relations – Turkey – and arguably the most critical issue in Turkey – the Kurdish question.

In some instances, the Parliament did force Turkey to undertake reforms on the Kurdish question, such as the constitutional amendments enacted during the tenure of then Prime Minister Tansu Ciller, however eventually the EU and Turkey ended up signing the Customs Union despite heavy parliamentary resistance, the PKK leader Abdullah Ocalan was forced out of two European Union countries and Turkey was granted EU candidacy, all took place against almost unanimous objection from the European Parliament. Did Turkish lobbying have anything to do with this? On 13 December 1995 Pauline Green criticized what he sees as pushy Turkish lobbying efforts:

“The Turkish lobby has been sometimes aggressive, and, as I know, to my cost, sometimes

personally abusive. Some of their authorities have shown careful sensitivity, others crass crudeness; and nothing has been more obvious than their lobby this week to change the text of the resolution before this House, which has been an absolute disgrace”.

However, the European Parliament's gambit on the Kurdish question as a way to increase its influence in EU's external relations appears to be unable to reach desired heights and the EP was not able to rise above the executive relations between the EU and Turkey.

5.1 How did discourse affect policy in the EP with regard to the Kurdish question?

When discussing the effect of the discourse in the European Parliament, we must understand that the discourse in question is institutional; reflecting not only the sense of the country or party group that a particular utterer is a member of, but also of the European Parliament as a whole, reflecting (but not necessarily conveying) the culturally framed, interest based and institutionally agreed (at the EU level) rules and norms. From that perspective, speeches made on the floor of the European Parliament is often mentioned in the media (especially Turkish), not as “Greek member of the Nordic Left said that...”, but as “the European Parliament said that...”. Therefore, party and country differences notwithstanding, discourse in the European Parliament is perceived as the discourse *of* the European Parliament. Therefore first of all, from Turkey’s perspective European Parliament discourses were considered to be policies by themselves, even though such discourses seldom lead to a concrete policy outcome.

Secondly, the European Parliament was able to exert varying degrees of pressure on the European Council and Commission in cases when the Parliament’s sense was more or less homogenous with regard to the Kurdish question. In one of those (in) famous cases, the Parliament was able to pressure the Council to add a clause to E.U. – Turkey Customs Union negotiations,

demanding Turkey to take steps towards reform and easing its pressure on the Kurdish provinces.

Third, and related to the second point, the assent procedure was a critical avenue through which Parliament's discourses influenced policy of the European Union. This procedure necessitates the Council to consult the European Parliament before critical decisions are taken and the European enlargement (hence, Turkey's inclusion) was a subject to this law. As the assent procedure is generally used during treaty negotiations with the non-member countries, as well as debates candidacy, all major negotiations regarding Turkey – EU relations were, and often still are subject to the consent and approval of the European Parliament. Therefore, Turkey's general policy of ignoring the legislatures and directly interacting with the executive bodies of organizations and countries has largely failed with regard to the European Parliament. Through much of the 1990s, Turkey appears to have built a momentum of frustration and anger in the European Parliament vis-à-vis the Kurdish question, which later manifested through Turkey's candidacy and membership negotiations. More critically, the assent procedure enabled the European Parliament to exert considerable degrees of pressures on issues regarding Turkish – Greek relations and the Cyprus question on issues regarding security and neighbourhood policy.

The assent procedure meant that the European Parliament was a central player in Turkey's E.U. negotiations and was more than a 'talking shop'. Turkey's lack of presence in and cooperation with the Parliament through the 1990s, together with its neglect of Parliamentary calls for reform have laid the foundations of a momentum and institutional memory in the EP towards Turkey's membership negotiations.

CHAPTER 4

US Congress discourse on the Kurdish question in Turkey

The very measures Turkey is employing to safeguard the State from the threats of separatism are polarizing Turkish society even further. Rising nationalism and the tendency to view reforms as concessions to terrorism intimidate any who speak of compromise. The Tactics of the PKK do nothing to engender support yet it is the PKK that finds itself the beneficiary of increased sympathy by a people who view themselves with no choices. – Senator Dennis DeConcini

It must be acknowledged that the Turks have not invented Rolling Thunder. We used B-52 to solve a guerrilla problem (in Vietnam). The Russians used very large weapons platforms (in Afghanistan). And the Israelis get irritated on a reasonably consistent basis and use F-16s in Southern Lebanon. One wishes that it didn't happen. Sitting in the comfort of one's office, one might tell all four countries they're wrong. It's a lot easier to say that here than when you're there and it's your military guys who are getting chewed up. -- Joel Johnson, chief lobbyist for the Aerospace Industries Association

1. Introduction

In Turkish collective memory, first American involvement with the Kurds in Turkey dates back to the end of the World War I, when the twelfth of Woodrow Wilson's 'Fourteen Points' stipulated: “[...] other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development”.¹⁸⁰ Along with Turkey’s *Sevres Syndrome* arising from European involvement with Ottoman minorities, Wilson’s twelfth principle was regarded as the ‘icing on the cake’; an American affirmation of Ottoman collapse and partition through the Sevres Treaty of 1920 suggesting the establishment of a Greater Armenia and Kurdistan carved out of Ottoman territory. Even today, although American foreign policy actors portray Wilson’s principles as the epitome of American foreign policy idealism, they choose not to mention them among their Turkish counterparts as they are interpreted as an American backing of Turkey’s partitioning, most importantly carving away a Kurdistan out of the south-eastern provinces of Turkey.

¹⁸⁰ Scans of the original document of Wilson’s principles can be found in: Beschloss, Michael (2003) *Our documents: 100 milestone documents from the National Archives*. (Washington, DC: National Archives and Records Administration, United States) p. 150

The Iraqi Kurds came under the American political 'radar' again in March 1974 when the United States instigated a Kurdish revolt, headed by Mulla Mustafa Barzani against Saddam Hussein in support of the Shah Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi of Iran.¹⁸¹ In the following decades, arming and inciting a rebellion among the Kurds of northern Iraq became one of the primary tools of leverage of the United States against Iraq and Iran – albeit at the expense of alienating Kurdish tribes that complained United States used and discarded them.¹⁸² Another renewed American interest in Kurds came with the Gulf War in 1991, when – again – the Kurds were asked to take up arms against Saddam Hussein's army, with the promise of US air support against Saddam's jets. However – again – at the last minute, the Kurds attacked Saddam's forces, only to discover that the US air support wouldn't come¹⁸³, eventually leading to the decimation of the rebellion by Saddam's better armed and larger forces. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Saddam's most severe response to the Kurdish rebellions came with the genocidal *al-Anfal* campaign, aiming to clear northern Iraq of the Kurds and settle Arab tribes to the Kurdish lands.¹⁸⁴ This time, Saddam ordered his forces to march onwards to the Kurdish areas, pushing (but not destroying) the Kurdish population towards the Turkish border, leaving the Turkish border with almost 3 million refugees within a matter of weeks. Turkish foreign policy elite still considers this tactic of pushing the Iraqi Kurds towards the Turkish border as Saddam's indirect method of punishing

¹⁸¹ For an extended review of the US policy towards the Iraqi Kurds, see: Gunter, Michael 'United States Foreign Policy Towards the Kurds'. in Lokman I. Meho (ed.) *The Kurdish question in U.S. foreign policy* (New York: Greenwood Publishing)

¹⁸² For a commentary on this, see: Pope, Hugh. 'US abandoned us, say Kurds'. *The Independent*. September 4, 1996. Available online (accessed May 3, 2009):
<<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/us-abandoned-us-say-kurds-1361688.html>>

¹⁸³ On this, see: Rosett, Claudia. 'Kurd on the Street; A visit with an Iraqi ally against terror'. *Wall Street Journal*. September 4, 2002. Available online (accessed May 3, 2009):
<<http://www.opinionjournal.com/columnists/cRosett/?id=110002214>>

¹⁸⁴ For a detailed review of the Anfal campaign, see: Anderson, Kenneth (1993) *The Anfal Campaign in Iraqi Kurdistan*. (New York: Human Rights Watch)

Turkey for its support of the United States during the Gulf War by allowing access to US aircraft to the Incirlik airbase in Adana. Turkey had to deal with an initial 1.5 million Kurdish refugees, a number which increased to 3 million within a matter of weeks and has been suffering long term economic, social and security-related problems since then. The increase in PKK recruits and intensification of its violence in the 1990s must also be evaluated within this context.

The Congress – like the European Parliament – has been a frequent critique of Turkish domestic policy against the Kurds. Although the Senate appraised Turkish contribution during the Gulf War and the protection of the Iraqi Kurdish refugees and Turkish cooperation on the Operation Provide Comfort¹⁸⁵ (OPC), as the Turkish government got overwhelmed with this new influx of Kurds unable to accommodate them logistically and politically, the Congressional criticism on Turkey intensified. As Turkey's EU membership was the main bargaining chip of the European Parliament, the Congressional veto powers on military/financial aid was the main influence of the Congress over Turkey. Indeed, the Congress passed numerous amendments on the annual foreign operations and export financing appropriations, which limited aid and loans to Turkey because of the human rights conditions, although Turkey desperately needed these funds to combat the PKK.

The Kurdish issue has been debated extensively both in the House and the Senate, where the majority of the debates on the Kurds were focused on the Iraqi Kurds, while the focus on the

¹⁸⁵ Operation Provide Comfort I and II were military operations by the United States and United Kingdom to defend Kurdish refugees in northern Iraq against Saddam's forces. The operation commenced in 1991 and continued until 1996 through the Incirlik airbase in Adana, Turkey, which was the base of the operation. OPC's tenure had to be extended by the Turkish Parliament voting through 6-month terms. OPC was quite unpopular among the Turks on the grounds of 'aiding the PKK'. OPC II was renamed as Operation Northern Watch (ONW) due to the unpopularity of the OPC in Turkey. For more on OPC and ONW, see: Marquis, Susan Lynn. (1997) *Unconventional Warfare: Rebuilding U.S. special operations forces* (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press) pp. 244-250.

status of the Kurds in Turkey was not as intense as it has been in the European Parliament. Although the Iraqi Kurds have institutionalized their influence over the US Congress very recently through the establishment of a Kurdish – American Caucus¹⁸⁶, Kurds in general and the Kurds in Turkey in particular did not enjoy any significant access to the legislative or executive branches in the United States. However as claimed in a New York Times article¹⁸⁷: “Sympathetic to the Kurds, a people without a homeland, and heavily influenced by Greek-Americans and Armenian-Americans, many members of Congress have long been hostile toward Turkey, even though it is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization”. Indeed, since Turkish Kurds did not have a foothold in the United States as they did in the European capitals and the Iraqi Kurds sought good relations with Turkey, the existence of so many Congressional discourses on the Kurdish question in Turkey begs further research. One of the arguments pursued in this chapter will be that Hellenic – and Armenian – American organizations and interest groups became the champion of the cause of Kurds in Turkey and the Kurdish issue in Turkey was brought into the Congressional debates not through Kurdish interests but through Greek and Armenian groups hoping to influence American legislative process, most notably trying to limit or cancel US arms transfers to Turkey in order to change the balance of military power in the region. Indeed, the Kurdish question would often come out of its human rights – democratization context and lead to debates on historical revisionism as frequently advertised by the Greek and Armenian interests, such as the statement on 1 May 1997¹⁸⁸ by Congressman Bob Filner (D-CA), that rebuked the founding treaty of Turkey:

“Over one half of Kurdistan and nearly two-thirds of the Kurdish population are

¹⁸⁶ See for example; 'Kurds Supporters at American Congress are Increasing' *Patriotic Union of Kurdistan Media*, <http://pukmedia.com/english/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=5933&Itemid=52>

¹⁸⁷ Greenhouse, S. 'US Support for Turks' Anti-Kurd Campaign Dims' *New York Times*, March 29, 1995. Available online (accessed May 3, 2009): <<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=990CE1DD163DF93AA15750C0A963958260>>

¹⁸⁸ Self-determination for the Kurds. H2152: Vol. 143 No. 55. May 1, 1997.

under Turkish control, an occupation legitimized in the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne, which reneged on a promise to Kurds and Armenians in the earlier 1920 Treaty of Sevres [...] The Lausanne Treaty legitimized the Turkish massacres against the Armenians which had already taken place and set the stage for a stepped-up campaign of genocide against the Kurds in subsequent years.

This chapter will provide an overview of the discourses adopted in the US Senate and the House of Representatives on the Kurdish question in Turkey and is divided similar to the previous chapter on the European Parliament. The first section deals with the discourses of the Senators and the Representatives of the House on the Kurdish question. The first section then, is also divided into five sub-sections. The first sub-section deals with the 'human rights' discourse, which focuses on the responses of the Congressmen on torture, beatings, disappearances in custody and other security misconducts. The second sub-section focuses on the 'democracy' discourse where the Congressmen debate Turkey's practice of democracy – often in a critical manner – such as restrictions on the Kurdish parties or issues such as freedom of expression and independence of the judiciary. The third sub-section deals with the discourses of criticism of the Turkish police and the army for using 'excessive force', targeting civilians and unnecessary usage of heavy weaponry. Fourth sub-section deals with discourses that focused on the identity aspect of the Kurdish issue, such as the linguistic, educational rights, ethnic nature of the conflict and discourses that focus on autonomy. Fifth sub-section provides an overview of the discourses that have converged with that of the Turkish state. These statements often 'defended' the Turkish government or the military and provided counter-arguments to the critical discourses.

The second section provides an overview of discourses of the executive branch that were

quoted or presented in the Congress. It is worth underlining that this section does not deal with Departments of the State or Defense outside the Congressional debates; only statements that were a part of Senate and the House proceedings are included in this section.¹⁸⁹ Third section focuses on Congressional critiques of the United States policy, other branches in the government or other senators or representatives for their stance on the Kurdish question in Turkey. While some congressmen were self-critical because of its support to Turkey such as the sale of advanced weapons systems, some were critical of other congressmen because of their negative approach towards Turkey.

2. Types of discourses adopted in the US Congress on the Kurdish question in Turkey

2.1 Human rights discourse

The United States Senate and the House of Representatives each have a sub-branch that focuses on human rights issues. While the House has its 'Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight', the Senate has its 'Human Rights and Law' subcommittee functioning under the Committee on the Judiciary. The United States has been quite influential on the establishment of an international system based on human rights since the Second World War and – at least discursively – the human rights became a central principle in US foreign policy. However, according to David Forsythe “In the early 1970s, some members of Congress began to feel that American foreign policy under the Nixon – Kissinger team had become divorced from traditional American values. Some said the policy was too Machiavellian and amoral, overly concerned with an impersonal balance of power”.¹⁹⁰ Hence, the Congress aimed to bring human

¹⁸⁹ While Council or Commission members were generally present in the European Parliament debates, American executive branch members did not frequently attend legislative sessions unless they are summoned for a hearing.

¹⁹⁰ Forsythe, David. (2000) *The United States and human rights: looking inward and outward*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press) p. 1

rights back into the center of American foreign policy-making, arguably since the Vietnam War. It can be argued that the Congress managed to exert some influence over US foreign policy through ending the Vietnam War, passing the War Powers Act over presidential veto and blocked CIA involvement in Angola. The Congress was also able to initiate an arms embargo against Turkey for invading Cyprus.

Similar to the trend in the European Parliament, Turkey's human rights record had been evaluated primarily within the context of the Turkish military presence in Cyprus prior to the Gulf War in 1991. However, while the criticism towards Turkey on the Kurdish matter intensified after 1991 in the European Parliament, it was already a heated issue in the US Congress. The first proceeding in the US Congress on the situation of the Kurds expelled by Saddam Hussein, took place on 7 March 1991.¹⁹¹ Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA) mentioned “the plight of Iraq's 3 million Kurds” during which he presented his belief that the main reason for US inactivity to help the Kurds has been its relationship with Turkey. He didn't directly claim so, however he quoted that morning's Washington Post article by David A. Korn which, Cranston said he agreed: “In Korn's view, an opinion I share, the administration's standoffish-ness has a lot to do with our relationship with Turkey, which has waged its own campaign of repression against its Kurdish population”. Although he was indirect on his reference to the Kurdish question, he was more straightforward on the human rights aspect of the situation with a reference to the Cyprus issue: “[...] I question just how close a relationship we should have given the Turkish government's well-documented record of human rights abuse and as even greater proof of the folly of this course, I would draw attention to the continued occupation by Turkey of part of Cyprus”, mirroring issue linkages made in the European Parliament between Turkish government's treatment of the Kurds and its acts in Cyprus,

¹⁹¹ Iraqi Treatment of the Kurds. S2991: Vol. 137 No.39. March 7, 1991.

and against Armenians during World War I.

While the European Parliament was more encouraging towards Turkey's contribution to the relief efforts against the Kurdish refugees escaping from Saddam's army, more critical voices dominated the debates in the US Congress. On 11 April 1991¹⁹² Senator Dennis DeConcini (D-AZ) criticized Turkey for its initial refusal to aid Kurdish refugees “While the Congress and the State Department heeded the Turkish Government's call for aid to the refugees, the Turkish Government unfortunately refused to allow this and other international assistance to be distributed to the refugees”. The reason why this statement was put forward is difficult to infer, since the European Parliament had passed a resolution¹⁹³ that praised Turkey's contribution to the relief efforts for the Kurds, exactly the same day with DeConcini's criticism.

Also, while the level of criticism in the European Parliament followed an ascending pattern of intensity, which peaked in the mid-1990s, the US Congress discourse was already very critical of Turkey by the end of the Gulf War. The source of this criticism was initially related to human rights situation in the Turkish-Iraqi border; later the criticism focused on Turkish security practices within Turkey. On 30 March 1992¹⁹⁴ for example, William S. Broomfield (R-MI) referred to Turkish response against Kurdish separatism within the context of security misconducts: “[...] many Turkish troops and police units have been involved with illegal killings, torture and related human rights abuses”. Such a discourse would match to that in the European Parliament in the 1995 – 97 period – the height of the insurgency – and also shows that the Congress was less restrained in its discursive options on Turkey, whereas the European Parliament

¹⁹² Turkey: Economic Assistance. S4110. Vol. 137 No. 53. April 11, 1991.

¹⁹³ Extraordinary Meeting of the European Council: The situation of the Kurds. B3-0560/91. April 18, 1991.

¹⁹⁴ Turkey: human rights violations against the Kurds. E875: Vol. 138 No. 46. March 30, 1992.

appears more careful in its criticism, gradually increasing the dose.

In 1992, one of the harshest critiques of Turkey's policy towards the Kurds came from Nicholas Mavroules (D-MA), on 2 October 1992¹⁹⁵ who referred to the situation in Turkey's southeast as "Ethnic cleansing in Turkey". Pointing to the 1915 Armenian massacres, burning of Izmir¹⁹⁶ and occupation of Cyprus, he then referred to the Amnesty International report, which "[...] condemned Turkey for its use of torture [...] against its Kurdish minority". He then crossed out the strategic importance argument related to Turkey: "Cold War is over. Communism and the USSR are dead [...] The political reality of the "New World Order" is simply that Turkey is not the strategic ally that the Bush administration claims". Mavroules also questioned U.S. - Turkish alliance "The list of grievances reads like the rap sheet of an international criminal, not a close ally of the land of the free". In fact the arguments related to the end of strategic importance of Turkey because of the end of the Cold War were not new. Through the Cold War, Turkey had covered NATO's southern flank by tying numerous Soviet armored divisions in the Caucasus and because of its strategic importance, many claimed that the United States was being too 'soft' on Turkey's democratic shortcomings. With the end of the Cold War, Turkey's credentials as the invaluable US ally became questioned and lead to arguments calling for a harsher policy towards Turkey both in the US Congress and in the European Parliament.

The US Congress was also very quick in arguing in favor of stopping military aid to

¹⁹⁵ Turkey: human rights violations. E2906: Vol. 138 No. 139. October 2, 1992.

¹⁹⁶ This historic event is known as the Great Fire of Smyrna/Izmir. It was a four-day fire that destroyed much of Izmir and took place in September 1922, during the Turkish liberation army's reclamation of Izmir from the invading Greek forces. While Greeks, Turks and Armenians blame each other for starting out the fires, more recent scholarship points to the possibility of accident or typical side-effects of warfare as the cause of the fires. For more on this, see: Dobkin, Majorie Housepian (1972) *Smyrna 1922: The destruction of a city*. (London: Faber)

Turkey. Although the perceived Turkish intransigence regarding Cyprus and its attitude towards Greece have been major causes for this, Turkey's reported heavy-handedness during the fight against the PKK rendered Greek-American interests much more credible. Because of the reports on Turkey's use of US-issued weaponry in its PKK attacks that also killed civilians, the Congress eliminated all military aid to Turkey in the fiscal year 1993 and in the successive fiscal years, more calls for cutting US aid to Turkey began to dominate the Congress. On 5 January 1993¹⁹⁷ for example, Congressman John Edward Porter (D-IL) brought three cases before the House. The first was the case of a 16-year-old Kurdish girl who had died in police custody. Although Turkish officials claimed she had "shot herself with a rifle in her cell", Congressman Porter was anxious as "[...] no independent inquiry was ever initiated on this case. The autopsy was never released and the family's request for a second autopsy was refused". Second he mentioned a case from the year 1992 where a group of Turkish soldiers had "[...] beat and dragged a 16-year-old boy out of his house [...] laid the boy on embers and forcibly held him down". Finally he brought forward the case of Nazlı Top, a tortured nurse who had also attracted attention in the European Parliament debates. Following these cases, Porter questioned Turkish arguments that claim fight against the PKK necessitate such abuses: "Amnesty International does not deny the government of Turkey its rights to respond to violent assaults by the PKK or other violent organizations but who protects citizens from the violence of the government?"

The Kurdish question in Turkey also became an issue during the debates on foreign operations and export financing appropriations. On May 25, 1994¹⁹⁸, Congressman Tony Patrick

¹⁹⁷ Turkey: economic assistance relative to the resolution of the Cyprus problem and compliance with international law E69: Vol. 139 No. 1. January 5, 1993.

¹⁹⁸ Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1995. Vol. 140 No. 106. May 25, 1994.

Hall (D-OH) gave a very clear account of the extent of human rights abuses in Turkey: “Nine of the Turkish Human Rights Association's workers have been killed in the last year and 27 of its 57 offices have been closed in 1992. 17 journalists and 14 distributors of pro-Kurdish publications have been assassinated [...]”. He added: “It is a travesty that we are providing any funds to the Turkish Government while it has the fresh blood of innocent noncombatants on its hands and is apparently committing more atrocities every day”. Although Congressman Hall proposed a 100% cut to foreign aid to Turkey, the bill was eventually passed with a 10% cut. It is also worth highlighting that Congress debates and statements included more detail in the description of beatings and torture than it has been in the Parliament, where MEPs generally spoke about Turkey’s Kurdish question without much detail. It is also safe to argue however, that dramatization and provision of 'unpleasant' details have also been adopted as a method of argumentation in the US Congress much more frequently than it has been in the European Parliament.

During the peak of insurgency in the south-east, American concern for human rights – like the European Parliament – was not limited to that of the Kurds. Quite often, foreign journalists, aid workers or human rights monitors were taken into custody by the Turkish security forces on the grounds of ‘complicity with rebellion’. While most of them were discharged, some had to endure jailing, interrogation and in some instances, torture. The arrest and jailing of the American reporter Aliza Marcus was a major case and was also subject to criticism on 17 November 1995¹⁹⁹. After her acquittal by the Turkish court, Congressman John Edward Porter (D-IL) criticized the arrest, calling it “a complete vindication”, arguing “She was merely doing her job [...]” for “[...] reporting the truth about the ongoing Turkish military campaign of forced evacuation and

¹⁹⁹ Justice for Alizia Marcus. E2213; Vol. 141 No. 183. November 17, 1995.

destruction of Kurdish villages”. As much as he was critical, he also claimed that her acquittal might be a good sign: “[...] is an encouraging indication that Turkey may be willing to reform its ways”.

The Congress undertook its first major human rights fact-finding trip to Turkey’s southeast in 1995. The 'Parliamentary Human Rights Foundation Delegation'²⁰⁰, headed by Congressman Christopher Smith (R-NJ) went to Turkey to meet government and military officials as well as human rights monitors and journalists. In March 1995²⁰¹, their findings were presented at the House of Representatives. Congressman Smith claimed, “The human rights situation in [Turkey] has significantly deteriorated in recent years despite assurances otherwise by Turkey's leaders”. The 'Report on Human Rights Conditions in Turkey', dated March 2, 1995 investigated the extent of PKK violence, violations by the Turkish government and security forces and acts against Kurdish citizens. Some of the findings of the report listed:

- *“Turkish authorities are systematically violating the rights of Turkish citizens, including those of Kurdish origin*
- *The Anti-terror Act and the State of Emergency provide legal sanction for gross human rights violations particularly in Southeast Turkey*
- *Many civilian non-combatants suffer human rights violations as a result of the struggle between Turkish authorities and the PKK*
- *Government of Turkey believes all persons who seek political cultural expression for the Kurds as 'separatists' and PKK sympathizers.*
- *Suspected by Turkish authorities as bases for PKK operations, more than one thousand Kurdish villages have been destroyed”*

The report also drew on the differences between Ministry of Interior records and human rights monitors' reports:

“The Interior Ministry indicates that 1046 villages in the emergency region have

²⁰⁰ Formerly known as 'The Congressional Human Rights Foundation'

²⁰¹ Delegation Details Human Rights Conditions in Turkey. E705-E706. Vol. 141. March 28, 1995.

been evacuated, human rights monitors say several thousand villages have been destroyed; homes and their claimed inhabitants have been burned; use of chemical agents and poison gas are reported. The Government acknowledges 940 combatants have been killed; however, other reports claim that thousands have died”

while also giving an account of PKK's record: “By the admission of its own representatives, the PKK has recently killed 179 village guards, 66 collaborators, and police officials”. The report also called on a joint US and EU effort to restrict arms sales to Turkey, as well as “[...] the extension and/or relaxation of tariff and trade privileges based on Turkey's overall human rights performance”.

While the membership process was the main carrot-stick option for the European Parliament, foreign aid was its US Congress counterpart. On 20 March 1995, Senator Alfonse D'Amato (R – NY) proposed a “Turkish Human Rights Compliance Act”²⁰² that sought to limit foreign aid to Turkey. The proposal was interesting since it was the first Congress bill that tied foreign aid directly to Turkey’s human rights practices. D'Amato argued: “If Turkey is to continue benefiting from the generosity of the American taxpayer, it must take demonstrable steps toward the full recognition of the civil, cultural and human rights of its Kurdish civilians [...]”. Section 3 of the act titled “Restrictions On Assistance For Turkey” stipulated:

“(a) Restrictions – Of the funds made available for fiscal year 1996 for assistance for Turkey under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act, the President shall withhold, first from grant assistance, if any, and then from loan assistance, \$ 500,000 for each day that Turkey does not meet the conditions of section 4.”

²⁰² Turkish Human Rights Compliance Act. S4199: Vol. 141 No. 51. March 20, 1995.

The section 4 of the Act included allowing free monitoring of the human rights situation, recognition of civil, cultural and human rights of Kurdish citizens, cease of military operations against Kurdish civilians, taking demonstrable steps towards peaceful solution of the Kurdish issue and also some provisions related to the Cyprus and Armenian conflicts that are out of the scope of this dissertation.

Human rights was also the prevailing discourse during the debate of the 'Porter-Smith-Wolf amendment'²⁰³ of 28 June 1995 which proposed the limitation of economic aid to Turkey to 21 million dollars; a 25 million dollar cut from the original 46 million dollars without any conditions. Congressman John Edward Porter (D – IL) explained this amendment: “[...] ongoing and worsening human rights problems that are not being addressed by Turkey, are so severe that the Turkish democracy itself is being undermined and could well be lost”. He also mentioned police misconduct within the context of human rights: “[...] in 1994 deaths in custody were the highest since 1982. Persons increasingly disappear while they are in police custody. Their tortured, mutilated bodies are usually found in days, weeks or months later. In the first 3 months of this year, 77 people disappeared while allegedly in police custody, more than in all of this year”. While the discourse prevalent in the debates on previous cuts in economic aid focused on Turkish military practices in northern Iraq, the discursive focus of the Porter amendment was domestic practices of the security forces and their misconduct within the cities. In other words, it can be argued that the Porter amendment was a 'punishment' of the Turkish police, rather than the Turkish military.

²⁰³ *“LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY: Sec. 564. Not more than \$ 21,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading “Economic Support Fund” may be made available to the Government of Turkey”*
 Amendment proposed by John Edward Porter on the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act 1996. H6483: Vol. 141 No. 107 Page 78, Line 7. June 28, 1995

As Turkey undertook one of the biggest cross-border operations to combat PKK in Iraq in 1997²⁰⁴, a group of Kurdish-Americans started a fast-protest in front of the Capitol Hill in order to attract attention to the situation of Kurds in Turkey and in northern Iraq. Congressman Frank Pallone (D – NJ) brought this to the attention of the House on 7 November 1997²⁰⁵:

“[...] my colleague from California, Bob Filner, has basically spearheaded this effort, there has been a group of Kurdish Americans who have been fasting on the steps of the Capitol now for a number of days, probably more than a few weeks, in order to highlight [...] the ongoing tragedy in the mountains of Kurdistan, where, again, Turkish Government [...] is trying to essentially obliterate [...] Kurds in Turkey [...]”

It was also mentioned that human rights activist Cameron Porter, spouse of Congressman John Porter who was arguably the most vocal critic of Turkey's policy towards the Kurds, was also among the protesters.

The arguments used in the Congress within the context of human rights discourse had less variety than those of the European Parliament. The focus was mainly to criticize Turkey and apply more sticks than carrots (such as cuts in aid) against Turkish security practices, with very rare references to the security problems posed by the PKK. Steps towards progress such as the constitutional amendments, release of political prisoners or amendments to the anti-terror law were very briefly discussed and not paid much attention. Indeed, it can be argued that Congressional discourses on the human rights aspect of the Kurdish question were more rigid and

²⁰⁴ According to Turkish Office of the Chief of Staff data, ‘Operation Hammer’, May 12 – July 7 1997 had eliminated 3145 PKK militants and ‘Operation Dawn’, September 25 – October 15, 1997 had eliminated 902 PKK militants. For more on Turkish cross-border operations, see: Kirisci, Kemal and Gareth M. Winrow. (1997) *The Kurdish Question and Turkey: An Example of Trans-state Ethnic conflict*. (London: Routledge) pp. 130 - 132

²⁰⁵ Plight of the Kurdish People. H10328: Vol. 143 No. 155. November 7, 1997.

monolithic than those in the European Parliament. The inflexibility and the rigidity of Congressional discourses on the human rights issue suggest that the discourses were highly vulnerable to lobbying, that utilized canned discursive patterns in order to define the situation in Turkey.

2.2 Democracy – democratization

Protection of Turkey's identity as a secular and democratic country has been the primary objective of American foreign policy with regard to Turkey since the early 1950s, when Turkey joined the Western Alliance against the Soviet Union. Not only Turkey's adherence to free elections and free market economy was invaluable to the United States during the Cold War against the Iron Curtain, but after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Turkish democracy gained a renewed strategic asset for the US foreign policy against Islamic extremism in the Middle East, since Turkey was the only functioning Muslim democracy in the region. Specifically the American executive branch has had a tradition of issuing encouraging statements after every Turkish election, praising the unique status of Turkey in the region and re-affirming US – Turkish 'strategic partnership'.

The US Congress approach to Turkey's democratic credentials was not different. Although highly critical of Turkey's human rights practices, the Congress was generally upbeat and encouraging about Turkish elections. The Democratic Senator from Arizona, Dennis DeConcini almost singlehandedly created the discourses on Turkish democratization in the US Senate and was the most active Democratic Party legislator and member of the Senate on Turkey's Kurdish question, until he was succeeded in January 1995. Therefore, especially between 1990 and 1995,

Senate discourse on the Kurdish question was shaped along Senator DeConcini's words. On 13 November 1991²⁰⁶ for example, Congressman Dennis DeConcini (D – AZ) – a highly critical figure on the Kurdish question – praised October 1991 elections in Turkey and claimed that “The closely contested race, with its flamboyant political campaigns, makes it abundantly clear that the democratic process is alive and well in Turkey” further arguing “I believe that Turkish democracy [...] can serve as a model for its less democratically inclined neighbors indeed [...]”. The latter statement carries a more revealing value in terms of inferring US policy, since preservation of Turkey as a democracy has been critical *because* of its possibility to influence its neighbors: Iron Curtain countries during the Cold War and the Muslim countries of the Middle East afterwards. However, the intensification of the security crisis posed by 1991 Gulf War led the Congress to pursue a new discourse on democracy. While Turkey's free elections were deemed sufficient proof of its democratic credentials throughout the Cold War, the aggravation of the Kurdish issue led the Congress to pursue a widened definition of democracy, which now included recognition of the minorities, freedom of expression and constitutional rectifications.

As much as the Soviet Union had disintegrated and the United States emerged as the victor of a bi-polar ‘Cold War’, the discourse of Communism was still used in the United States Congress against countries, incidents and practices that were considered 'unwanted'. Making such issue linkages and likening the situation in Turkey to that of the Soviet Union was also one of the favourite argumentative discourse used by Congressmen whose interest in Turkey arose from the human rights and democratic shortcomings. Dennis DeConcini (D-AZ), this time on 17 May 1994²⁰⁷, referred to the restriction of free speech in Turkey: “[...] I sadly recall similar statements I

²⁰⁶ Elections in Turkey. S16655: Vol. 137 No. 167. November 13, 1991.

²⁰⁷ Turkish Democracy? Free Mehdi Zana. S5848: Vol. 140 No. 61. May 17, 1994.

have made on behalf of political prisoners who spoke out and then suffered at the hands of authoritarian Communist rulers behind the iron curtain” after Turkish government jailed Mehdi Zana following his speech at the European Parliament in October 1992. However, framing Turkish policy towards the Kurds within the context of well know human rights abusers or anti-democratic countries was not limited to the example of the fallen Soviet Union. Turkey's Kurdish conundrum was quick to be put into the same discursive bucket with the Kosovan, Chechen or Palestinian contexts. For example in another analogy during the same session, DeConcini criticized Turkish security forces for burning villages which he likened to the Serbian case as: “[...] a pattern which has been compared to ethnic cleansing conducted by the Serbs in Bosnia”.

The arrest of the Kurdish parliamentarians on 4 March 1994 and the banning of their party DEP under the charge of “instigating separatism at home and abroad through direct orders from the PKK” made an impact on the Senate as well. On 23 June 1994²⁰⁸, DeConcini expressed his frustration and shock over five deputies being jailed without indictment and six others fleeing to Belgium to seek asylum. This time, the democracy discourse was taken out of the context of free elections and re-framed under parliamentary participation, parliamentarians' rights and political immunity; DeConcini asked: “[...] what kind of democracy finds its own legislators either in prison or fleeing arrest to seek political asylum?” Then his discourse focused on Turkey's obligations within the context of the international agreements it had signed: “[...] Turkey has obligated itself to protect all forms of nonviolent expression. The decision to remove 13 duly elected parliamentarians because of speeches they made or documents they sign is an affront to all democratic legislatures”. In fact, although this democracy discourse can be regarded as 'negative', it still accepts Turkey within the framework of the international legal system. Therefore, the

²⁰⁸ Congressional Hearing. S7588: Vol.140 No. 81. June 23, 1994.

discourse is not exclusionist, but inclusionist, despite the tone and intensity of the accompanying criticism. DeConcini also offered his view on the solution of the problem, mostly related to democratization issues. He listed:

“First, allow all nonviolent political parties to participate in political life. Second, abolish restrictions on free expression including those within the Anti-terror law. Third, repeal the state of emergency. Fourth, dismantle the village guard system. Fifth, remove all restrictions on Kurdish linguistic and cultural expression. Sixth, lift constraints on dissemination of Kurdish language television and radio broadcast, print, music and other mediums. Seventh, develop a government-sponsored Institute of Kurdish Studies and allow schools to offer instructions in Kurdish and Eighth, convene an official, high-profile conference examining all aspects of Turkish – Kurdish relations.”

Although mid-1990s were the worst period for Turkish democracy, there was some effort towards reform in Turkey and the US Congress was mostly encouraging towards such moves. On 23 July 1995, the Turkish National Assembly approved major amendments to the 1982 Constitution, most notable being the amendment to the infamous 'article 8' of the anti-terror law that provided a legal base for arbitrary arrest and imprisonment.²⁰⁹ On 27 July 1995²¹⁰ Congressman Christopher Smith (R-NJ) praised Turkish Parliament for its recent decision on passing through a set of constitutional amendments, which, in Smith's words, took “[...] an important step towards strengthening democracy”. For Smith, the set of amendments were particularly impressive since it was “[...] the first time the civilian government in Turkey has altered the 1982 constitution promulgated by the military”. Being selective in his praise, Smith also identified parties that favored reform: “Prime Minister Çiller and the junior coalition partner, Republican Peoples Party deserve much praise for standing by the legislation despite strong

²⁰⁹ Article 8 of the Anti-terror law (terörle mücadele kanunu) concerned ‘Propaganda against the indivisibility of the state’ and its vague terms had enabled many arbitrary arrests and imprisonment. For the full text of this law in Turkish, see the Ministry of Justice webpage (accessed May 4, 2009): <<http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/809.html>>

²¹⁰ Turkey’s Parliament Takes Important Step Forward. E1521: Vol. 141 No. 123. July 27, 1995.

opposition from Islamic and nationalist parties”. This particular statement by a representative who had previously criticized Turkey quite frequently on the human rights front, can lead to the argument that positions adopted in the US Congress on democracy have been more fluid than those adopted on human rights. Also, it can be said that US Congress discourse on democracy has been more fluid than those in the European Parliament. While the EP was divided sharply between 'pro-' and 'anti-Turkish' trenches among which ideological mobility was almost non-existent, the generally critical representatives in the US Congress did actually praise Turkey on its democratic improvements when there was a positive development. However, one cannot observe a similar trend in the human rights discourses that were generally critical and rigid. Therefore, it can be argued that the US Congress was more lenient towards criticism of Turkey on the 'democracy' discourse, but less tolerant on 'human rights' discourse. Indeed, Congressman Smith revealed this himself: “[...] as someone who has spoken out in the past against actions taken by the government of Turkey, I believe it is important to give the Turkish Government credit where credit is due”.

The 'Porter amendment' debate²¹¹ which sought to limit economic aid to Turkey also touched upon shortcomings in Turkish democracy within the context of the Kurdish question in terms of political opposition, political organization and free-speech. Congressman Porter explained his proposed cut in aid to Turkey:

“[...] most disturbingly, the Government continues to harass, detain and prosecute writers, journalists, even elected parliamentarians who are critical of Government policies. One hundred sixty-six people are currently imprisoned under their sedition law [...] Political organizations and media continue to face harassment and shutdowns. The Ciller government has indefinitely removed from consideration proposed Democratic reforms to the antiterror law. The state minister in charge of human rights, the first high ranking Government official to speak openly about

²¹¹ Amendment proposed by John Edward Porter on the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act 1996. H6483: Vol. 141 No. 107 Page 78, Line 7. June 28, 1995

torture, was relieved of his post earlier this year.”

However, the text of the amendment had a very critical factual error: constitutional amendments on the anti-terror law that the Porter amendment claimed being “indefinitely removed from consideration” was passed by the Turkish Parliament the following month. Therefore that phrase was in fact a misleading statement, aiming to limit aid to Turkey through deceptive information, since the amendments to the anti-terror law were made soon after. As Congressman Porter had previously pushed for a reduction of aid to Turkey for “not recognizing the Armenian genocide”, it might be argued that this particular discourse had in fact very little to do with actual democratization of Turkey and more a part of Armenian lobbying efforts; it is worth highlighting that Congressman Porter was also a member of the Armenian Caucus at the Congress. This shows how often unverified information was used against aid cuts to Turkey, despite the fact that verified and accurate data would probably be sufficient to convince the Congress to limit the aid anyway.

Arrest and conviction of the Kurdish parliamentarian Leyla Zana became a topic of intense debate in the US Congress as it was in the European Parliament. Following the trend of drawing similarities with the Soviet Union, Kosovo or Rwanda, on 10 November 1997²¹², Congressman John Edward Porter (R-IL) criticized the arrest of Zana and likened the human rights situation in Turkey to that in China: “The litany of human rights abuses that we heard about is, unfortunately, what we have come to expect from countries like China. What we should not expect or tolerate is for a country like Turkey – ostensibly a western, European, democratic country – to have the same type of human rights problems”. This discourse can be regarded as another one of the ‘critically inclusive’ discourses. On the one hand the criticism is directed towards Turkish practices, however

²¹² Free Leyla Zana. E2305: Vol.143 No. 158. November 10, 1997.

on the other hand, Turkey is not 'otherized'; the statement still discusses the level of democracy in Turkey, highlighting the fact that such abuses cannot be tolerated 'because Turkey is western'.

However, some other Congressmen preferred to approach the issue of Turkish democracy from a different perspective and knock Turkey's credentials as a democratic country altogether. In some instances, they challenged the policy and approach of the executive branch by extending their unwavering support to Turkey despite Turkey's democratic shortcomings. Also, during the debates on Leyla Zana and other arrested Kurdish parliamentarians, questioning Turkey's democratic credentials was an observable trend in discourses. For example, on 1 May 1997²¹³ Frank Pallone (D-NJ) referred to Turkish democracy in a satirical manner: “[...] we often hear – from our own administration, from other apologists for Turkey – about what a great democracy the Republic of Turkey is. Yet this is how a duly elected representative of that so-called democracy is being treated, for the crime of speaking her language and defending the rights of her people”.

Overall, the Congress discourse on Turkish democracy was less rigid and uniform than its discourse on human rights. In fact, the intensification of the Kurdish issue with the Gulf War enabled the American Congress to discuss Turkish democratization within new parameters. While the United States was more interested in how Turkish elections were conducted, the Kurdish question enabled the American curiosity to penetrate deeper through many layers of Turkish democracy. In summary, the debate on Turkish democracy within the context of the Kurdish question led to the exposure to many of the shortcomings in democratic practices in Turkey; shortcomings that were mostly ignored within pre-1991 parameters. Although through the 1990s,

²¹³ Self-determination for the Kurds. H2152: Vol. 143 No. 55. May 1, 1997

the US executive branch refrained from making statements on Turkish democracy within the Kurdish context, the same period witnessed some of the harshest statements coming out of the Congress, leading to the creation of two strands of policy positions with regard to Turkey.

2.3 Excessive force

The 'excessive force' discourse focused on Turkish police and army misconduct in their dealings with the PKK or people believed to be affiliated with the organization, as well as civilians and non-combatants. The excessive force argument was also used on statements condemning the use of disproportionately heavy weaponry by the Turkish military such as cluster bombs and advanced tactical missiles against PKK targets close to civilian settlements. Since Turkey and the United States were important defense procurement partners, most Congressmen discourses focused on the abolishment of the arms transfers to Turkey pointing to the excessive methods adopted by Turkish forces using American equipment.

On 30 March 1992²¹⁴ for example, Congressman William Broomfield (R-MI) referred to Turkish response to the PKK as “[...] brutal suppression of the Kurds by Turkey [...]” claiming “[...] Turkish security forces have used massive force to put down separatist Kurdish guerrillas”. Also referring to the German-supplied weapons²¹⁵ used by Turkey – just as German MEP Claudia Roth had referred to US-supplied weapons – Broomfield argued: “[...] Ankara's security forces appear to operate like a bull in a china shop [...]”. The statement was made after the Turkish police and gendarmerie forces responded to the Kurdish *Nevruz* incidents with heavy equipment right

²¹⁴ A Human Rights Tragedy: Turkey's Treatment of the Kurds. E875: Vol. 138 No. 46. March 30, 1992.

²¹⁵ Between 1981 and 1990, Turkey was the second biggest recipient of German major arms exports, supplied for NATO defense purposes. For a graph showing the break-down of German Major Arms Exports by year and country, see: Harrison, Glennon J. (1994) *Europe and the United States: Competition and Cooperation in the 1990s*. (New York: M.E. Sharpe) p. 247

after the PKK had called for an all-out uprising in the Turkish cities.

Apart from Turkey's response towards what it considers as 'combatants', its inability to discern between civilians and PKK members was also a major topic within the Congressional excessive force arguments. It wasn't long before the use of US-made heavy weaponry against civilians led the Congress to adopt conditions on military aid to Turkey. On 29 June 1994²¹⁶ for example, Senator Patrick Leahy (D-VT) explained the condition on that year's military funding to Turkey: "If the Turkish Government wants to use our aid to fight their war against the Kurds inside Turkey, they are going to have to show that they can tell the difference between noncombatant women and children who happen to be Kurdish, and terrorists". Senator Leahy was one of the higher-profile members of the Congress who had argued in favor of an aid restriction to Turkey; hence members of the Congress who pushed for a cut in military aid mirrored his position in the following years. However, some arguments within the excessive force discourse were not adopted merely to cut aid. The ferocity of the violence adopted by both Turkish security forces and the PKK caused fear both in the European Parliament and the US Congress that the conflict would spiral down into an all-out civil war (some agree that it actually was a civil war in the mid-1990s), while Turkey's heavy handedness towards the Kurds actually push them towards the sphere of the PKK. Senator DeConcini (D-AZ) explained this rationale further in one of his statements:

"The very measures Turkey is employing to safeguard the State from the threats of separatism are polarizing Turkish society even further. Rising nationalism and the tendency to view reforms as concessions to terrorism intimidate any who speak of compromise. The Tactics of the PKK do nothing to engender support yet it is the PKK that finds itself the beneficiary of increased sympathy by a people who view themselves with no choices"

²¹⁶ Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. S15254: Vol.140 No.148. June 29, 1994

Excessive force argument was also used in statements concerning sale of the infamous advanced missiles to Turkey. On 12 December 1995²¹⁷, Congressman Christopher Smith (R-NJ) opposed the sale of advanced Army Tactical Missile Systems (ATACMS) sale to Turkey. His technical concern was: “Essentially a massive, guided cluster bomb [...] delivers 950 small bombs. Many of the munitions fail to detonate, remain on the ground and become a mortal threat to noncombatants” followed by his concerns over Turkish security practices: “[...] Turkish regime could use these missiles against civilians as it pursues its ruthless campaign against Kurdish guerrillas [...] Human Rights Watch detailed in a 171-page report the Turkish military's widespread use of United States-supplied equipment in campaigns which inflict death and destruction against civilians”.

Excessive force arguments have often been backed up either by the Cyprus issue or the Armenian question, similar to the issue linkage trend in the European Parliament. In the first case, some Congressmen would refer to Turkey's actions in the south-east as an 'invasion' and would remind Turkey's invasion of the northern part of Cyprus; in the latter case, some would refer to Turkey's actions against the PKK as 'genocide' tying it to the Armenian genocide allegations of 1915. For example on 2 May 1995²¹⁸, Congressman John Edward Porter (R-IL) referred to the Kurdish question during his statement titled “Eightieth Anniversary of Armenian Genocide”. After his remarks on the events of 1915, he referred to the Kurdish question:

“[...] let us remind ourselves as well today in Turkey another genocide is occurring by the Turkish Government against yet another Turkish minority, Kurdish people

²¹⁷ Oppose the Sale of Advanced Missiles to Turkey. E2340: Vol. 141 No. 197. December 12, 1995

²¹⁸ Eightieth Anniversary of Armenian Genocide. H4494: Vol. 141 No. 71. May 2, 1995

and today thousands of Turkish troops not only have driven through the southeastern portion of Turkey, executing those in the Kurdish minority who oppose them, burning and tearing down Kurdish towns, but have crossed into the border in Iraq to attack Kurdish peoples in their camps, refugee camps”.

Just as all excessive force arguments did, this one too ended with a proposal to reduce military aid to Turkey: “[the Congress should] provide, I believe, not 1 cent of assistance to Turkey until reforms, major reforms, come about in that society [...]”.

Articles, op-eds and commentaries from the press were also frequently used in the Congress to back up arguments on Turkey's conduct during its cross-border incursions through the facts provided by reporters. During her statement on American Overseas Interests Act of 1995²¹⁹, Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney (D-GA) cited a Washington Times news-analysis by John Pomfret titled *Turkey's Hunt for the Kurds: the Making of a Quagmire?*²²⁰ in which a Turkish soldier was quoted: “we have a big problem because we don't know who is a villager and who the PKK is ... we can't do a thing”. She then quoted a farmer named Fevzi Rashid, an inhabitant of the Iraqi village of *Beshile* who spoke to Reuters after a Turkish attack: “First the planes bombed our village. Then soldiers came some days later and burned the houses. Yesterday they came again and fired at the village with rockets and mortars”²²¹. McKinney also quoted a Helsinki Human Rights Watch report²²² which gave detailed accounts of American armament used during Turkey's cross-border operations: “Major encounters involving U.S.-supplied weaponry have included May 1993 bombing raids in the Karlioiva valley that utilized F-4 fighter planes and Cobra helicopters to kill 44 Kurdish fighters and a January 1994 incursion into Iraq to bombard PKK camps with cluster bombs, 500- and 2000-pound bombs dropped from F-16 and F-4 aircraft”. Her statement

²¹⁹ American Overseas Interests Act of 1995. H5389-H5455. May 23, 1995.

²²⁰ Pomfret, John. “Turkey's Hunt for the Kurds: the Making of a Quagmire?” *Washington Times*. April 2, 1995

²²¹ Erdem, Sari. “Iraqi Kurds Say Turkey Torched Their Town” *Reuters*, March 30, 1995.

²²² Human Rights Watch. *Helsinki Report of October 1994*, (Washington, DC: Human Rights Watch), p. 4

also included a section which likened Turkey's Kurdish conundrum to the Vietnam War: "Turkey's ongoing war against the PKK, both in Northern Iraq and Southeastern Turkey, is looking increasingly like it may become that nation's Vietnam: a draining, divisive and ultimately unsuccessful effort to defeat a nationalist movement by military means". McKinney also quoted a statement made by Joel Johnson, chief lobbyist for the Aerospace Industries Association:

"It must be acknowledged that the Turks have not invented Rolling Thunder. We used B-52 to solve a guerrilla problem (in Vietnam). The Russians used very large weapons platforms (in Afghanistan). And the Israelis get irritated on a reasonably consistent basis and use F-16s in Southern Lebanon. One wishes that it didn't happen. Sitting in the comfort of one's office, one might tell all four countries they're wrong. It's a lot easier to say that here than when you're there and it's your military guys who are getting chewed up".²²³

Excessive force argument was one of the major discourses underlying the 'Porter amendment'. In his defense of the cut in economic aid to Turkey, Congressman John Edward Porter (R-IL) argued that the Turkish government had engaged in genocide against the Kurds: "Turkey continues to take a strictly military approach to the Kurdish situation. Government genocide is being committed against the Kurdish minority. Of 15,000 people dead from the conflict, half of them have been killed in just the last 2 years; 3 million people have been internally displaced in Turkey as villages have been forcibly evacuated or destroyed". A similar argument was used by most of the representatives through the debate of this amendment. Congressman Frank Wolf (R-VA) referred to the photos in possession of Congressman Porter: "[Edward Porter] had the pictures of the butchering, literally, the butchering of the Kurds and the ripping apart, and the body parts that are all over".

In some instances, representatives chose to quote Turkish officials in order to back their

²²³ Morrison, D. "Turkish War Concern for America," *National Journal*, April 15, 1995.

arguments. On 26 March 1996²²⁴, Congressman Edward Porter (R-IL) quoted then newly elected prime minister of Turkey, Mesut Yılmaz regarding his comments on the non-military solution to the Kurdish problem. Porter translated Yılmaz's statement as: “[...] after having witnessed such terrible events in the past, after losing 15,000 people, I believe we have come to a common understanding that this problem can be resolved only by peaceful means and not by military means” and commented that “[...] this is extremely good news”. However, Porter's optimism was reversed the next year after Turkey launched a massive military campaign in northern Iraq. On 10 November 1997,²²⁵ Porter this time criticized Turkey's use of internationally banned weaponry during its operations against the PKK: “The use of napalm and cluster bombs against civilians in Northern Iraq is irrefutable evidence that Turkey does not care who it hurts in its mindless military effort to eradicate the Kurds”.

While 'excessive force' discourses include the most 'anti-Turkish' statements, some variations of this position have been even harsher than the mainstream arguments. The biggest cross-border operation in 1997 elicited many responses both from the Senate and the House. Such was the statement of Congressman Filner on 1 May 1997²²⁶: “Today, Turkish Special Komandos²²⁷ actually collect rewards for the severed heads of Kurdish guerrillas and others, casually referring to their victims as Armenians, leaving no doubt as to what is in store for the Kurds and their national aspirations”.

2.4 Identity/Autonomy/Cultural rights

²²⁴ Anniversary of Massacre of Kurds by Iraqi Government. H2853: Vol. 142 No. 43. March 26, 1996.

²²⁵ Turkey Looks Outside its Borders to Solve its Kurdish Question, when the problem clearly Rests Within. E2251-E2252. November 8, 1997.

²²⁶ Self-determination for the Kurds. H2152: Vol. 143 No. 55. May 1, 1997.

²²⁷ He refers to the commando regiments; special forces, somewhat equivalent to the US Marine Corps.

In some instances, the Congress spoke about the Kurdish issue within the context of an ethnic conflict, rather than a rebellion or insurgency. Within this discursive sub-branch, the overall belief was that the Kurdish question in Turkey arose merely from the fact that 'Kurds were Kurds' and that Turkey was 'oppressing' them simply because of their ethnicity. The tone of the arguments ranged from suggesting Turkey to grant full ethno-cultural rights to the Kurds to outright accusation of Turkey for being 'a racist state'. Even before the Gulf War, the cultural aspect of the Kurdish question was being spoken within the Congress and the arguments adopted within the 'cultural rights' discourse had some similarities with the ones adopted in the European Parliament. On 21 July 1989²²⁸ for example, Congressman John Dingell (D-MI) attracted the attention of the House of Representatives to the Turkish treatment of Kurds, adopting a culturalist discourse similar to that adopted by MEP Alexadros Alavanos of the European Parliament 5 years later on 10 March 1994²²⁹: "[Turks] have imprisoned an estimated 10 million Kurds for declaring their Kurdishness, speaking Kurdish, wearing Kurdish costumes and passing their names on to their offspring".

While Kurdish autonomy was considered as a taboo in Turkey, both the European Parliament and the US Congress believed granting autonomy to the Kurds would lead to the solution of the problem. In fact, the undeclared autonomy of the Iraqi Kurds after the Gulf War created a problematic situation for Turkey in which Kurds in Iraq were able to exercise some degree of control protected under the American and British air cover (Operation Provide Comfort), whereas a power vacuum like that in Iraq had never taken place in Turkey. The duality of the situation of the Kurds in both sides of the Turkish-Iraqi border provoked comparative arguments

²²⁸ Man's Inhumanity to Man. E2624: Vol. 135 No.99. July 21, 1989.

²²⁹ Turkey. D2258 - B3-0347/94. European Parliament Sitting of March 10, 1994

from the Congress. On 7 March 1991²³⁰, for example Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA) criticized Turkish denial of autonomy to its Kurdish population: “The Turkish government would be deeply apprehensive if the United States were to be seen to be doing anything to help Iraq's Kurds gain the kind of autonomy that it denies its own Kurdish citizens”. Indeed, the Operation Provide Comfort (OPC) which established a no-fly zone over the predominantly Kurdish areas of northern Iraq caused concern in Turkey both at the elite and public level and believed to be aggravating the security threat posed by the PKK.²³¹

As Turkey intensified its military response to the PKK in the 1990s, the frequency of autonomy – cultural rights discourse increased together with most other discourse types. Many members of the Congress had argued that the cease of armed acts between the PKK and the Turkish army should be a prerequisite. Senator John Kerry (D-MA), in response to a then recent Turkish cross-border operation against the PKK, proposed that a solution to the Kurdish question will not come through military means: “Turkey's recognition, that its Kurdish civilians have civil, cultural, political and human rights is an essential first step”.²³² The cultural rights discourse also increased its frequency over the autonomy discourse as the Turkish military started to gain the upper hand against the PKK and the PKK denounced its earlier goal of carving a Kurdistan in south-eastern Turkey.

One of the less generic analyses of the situation in Turkey came in August 1995, when two members of the Foreign Relations Committee minority staff went to Turkey on Senator Claiborne Pell's (D-RI) directions to observe “a range of issues related to United States – Turkish bilateral

²³⁰ Kurds, Turks and Cypriots: A New World Order for Whom? S2991: Vol. 137 No.39. March 7, 1991.

²³¹ This line of argument will be presented in the next chapter on Turkish Grand National Assembly

²³² Turkey's invasion of Iraq. S4741. March 28, 1995.

relations”. Pell presented their findings at the Senate on 15 September 1995²³³, which introduced several unique and new arguments, related to identity and ethnicity. However the identity discourses adopted in the statement weren't related to the Kurds, but to Turkish identity as the underlying factor behind the conflict in the southeast. In the 'Summary of Key Findings' it was stated:

“In keeping with traditions established during the days of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, Turkey has an almost paranoid fear of losing its Turkish identity. The government of Turkey accordingly is unable-or unwilling-to distinguish the genuine threat posed by the PKK from the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Kurdish people. As a result, Turkey refuses to engage in a political dialogue with nonviolent Kurdish representatives, and is executing a heavy-handed, indiscriminate military campaign to eradicate what it views as a monolithic threat to the unity of the country.”

Evaluation of the Kurdish question within the context of Turkish identity and self-definition was indeed a novelty in both the European Parliament and the US Congress. The observation that Turkish policy towards the Kurds had its origins in the Kemalist legacy of one-nation, one-country is in fact accurate; however the idea itself had in fact originated in Europe.²³⁴ The German and French nationalism in the 19th century became the primary inspiration to the Young Turks (the ideological and intellectual legacy from which Atatürk comes) in their idea of Turkism and 'Turkish-ness'. As for example, regardless of his or her ethnic origin, every French citizen was regarded as 'French' in an overarching definition of nationality. Similarly, Turkey had adopted a system where citizens of Turkey were accepted as 'Turks' even though they may ethnically be Kurdish, Circassian, Arab etc... There are competing theories on why the Kurdish situation evolved in to a conflict whereas other ethnic groups in Turkey accepted the overarching macro-

²³³ Foreign Relations Committee Staff Report on Turkey. S13655: Vol. 141 No. 144. September 15, 1995.

²³⁴ I have made an elaborate discussion on the European intellectual roots of Kemalist and Turkish nationalism in Chapter 2

identity of 'Turkish-ness', however this is a much larger debate and will not be covered in this dissertation.

Making similarities between other problematic episodes of Turkish history and the Kurdish issue was also adopted as an argumentative strategy within the cultural rights sub-discourse. During the debate on 7 November 1997²³⁵, which highlighted Kurdish Americans fasting on the steps of the Capitol, Congressman Frank Pallone (D-NJ) claimed that Turkey was destroying not Kurds as people, but Kurdish culture in general. It was particularly worth highlighting his linkage between the Armenian genocide and Kurdish cultural destruction allegations: “[...] the Turkish Government, which is, of course denying the Armenian genocide and continues to, is also basically trying to obliterate [...] by denying Kurds the ability to speak their language, to learn about their culture, to go to school in Kurdish [...]”.

The decision by the Turkish court to sentence Leyla Zana an additional two years of prison sentence sparked intense criticism in the House of Representatives. Within the ethnic conflict discourse, statements that framed the Kurdish conflict in the context of a perceived racial/racist policy by Turkey became more frequent in the later 1990s as Turkey pursued a strictly militarist approach, curbing Kurdish political activity in the parliament. Congresswoman Furse (D-OR) adopted a racial-ethnicist discourse in her statement on 13 October 1998²³⁶ “The fact that Leyla Zana has been charged with inciting racial hatred reveals that Turkey is a racist state and continues to deny the Kurds a voice in the state”.

²³⁵ Plight of the Kurdish People. H10331. November 7, 1997.

²³⁶ Ankara's Decision to Sentence Leyla Zana. E2132: Vol.144 No.145. October 13, 1998.

Cultural rights – autonomy – identity discourses in the Congress were slightly harsher than the arguments presented in the European Parliament. As previously stated, while Turkish definition of statehood accepted every ethnic group as 'Turks', the general sense of the US Congress was that the violence between Turkish military and the PKK would stop only if Turkey would make necessary concessions in providing Kurds with a different citizenship status, that would mean a disregard for Turkey's policy of citizenship. The proponents of the ethnicist argument of "*Turkey oppresses Kurds because they are Kurds*" did not, however, get into the details of why adoption of a supra-identity of 'Turk-ness' did not lead to a violent conflict between the government and other minorities within Turkey. More importantly, all the arguments that regarded the Kurdish question as an essentially ethnic conflict, referred to all the non-Kurds in Turkey monolithically as Turks, without making any reference to other minority groups within the country. Therefore, in most Congress discourses Kurds were identified as the only minority living in Turkey, whereas Azeris, Circassians, Arabs, Bosnians, Abkhazians, Laz, Traceans (muhajees), Jews, Chechens, Cretans, Turcomans, Kyrgyz, Uighurs, Assyrians, Chaldeans and other ethnic groups were monolithically referred as 'Turks'.

2.5 Discourses that converged with that of the Turkish State

Given the history of US - Turkish strategic partnership, some arguments in the literature pointed to the perceived American unwillingness to criticise Turkey on its human rights record in order not to protect strategic US interests in the region.²³⁷ While this may be true for the statements coming from the executive branch, the Congress was fiercely critical of Turkey's human rights practices and this directness often left even European Parliament statements look

²³⁷ See for example: Lesser, Ian 'Turkey and the United States: Anatomy of a Strategic Relationship' in Lenore G. Martin and Dimitris Keridis (eds.) (2004) *The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy*. (Boston: MIT Press) and Couloumbis, Theodore (1983) *The United States, Greece and Turkey: the troubled triangle* (New York: Praeger)

milder in tone. Yet, there were also instances when Turkey was praised either in the Senate or the House, not by people who hold a different view of Turkey's human rights record, but rather by people who sought to attract attention more into Turkey's strategic worth and away from its handling of the Kurdish issue. It is worth pointing out here that there has been a trend among representatives who spoke in favour of Turkey to quote a publication – an article or op-ed – whereas representatives who criticised Turkey's human rights or democratic practices relied less on quotes from outside publications in their statements. Therefore, 'pro-Turkish' statements in the Congress had less discursive quality (since the actual statements were much shorter than the quoted articles) and so called 'anti-Turkish' statements were more suitable for discourse analysis because they relied less on quoted text. Also, one particular member of the House of Representatives, James Bunn (R-OR) had almost singlehandedly-defended Turkey in the Congressional debates against criticism; this particular Congressman produced almost all of the 'pro-Turkish' discourses.

An example to such praise can be the statement made by Congressman Jim Bunn (R-OR) on 18 October 1995, titled “Forsaking a Bulwark to Extremism”²³⁸. In a period rife with criticism of Turkey's Kurdish policy, Bunn reminded the fact that “[...] Turkey has, for several decades, been one of America's closest allies” and that it had “[...] stood by [the United States] throughout the Cold War, during Operation Desert Storm and the crisis in the Balkans”. The timing of the statement is worth attention, as September - October 1995 witnessed the highest frequency of criticisms of Turkey's handling of the Kurdish issue.²³⁹ Nonetheless, Bunn wasn't discrete about the timing of his statement and claimed: “Unfortunately, some in Congress have failed to

²³⁸ Forsaking a Valued Bulwark To Extremism. E1972: Vol: 141 No. 161. October 18, 1995.

²³⁹ This will be presented in detail in Chapter 6

recognize Turkey's friendship and strategic importance in recent weeks". In addition, Bunn indirectly criticised the trend of 'anti-Turkish' discourses coming from representatives who had Kurdish, Greek or Armenian constituency: "[The quoted Washington Times editorial by Amos Perlmutter²⁴⁰] illustrates the danger of basing our foreign policy on ethnic head counts in our districts, instead of the national security concerns of the United States".

During the 'Porter amendment' debate²⁴¹, the general tone of the representatives was overwhelmingly critical of Turkey. However still, Congressman Bunn complained that the arguments did not refer to the PKK violence: "[...] we are not being told about the PKK, which is a terrorist group that was founded by the KGB to disrupt one of our NATO allies. Yet even the Soviet Union no longer exists, the PKK still does, killing tourists, disrupting the economy and trying to divide the nation". Bunn was partly correct. Congress did not refer to the PKK violence as much as it did to Turkish security misconducts in the military aid reduction debates. He also questioned the notion that Turkish Government policies were inherently anti-Kurdish. Bunn had also dismissed his colleagues who argued that Turkey was oppressing Kurds because of their ethnicity, by quoting that year's State Department report on the situation of Human Rights in Turkey which read: "Currently as many as 25 per cent of the members of the 450-seat parliament are Kurds" and stating satirically: "That does not sound like genocide of the Kurds to me".

3. Discourses of the State Department and Department of Defense and US military officials

While the European Council or Commission members were present frequently, offering

²⁴⁰ Perlmutter, Amos. 'On Target...Or Off Course in Kurdistan Clash?' *Washington Times*. April 4, 1995. p. A17

²⁴¹ Amendment proposed by John Edward Porter on the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act 1996. H6483: Vol. 141 No. 107 Page 78, Line 7. June 28, 1995

their views during the European Parliament debates, executive branch officials did not regularly contribute to Congress debates, unless summoned for a hearing. Apart from Congressional hearings and written statements used during the debates, it wasn't methodologically possible to undertake a pattern study for the executive branch discourses as I did with the Commission and Council in the European Parliament. In this heading, discursive material I used belonged mostly to subcommittee hearings and written answers provided to Congressional inquiries to the executive branch.

On 10 February 1994²⁴² Congressman Lee Hamilton (D-IN; Chairman of House Foreign Affairs Committee) provided a written exchange between himself and Peter Tarnoff, then acting Secretary of State, on the Kurdish question in Turkey. Hamilton had inquired about the security situation in Turkey and the human rights abuses that went along with, asking whether the State Department would “do something about it”. In his reply, secretary Tarnoff adopted a discourse similar to that of the Turkish state. He condemned the PKK repetitively and firmly: “Increasing PKK attacks have involved acts of murder and extortion against innocent civilians [...] Last fall's spate of terrorist attacks in several European capitals led Germany to ban the organization”. However he was equally critical of Turkey: “We also share your concerns about human rights violations committed by Turkish security forces in the south-east. There are reports of significant human rights violations, including extra-judicial killings and torture, committed by the Turkish military in its counter-terrorism campaign”.

Some representatives were critical of the executive branch because of the usage of US-

²⁴² United States policy towards Turkey. E171: Vol. 140 No. 13. February 10, 1994.

origin military equipment in the cases of human rights abuses. On 6 September 1995²⁴³, Congressman Lee Hamilton, this time attracted the attention of the House to the report prepared by the State Department on 1 June 1995 regarding the use of American-issued weaponry involved in practices against human rights. Then, he presented his written exchange with then Assistant secretary of Legislative Affairs of the State Department, Wendy Sherman regarding the sale of arms to Turkey. While the letters are obviously neither spontaneous nor speech-acts, it is nonetheless interesting to observe the context and words with which the legislature discusses this matter with the executive branch. In his letter of inquiry, Hamilton asked “For how long do you believe human rights abuses in connection with Turkish military operations against the PKK have been occurring?” followed by “Do you intend to report under Section 3(c)(2) of the AECA concerning a violation of that Act, through the use of U.S. - origin defense equipment for a purpose not authorized under Section 4 of the AECA?”²⁴⁴. Finally, he ended the letter with a direct “Is it U.S. Policy to promote a political solution in southeastern Turkey? Does Turkey support a political solution?” Although the letter was directed to then secretary of State Warren Christopher, the reply was answered by Wendy Sherman, which read:

“The United States has had a military supply relationship with Turkey for over 40 years. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that Ankara has used U.S. - origin equipment against the PKK since the conflict started nearly 11 years ago. The Turkish military became extensively involved in operations against the PKK in 1992, when the conflict worsened dramatically. Until that time, the military's involvement, as opposed to that of the Jandarma (national guard), was minimal.”

As for Hamilton's inquiry whether the situation in south-eastern Turkey constituted a violation of the Arms Export Control Act, Sherman stated: “[...] section 4 of that Act provides in relevant part that the U.S. Government may provide U.S. - origin defense articles to friendly countries for a

²⁴³ Human rights abuses and United States-origin military equipment in Turkey. E1721-E1722. September 7, 1995.

²⁴⁴ Section 4 of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) deals with “Purposes for Which Military Sales by the United States Are Authorized”. The full text of the AECA can be accessed from the U.S. Department of the State website (accessed May 6, 2009): < http://www.pmddtc.state.gov/regulations_laws/aeca.html >

number of purposes, including for internal security. Although human rights violations have occurred in the course of operations, those operations appear in fact to have been undertaken for a purpose authorized under the AECA [...].” Therefore, Sherman reformulated Hamilton's human rights concerns within the context of Turkey's internal security; while she confirmed violations of human rights, she stated the sense of the State Department that the violations constitute side-effects of responses again a major threat to an ally's domestic stability. Indeed, the letter further read: “Turkey's human rights record raises serious concerns, but we do not believe that it has engaged in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights within the meaning of Section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act²⁴⁵” and continued with a report of constitutional amendments approved by the Turkish Grand National Assembly, as well as a program initiated by the Turkish General Staff to educate soldiers in human rights requirements. This exchange is very important, as it gives a good example of difference in perception between the Congress and the State Department at the height of insurgency. Although the difference seems to stem from semantics, it exposes far deeper differences between legislative perception and that of the state/bureaucracy. Inherent in its establishment, the Congress is most concerned with freedom of expression and individual rights that manifest as a critique of Turkish state and the military (as opposed to Turkey in general) in its conduct towards a sizeable minority group, whereas the State Department – being a state branch – is most concerned about threats to the state and the country, which is expressed as a statement that emphasizes security over liberties.

²⁴⁵ “Accordingly, a principal goal of the foreign policy of the United States shall be to promote the increased observance of internationally recognized human rights by all countries”. Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 – Section 502B, pp. 229-230. Available online through USAID website (accessed May 6, 2009): <<http://www.usaid.gov/policy/ads/faa.pdf>>

On 21 September 1995²⁴⁶, Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV) presented two written exchanges between the officials of the US military and the Congress. The first one was from the secretary of Defense William Perry, which was directed to the Congressman Richard Gephardt (D-MO), the minority leader of the US House of Representatives. The letter urged Gephardt not to limit financial assistance to Turkey:

“I am also disturbed by some provisions of H.R. 1561 which would impose unnecessary restrictions on the ability of the President to conduct U.S. Foreign policy. Its prohibition on assistance to countries which in any way restrict the flow of U.S. Humanitarian aid would unduly damage our important security relations with Turkey”.

As in many ‘pro-Turkish’ discourses, this one too did not elaborate on the crux of the matter, which is Turkish state behavior towards the Kurds. Instead, Perry focused on ‘security relations’; an emphasis that reveals Perry’s belief that security partnership holds more importance than humanitarian concerns. Second letter was more elaborate. Written by the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff John Shalikashvili to Congressman Sonny Callahan (R-AL) of the House Appropriations Committee argued that there were improvements in Turkey’s human rights practices: “The Turkish military is actively engaging in efforts to improve human rights awareness among its personnel [...] They have instituted new rules of engagement for all military operations and provided additional training to many soldiers assigned to anti-terrorist operations”. Shalhashvili also pointed to the military support to the process: “I have personally engaged General Karadayi, Turkey’s Chief of Defense [...] and found him to be willing to assist in moving forward with new measures aimed at enhancing Turkish democracy and human rights. The Turkish military leadership is backing progress on human rights and is ready to make a concerted

²⁴⁶ Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 1996. S14031: Vol. 141 No. 148. September 21, 1995.

effort to see democratization legislation to pass”. This was one of the very few statements of support for the Turkish state addressing directly concerns on human rights and democratization.

On 28 March 1996²⁴⁷, there was another written exchange with the State Department being presented, this time at the House of Representatives again by Congressman Lee Hamilton on the occasion of the sale of US-origin military equipment to Turkey. On 8 September 1995, Hamilton had sent a letter to the attention of secretary of the State, Warren Christopher on the continuation of military sales to Turkey despite State Department reports that those arms have been misused during military operations against the PKK. The reply letter written by Wendy Sherman from the Legislative Affairs of the State Department, started off with a typical highlight of the PKK threat: “As we consider how best to pursue our objectives in Turkey, it is important to understand just what Turkey is up against. The Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) has stated that its primary goal is to create a separate Kurdish state in part of what is now Turkey”. Sherman also expressed the worry of the State Department over human rights abuses: “We have frequently cautioned the Turkish government to exercise care that its legitimate military operations avoid targeting civilians and non-combatants”. The State Department letter also shed some light on the statements condemning the Turkish government for its 'mystery killings', indicating that some of those unidentified murders that were reported to be doings of the Turkish security forces were in fact, actions by another terrorist group: Hizb'allah: “[...] a number of Turkish 'Hizbullah' terrorists are now on trial for alleged involvement in 'mystery killings'. According to Turkey's prestigious Human Rights Foundation, these sorts of killings were down sharply in 1995”. The letter then expressed what the State Department had considered 'encouraging' in terms of legal proceedings against Kurds such as the Turkish Court of Appeals decision to annul charges on the Kurdish

²⁴⁷ United States-origin military equipment in Turkey. E469: Vol. 142 No. 45. March 27, 1996.

parliamentarians: “[...] Turkey's High Court of Appeals ruled in October that Kurdish former members of Parliament had not committed crimes when they took their oaths in the Kurdish language, wore Kurdish colors and stated that Turkish was a foreign language for them”. Finally, Sherman replied to Hamilton's question on whether the Kurdish parliamentarians who have fled to Europe would be regarded as proper intermediaries between the Kurds and Turkey: “Unfortunately, some of them associated the 'Kurdistan Parliament in Exile' (KPIE) which is financed and controlled by the PKK. We cannot, therefore, advocate negotiations with the so-called KPIE”.

4. Discourses of Inter-US criticism

Congressmen sometimes criticized each other, the executive branch or US policy on the Kurdish question. Such criticisms were most frequently directed towards US arms sales to Turkey.

On 30 March 1995²⁴⁸ for example, Congressman Bobby Rush (D-IL) highlighted the use of American weaponry in Turkey's abuses of human rights. Pointing to the said abuses, Rush claimed: “[...] we may be also partly to blame for the ongoing crisis in the mountains of Iraq” and explains: “Not only does the Turkish government receive vast amounts of United States financial aid, we and our allies also supply their government with large amounts of military hardware”. As much as the statement that Turkey received large amounts of US weaponry was true, discourses on US aid to Turkey almost always discursively overlooked the fact that such allocations were loans with high interest rates, as opposed to grants. Most congressmen portrayed such aids as if they were grants and did not get into the specifics of the type of the aid as well as its payback conditions. From the other perspective, the Turkish Grand National Assembly – as will be

²⁴⁸ Turkey must cease its relentless attacks against the Kurdish people. E745. March 30, 1995.

discussed in more detail in chapter 5 – would discursively construct these loans in a completely different way, within the context of US trying to tie down Turkey through loans that had insurmountable interest rates. Not surprisingly, US aid had also brought memories of pre-World War I history, when the Ottoman government went bankrupt because of its inability to payback loans with very high interest rates that they had borrowed from the British and the French.²⁴⁹

US sale of advanced cluster bombs to Turkey sparked the most severe criticism within the Congress. On 12 December 1995²⁵⁰, congressman Christopher Smith (R-NJ) criticized the State Department's stance on the sale of Army Tactical Missile Systems (ATACMS) to Turkey: “I am particularly disturbed that the State Department's Office on Democracy, Labor and Human Rights has lent its support to this sale when it had opposed the sale of ordinary cluster bombs to Turkey earlier this year” and also criticized the US government: “The sale of such weapons appears to indicate that the United States government is willing to ignore Turkey's ruthless suppression of its Kurdish population because of Turkey's value as a strategic and economic partner”.

Not all discourses of inter-US criticism were critical of US military support to Turkey; some members of the Congress criticized their colleagues for pushing for the cut in military aid to Turkey. During the 1996 foreign operations act debates²⁵¹ Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV) criticized his colleagues for being partial and considering an aid reduction to Turkey based on human rights, while not applying the same standard to other US allies in the region. After pointing to Turkey's value as an ally, Senator Byrd claimed that while the Senate was cutting funding on Medicare,

²⁴⁹ On this, see the section ‘Ottoman Debt’ in: Howard, Douglas Arthur (2001) *The history of Turkey*. (Oxford: Greenwood Publishing) pp. 70-72

²⁵⁰ Oppose the Sale of Advanced Missiles to Turkey. E2340: Vol. 141 No. 197. December 12, 1995.

²⁵¹ Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Act of 1996. S13920: Vol. 141 No. 147. September 20, 1995

Medicaid and health programs: “[...] we talk about cutting entitlements, cutting programs that benefit the American people [...] but not a word said about cutting that \$ 5 billion for Israel and Egypt – why not offer an amendment that will cut that largesse and see how many brave souls are there in this Senate?” also pointing to the fact that such a reduction would send the wrong message to Turkey.

On 10 November 1997²⁵², on the occasion of the arrest of the Kurdish parliamentarian Leyla Zana, by the Turkish police, Congressman John Edward Porter (R-IL) complained over the US administrations' decision to overlook Turkey's human rights record. Indicating that numerous representatives had sent a letter to the President Bill Clinton asking him to pressure Turkish government for Zana's release, he expressed his pessimism over lack the of administrative care on the Kurdish issue. Porter continued: “[...] I do not have high hopes that our Government will take her case seriously. Our administration – like those before it – has maintained a policy of ignoring outrageous Turkish human rights abuses, and papering over the fault lines in Turkish democracy”.

On 1 May 1997²⁵³, Congressman Robert Filner (D-CA) brought the issue of US cluster bomb sales again within the context of Turkish military operations: “Cluster bombs are continuing to be sold to Turkey and continuing to be used in bombing runs against Kurdish villages and areas” together with a statement on general US military supplies to Turkey within the context of elite forces that were involved in reports on human rights violations: “Special Action Teams – as they are called, color their faces green and white. The paint, as well as 80 percent of Turkey's military hardware and equipment is furnished by the United States, much of it at the taxpayer's

²⁵² Free Leyla Zana, Kurdish Parliamentarian jailed in Turkey. E2305: Vol. 143 No. 158. November 10, 1997.

²⁵³ Self-determination for the Kurds. H2152: Vol.143 No.55. May 1, 1997.

expense”. Again, this argument did not make any reference to the PKK violence and portrayed the situation as if the sole target of the military has been the villages and non-combatants, as if PKK terrorism did not exist. This way the general frame within which the Kurdish issue was discussed, was reduced down to simplistic arguments such as “the American taxpayer is killing innocent civilians” without putting the arguments into perspective by referring equally to both sides of the security problem.

The US policy towards the conflict in Kosovo was also linked to the Kurdish question in Turkey. On the occasion of US intervention against the Serbs, Congressman Mike Pappas (R-NJ) criticized Bill Clinton on 21 October 1998²⁵⁴ over what he called “double-standards” over his foreign policy: “I fail to understand why the same policy that's now being implemented against the Bosnian Serbs [...] is not being implemented upon Turkey”. In his view the Kurdish problem had similarities with the Bosnian one: “For 14 years, the Turkish military has been conducting an inhumane campaign of ethnic cleansing and oppression on its own Kurdish people in no different way than the Serbs are” and following this statement, he asked: “[...] are we ready to do the same against Turkey? A double standard foreign policy is not good policy [...]” referring to the administration policy as “double-speak”. This indirect suggestion of American military intervention against Turkey established one extreme of the Congressional political continuum on the Kurdish matter.

The State Department, CIA and FBI collaboration on the capture of Abdullah Öcalan became subject to criticism in the House too. On 25 March 1999²⁵⁵, Congressman Frank Pallone

²⁵⁴ Clinton Administration’s Double standard of foreign policy. E2289: Vol.144 No.151. October 21, 1998.

²⁵⁵ *Needed: Justice and a political solution for the Kurdish people*. H1792: Vol.145 No.48. March 25, 1999.

(D-NJ) first criticized American financial support to Turkey: “Turkey is considered an ally of the United States, a member of NATO, and the recipient over many years of millions in economic and especially military assistance courtesy of the American taxpayer” and then moved onto a criticism of American involvement in Öcalan's capture: “This embarrassing record of American support for the Turkish regime reached a new low last month when our intelligence and diplomatic services actually helped a Turkish commando team to capture Mr. Ocalan in Kenya”. He also called the collaboration between the US and Turkey as “shameful” and claimed that if Öcalan was in the United States: “[...] I cannot imagine that he would have been turned over to Turkey, just as Italy refused to do so when he was in Italy”.

5. Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of the dominant US Congress discourses on the Kurdish question in Turkey. Here, I have identified such argumentative positions as 'human rights', 'democracy-democratization', 'excessive force' and 'identity-autonomy-cultural rights' discourses. Additionally, I have identified discourses that converged with that of the Turkish state, as well as positions adopted by the US executive branch in their dealings with the Congress.

Although a statistical analysis of the US Congress performance on Turkey's Kurdish question will be given in more detail in Chapter 6, some highlights will be necessary to end this chapter. The House of Representatives was more active than the US Senate with the total number of discourses and/or argumentative positions adopted being 316 and 206 respectively. Also in both the House and the Senate, Democrats were more active than the Republicans with discourses

adopted being 383 and 205 respectively. In the US Senate however, the Democratic Senators²⁵⁶ (187) hold an overwhelming dominance over their Republican colleagues (17). In the House, the discourse activity is more evenly balanced with still a Democratic lead (207) over Republican (175).

The human rights discourse in the Congress had two dimensions; one focused on the situation of Kurds in Iraq, and the other focused on Kurdish rights in Turkey. Congress was overwhelmingly critical of Turkish practices in both fronts and not even Turkish contributions to Operation Provide Comfort seemed to disperse a strictly critical stance in both the House and the Senate. In terms of Kurds in Iraq, the Congress was critical of what they perceived as “lack of Turkish willingness” to aid Kurdish refugees fleeing Saddam's army at the end of the Gulf War. After the Gulf War, the Congress was critical on what they thought to be Turkey's restriction of international aid and the access of the Red Cross into northern Iraq, as well as reports on Turkish army misconducts during cross-border operations such as burning and evacuating Iraqi villages. With respect to Kurds in Turkey, the Congress emphasized illegal killings, torture and disappearances under detention. Village burnings and evacuations were also a part of the human rights discourse in the Congress and in some instances certain Congressmen referred to such misconducts as “ethnic cleansing” and “genocide”. Human rights discourses were frequently adopted to back up arguments in favour of cutting or restricting aid to Turkey, as well as the sale of military hardware. The general sense in the Congress was that Turkey had been undertaking human rights abuses in a systematic manner and such approaches were pursued as a state policy. Some Congressmen (such as Bob Filner) even initiated off-the-Congress efforts such as fasting protests in front of the Capitol in order to attract Congress attention to the abuses in Turkey and

²⁵⁶ Most specifically Senator Dennis DeConcini.

Iraq. In many ways, variation in Congress discourses were very little since most Congressmen were critical of Turkey and such critics almost never voiced praise or encouragement on constitutional changes, human rights trainings within the military and other positive towards taken. Such almost non-existent mobility in discourses suggests that Congressional positions on human rights have been pre-given through lobbying efforts and other affiliations; an overwhelming majority of the members of the Congress were either rigidly 'anti-Turkish' or staunchly 'pro-Turkish', with extremely rare cases of cross-argumentation.

In terms of democracy-democratization discourse Congress statements were somewhat more fluid than those made on human rights. For example, while certain Congressmen have been rigidly 'anti-Turkish', some of them (such as De Concini) did actually praise Turkish democracy in rare instances such as after fair elections or amendments made to the notorious article 8 of the anti-terror law. One of the reasons for this leniency was possibly Turkey's role as a uniquely democratic (as much as it was troubled) country in an overwhelmingly authoritarian and fundamentalist neighborhood. Indeed, DeConcini himself had conveyed his hope that "Turkish democracy [...] can serve as a model for its less democratically inclined neighbors [...]". However, by the intensification of the insurgency and democratic restrictions that followed, the Congress discourses turned completely critical. By the mid-1990s, once a success story of American foreign democratization policies, Turkey was being increasingly compared to the repressive Soviet regime in terms of the restrictions on free speech. This critical tone turned for the worse after the arrest of the Kurdish parliamentarians of the Turkish Assembly, which led the Congressmen to question whether democracy exists at all in Turkey, rather than arguing on the quality of it. Still, it is possible to frame such 'negative' discourses as inclusionist because Turkey's democracy was

debated within the context of Turkish obligations to the treaties and conventions that are part of the Western system, as opposed to certain exclusionist discourses in the European Parliament that regarded Turkey outside of Western system of beliefs and conducts. By 1997 however, Turkish democracy was already being likened to 'non-Western' countries such as China and the fact that the executive branch was still cooperating very closely with Turkey elicited Congress arguments stating that it was in fact the executive branch that was encouraging Turkey in its repressive policies.

Excessive force discourse has been one of the most frequent discourses adopted in the Congress. Such discourses focused on perceived Turkish security heavy-handedness and inability to distinguish between terrorists and non-combatants in cross-border operations as well as police measures within Turkey. The biggest criticism of the Turkish military in this respect was its usage of heavy weaponry such as cluster bombs and napalms against PKK bases surrounded by villages, which ended up producing more civilian casualties than destroying intended targets. As the United States and Turkey were major security partners and the US had provided almost 80% of Turkish arms acquisition²⁵⁷, Congress was extremely critical of the President and the executive branch for authorizing the sale of advanced weaponry to Turkey. The second line of criticism of the Turkish army was its perceived inability (and also unwillingness) to distinguish between civilians and PKK operatives in their operations. Most Congressmen believed Turkish army was creating conflicts that could have been avoided by what they believed to be unnecessary emptying and burning of the villages and expelling its inhabitants, who then became potential recruits for the PKK. The 'ethnic cleansing' and 'genocide' arguments were also frequently tied to this discourse

²⁵⁷ For a yearly breakdown of US military sales to Turkey, see the Federation of American Scientists page on Turkish arms acquisitions (accessed May 4, 2009): <<http://www.fas.org/asmp/profiles/turkey.htm>>

and many similarities between the events of 1915 against the Armenians and the invasion of Cyprus were drawn.

Identity-autonomy-cultural rights discourse focused on the longer term problems of the Kurdish issue. The sense of the Congress was Turkey had problem with the Kurds “because they are Kurds” and Turkey was oppressing them in order to make them denounce their ethnic roots. This line of argument was adopted in the Congress even before the Gulf War and constituted a widely held belief among Congressmen. Identity aspect of the conflict became more problematic as the no-fly zone established on the predominantly Kurdish areas in northern Iraq created an environment suitable for the development of an autonomous Kurdish entity, whereas establishment of such a region brought security challenges to Turkey both in terms of the growing power of the PKK and the rights of Kurds in Turkey. Indeed, Turkey feared that since Iraqi Kurds had an autonomous area under their command, Turkish Kurds might want the same thing. On the other hand, some Congressmen did in fact express their beliefs that the solution to the Kurdish problem would come through allowing the same type of autonomy to Turkish Kurds, while some other believed the problem would be solved if Turkey “gave cultural-linguistic rights to the Kurds”. Rarely, Congressmen expressed their beliefs that the crux of the matter did not lie in Kurdish identity, but Turkish identity, which imposed a monolithic and overarching definition of citizenship, accepting every ethnic group in Turkey as 'Turks'. Turkey was rarely referred as a 'racist state' too, although this was not a sense accepted by the majority of the Congress. It is also worth repeating the finding that in most Congress discourses Kurds were identified as the only minority group living in Turkey, whereas many other minority groups were ignored and were referred as ‘Turks’. Referring to non-Kurdish elements within Turkey monolithically as ‘Turks’,

yet criticizing Turkish citizenship definition for calling Kurds as Turks elicited a double-speak within Congressional discourse, where members of the Congress did exactly the same thing as the founders of modern Turkey did: referring to the citizens of Turkey as ‘Turks’ without referring to their ethnic background.

Within the executive branch, the State Department had balanced criticisms with moderate discourses on Turkey. Although State Department statements (and reports, that are not within the scope of this dissertation) highlighted the universal nature of torture and security force misconducts as well as conveying the dire security situation and the extent of PKK destruction to the Congressional inquiry. The biggest point of tension between the Congress and the State Department was the topic of high-tech arms sales, as well as area impact weapons such as cluster bombs and napalms. According to the State Department, although Turkey had violated human rights, such abuses did not constitute a violation of the Section 4 of the Arms Export Control Act as the sale of such items were considered within the context of an ally's internal security. Also the State Department did not believe that Turkish human rights abuses constituted “a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights within the meaning of Section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act”. Both the State Department and the US military officials were optimistic about the Turkish constitutional amendments and Turkish General Staff support for the human rights, however the military wing did not emphasize such violations like the State Department did. The State Department was however, much better informed on the situation and discussed the matter in more detail; predictably, because of regular reports from the US embassy in Ankara.

The US Congress was also highly critical of the State Department and the President for their support on the weapons sales to Turkey. In many instances the Congressmen sought to limit financial or military loans to Turkey and discursively concealed the conditional nature and payback requirements of such loans, perhaps in an attempt to amplify arguments such as “we are financing Turkey's human rights abuses”. The sale of Army Tactical Missile Systems (ATACMS) and combat helicopters were of particular tension. Just as some Congressmen were critical of US – Turkish cooperation despite Turkish military misconducts, some other Congressmen were critical of their colleagues for trying to spoil US – Turkish relations. According to 'pro-Turkish' Congressmen, their 'anti-Turkish' colleagues failed to see the importance of this bilateral security partnership and its wider implications on the Middle East. 'Anti-Turkish' Congressmen on the other hand, argued that the Cold War was over and that Turkey did not hold a strategic importance that it used to hold when the Soviet Union was still a real threat. As the American intervention to Kosovo loomed, some Congressmen criticized Bill Clinton's policy of “double-standards” for not punishing Turkey in a like manner because of its human rights abuses.

5.1 How did discourse affect policy in the Congress with regard to the Kurdish question?

The Congress had some tangible and important policy influences over U.S.-Turkish relations through the 1990s and the biggest source of that influence came through the Kurdish question. Congress members were almost unanimous in its criticism of Turkey's practices towards the Kurdish question and this momentum of criticism manifested itself as policy in several ways.

First, the Congress was able to restrict and block the U.S.-made military sales to Turkey. As the U.S. was the main supplier of Turkey's armed forces, which used American-made

armament in the south-east through the 1990s, the Congress mounted a campaign against arms sales to Turkey, using its constitutional authority to pass and refuse arms sales to the third countries. The most important cases of this influence was the Congressional refusal to grant permission for the sale of advanced missiles to Turkey during the 1996 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act and its pressures on the State Department in 1997, which pushed the State Department to grant marketing licenses to the U.S. weapons manufacturers to enter into talks with Turkey about AH-64 Apache and AH-1W Super Cobra helicopter acquisition tenders, with the condition that Turkey makes visible progress in legal and political reform.

Second, the Congress was able to restrict the amount of military and non-military financial aid to Turkey. Through much of the 1990s, Congressional restriction on the amount of aid and loans to Turkey rested upon three conditions; Turkey's withdrawal from northern Iraq, recognition of the Armenian genocide and withdrawal from northern Cyprus. These issues were frequently linked in the Congress through the Hellenic and Armenian Caucuses, establishing policy cartels and eventually succeeding in restricting financial aid and loans to Turkey in 1995, 1996, 1997 and 1998. The extent of the restriction was so frustrating for Turkey that in 1996 then Turkish foreign minister Tansu Ciller had claimed that the Congress was applying a 'shadow embargo' on Turkey.

Finally, the Congress was able to influence Turkish-American relations by threatening to pass the 'Armenian genocide resolution', which meant the official recognition of the 1915 massacres 'officially as a genocide' by the United States. Perhaps one of the top three policy items that have huge impact on bilateral relations, the executive branch and the Presidency had to scramble in the Congress to break the influence of the Hellenic and Armenian caucuses and

prevent the resolution to be passed in the House of Representatives. For Turkey, this issue was so critical, that in order to increase its influence in Washington, Turkey followed a policy of engagement with the American-Israeli lobbying firms and in return, chose to follow close relations with Israel in the 1990s, leading to the signing of military cooperation and intelligence sharing agreements between Turkish and Israeli Armed Forces. It is safe to argue therefore, that the main reason for Turkey's pursuit of close relations with Israel through the 1990s, was to gain the support of the Jewish political action groups in Washington to counter the Hellenic and Armenian influence in the Congress and to prevent the 'Armenian genocide resolution' to pass from the House of Representatives. Turkey's handling of the Kurds and its northern Iraq incursions were also used by the Hellenic and Armenian Caucuses to portray these acts as a 'second attempted genocide' by Turkey, using Turkey's Kurdish question a supporting argument to genocide allegations.

CHAPTER 5

Turkish Grand National Assembly discourse on the Kurdish question

“The Europeans say: The largest minority in Turkey are the Kurds. I am a Kurd, coming from a Kurdish lineage. In this capacity, I can assure you that the Kurds don't want anything. We Kurds, have smashed those rights and laws given by the Europeans within the Sevres rubbish and returned to those who want to give them to us... the same way [Turks and Kurds] had fought together at the Al-Jazeera hill, the same way we shed blood with the Turks; we don't want to be separated from Turkey” – Yusuf Ziya Bey. Statement made at the TGNA. December 25, 1922

“[In the parliament's main hall] we used to sit adjacent to our MP friends in the Nationalist Action Party (MHP). During many open sessions, we often had harsh arguments with them and even [verbally] fought; but in the lobby, we would sit and chat with the MHP deputies. In the lobby, many MHP deputies too, had conceded that [revoking the immunity of the Kurdish deputies] was not the right thing to do. However, the same MHP deputies with whom we had agreed in the lobby, became totally different people while speaking in the floor and in the open session voting [...] With little exception, they all voted in favour of revoking our parliamentary immunity” – Orhan Dogan. Sirnak deputy of the Kurdish HEP (later became DEP). Was arrested with other Kurdish MPs in December 1994. This quote is from his interview with Soner Yalcin regarding the TGNA voting, which revoked Kurdish MPs' immunity.

1. Introduction:

Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) was established on April 23, 1920, in Ankara, during the Turkish War of Independence against the Allied powers of the World War I. It is a unicameral parliament and is the sole legislative body designated by the Constitution. Currently, the TGNA holds 550 seats allocated by a party-list proportional representation system from 85 electoral districts representing 81 cities in Turkey (Istanbul is divided into three districts and Ankara and Izmir are divided into two each).²⁵⁸

The significance of the TGNA statements on the Kurdish issue, for the purposes of this dissertation, (other than the apparent fact that it is the legislature of the country that suffers from the intra-state violence examined in this work) is two-fold. First, since the representatives are directly elected, it serves as a forum where multi-partisan arguments and discourses throughout

²⁵⁸ For more on TGNA and Turkish party system, see: Rubin, Barry and Metin Heper (2002) *Political Parties in Turkey*. (London: Routledge)

Turkey can be expressed and debated. This has been particularly evident in Assembly debates and statements where Kurdish parliamentarians from the south-eastern cities provided much clearer information (and adopted a much different understanding of the problem) than their colleagues from Western cities. Second, TGNA representatives rely less on written statements in their debates, which hold greater discursive value for the purposes of the type of discourse analysis, as adopted in this dissertation. Additionally, - although not officially allowed - interventions made from the parliamentarians from their seats to the speaker on the podium, became an almost traditional aspect of the Assembly debates; during such instances, parliamentarians not only speak without a pre-tailored written text, they also speak in a reactionary way – often fed by emotions – which makes it clearer to elicit their underlying beliefs and thoughts generally concealed otherwise.

The political situation in Turkey through the scope of this dissertation (1991-1999) was exceedingly fragmented with short-lived successive coalition governments. In the 1991 general elections parties that made into the Assembly were - in descending vote percentage - True Path Party (DYP – conservative, center-right), Motherland Party (ANAP – center-right, neoliberal), Social-democratic People's Party (SHP – left, social-democratic), Welfare Party (RP – far right conservative, Islamist) and Democratic Left Party (DSP – left, social democratic). The coalition government was formed between True Path Party (headed by Süleyman Demirel) and the Social-democratic People's Party (headed by Erdal İnönü) and the government was called the 'seventh Demirel government'.

After the death of president Turgut Özal in 1993, Süleyman Demirel was elected as

president by the Parliament and general elections were held again. The new coalition government was headed by the new leader of the True Path Party, Tansu Çiller and the Social-democratic People's Party, headed by Erdal İnönü, who resigned his office to Murat Karayalçın in September 1993. After the Social-democratic People's Party joined Republican People's Party (CHP), the coalition partner became CHP, which was headed by Deniz Baykal. In a series of political disagreements and instability, successive governments were headed first by Mesut Yılmaz (Motherland Party, March 1996 – June 1996), Necmettin Erbakan (Welfare Party, June 1996 – June 1997), Mesut Yılmaz again (June 1996 – January 1999) and two governments headed by Bülent Ecevit (Democratic-Left Party, January 1999 – 2002).

47. Government: November 1989 – June 1991: Motherland Party (ANAP)
48. Government: June 1991 – November 1991: ANAP
49. Government: November 1991 – June 1993: True Path Party (DYP) – Social-democrat People's Party (SHP):
50. Government: June 1993 – October 1995: DYP-SHP
51. Government: October 1995 – October 1995 (25-day government): DYP
52. Government: October 1995 – March 1996: DYP – Republican People's Party (CHP)
53. Government: March 1996 – June 1996: ANAP – DYP
54. Government: June 1996 – June 1997: Welfare Party (RP) – DYP (ousted by military decree)
55. Government: June 1997 – January 1999: ANAP – Democratic Left Party (DSP)
56. Government: January 1999 – May 1999: DSP
57. Government: May 1999 – November 2002: DSP – Nationalist Action Party (MHP)

Such a fragmented and unstable political situation undoubtedly fed and was fed by the security and democratization challenges posed by the Kurdish question. In almost every sitting the opposition told the government to step down, suggesting that they are unfit to govern because of their inability to provide security against the PKK. Constant critical exchanges between the parliamentarians of the government and the opposition prevented any genuine solution to come out of the Assembly sittings, rendering legislative sessions a forum for rampant populism, rather

than one in which the competing senses of the electorate could be settled.²⁵⁹ The Assembly could unite neither against the PKK threat nor towards ameliorating the living conditions of the Kurds, necessitating the military top brass to make urgent decisions on behalf of the civilian authority. Many in Turkey recall the 1990s as the 'lost years' due to recurring fragmented coalition governments and today, there are many arguments strongly in favor of the current single-party government of the Justice and Development Party (AKP), simply because of the political stability of having a single-party government.

Turkish Grand National Assembly discourses on the Kurdish question have been diverse, ranging from arguments that deny the very existence of such a 'problem' or even of 'such a thing as Kurd', to arguments that favored *de jure* autonomy to the Kurdish region. However, with very little exception, the 'Kurdish problem' was referred almost synonymously as 'terror problem' in the TGNA; this by itself gives a general impression concerning the sense of the Assembly. Referring to the problem as the 'Kurdish problem' or 'Kurdish issue' by itself was regarded as an unwanted argumentative position in official state discourse in Turkey. In other words in official Turkish position "there is no Kurdish problem, there is only the problem of terrorism"²⁶⁰ and even regional development and democratization was discursively constructed within the context of 'combating terrorism'. Of course, from an academic perspective, there is no way to properly address the issue other than referring to it as the 'Kurdish problem' or at least the 'Kurdish question', since addressing it only as a 'terror problem' doesn't grasp the wider context within which that security concern exists. Indeed, although the issue was called as the 'terror problem' in the Turkish Grand

²⁵⁹ The TGNA floor became a greater 'policy advertising' tool when TBMM-TV (the state-owned TV station which broadcast legislative sessions live) was founded in December 10, 1994.

²⁶⁰ For a discussion of this policy see: Berkan, İsmet. 'Kürt Sorunu ve Terör Sorunu' [Kurdish Problem and Terror Problem], *Radikal newspaper*. November 6, 2007.

National Assembly, parliamentarians themselves have discussed this problem within numerous different contexts, each one representing a different aspect of the conundrum, which we will discuss in this chapter.

This chapter will provide an overview of such different contexts, making up argumentative positions and discourses that are dependent variables of the central thesis of this dissertation. The chapter breakdown is similar to that in chapters 3 and 4, with some additional sections. In the first part of this chapter, I will lay down types of discourses adopted in the TGNA on the Kurdish question, namely the human rights, democracy, excessive force, security, economic-developmental, legalistic and ethnicity-identity-culturalist discourses. The second part of the chapter will deal with types of discourses that the parliamentarians had adopted in their criticisms of each other, the government, the state or the security forces. In the third and final part of the chapter I will lay provide an overview of the types of discourses adopted in criticisms of foreign countries and groups. ‘Economic-developmental’ and ‘legalistic’ discourses are unique discourse types to the TGNA and do not exist in an observable pattern both in the European Parliament and the US Congress.

Executive branch (state) discourses will not be provided as a separate section in this chapter, because of two reasons; first, such discourses can be inferred through the statements of the Minister of Interior, Minister of Foreign Affairs and other state ministers, and second, an excellent academic study on the Turkish state discourse on the Kurdish question has recently been published by Mesut Yeğen²⁶¹. Therefore, this chapter will not attempt to re-create Yeğen’s work, rather it will look at how the ‘state discourse’ had penetrated legislative sessions through

²⁶¹ Yeğen, Mesut (2009) *Devlet Söyleminde Kürt Sorunu [Kurdish problem in State discourse]* (Istanbul: İletişim)

ministers' discourses and how legislative discourse in return, had responded to the state discourse.

2. Types of discourses adopted by the parliamentarians in the Turkish Grand National Assembly

2.1 Human rights discourse

Turkish state culture has not traditionally been synonymous with the respect for human rights or the primacy of the individual; the State in Turkish understanding has its priorities in the perpetuity of its own self, rendering it closer to the Machiavelli-Hobbes nexus within *raison d'état* discussions.²⁶² The Ottoman Empire had entertained more or less uninterrupted rule of Sultan-emperors (*Padişah*) who had based their authority on obedience without question, making the entire state establishment (including the *Sadrâzam*, highest military-bureaucratic position) as well as all subjects his servants.²⁶³ The authority of the Sultan-emperors were not challenged by the local notables until early 19th century; the provincial notables within the empire were generally obedient, mainly because the central administration had communicated effectively with the appointed regional administrators, rotating them through the empire regularly in order to prevent

²⁶² Theoretical foundations of the Turkish state culture is discussed in Chapter 2. Ottoman Empire was also regarded as one of the most tolerant imperial systems towards different religions, as religious minorities were not only tolerated, but were also represented within the Ottoman *millet* system. Yet, this tolerance was still exercised in a way that it does not jeopardize the perpetuity of the state. One might argue that Ottoman tolerance was not 'humanistic' in the sense that it sought the well-being and religious expression of individual subjects, was 'pragmatic'. Through allowing religious expression Ottomans had safely taken away the primary reason for rebellion (religious oppression) that was decimating European kingdoms through the medieval times. Allowing religious expression also enabled European Christians and Jews to take shelter in Ottoman territories, escaping religious persecution in their home lands. Jewish exodus to the Ottoman Empire, running away from the Spanish inquisition, might be evaluated within this context. For more on this, see: Cleveland, Willian (2000) *A history of the modern Middle East* (New York: Westview Press) pp. 50-52 and Keyman, Fuat and Ahmet İçduygu (2005) *Citizenship in a global world: European questions and Turkish experience* (London: Routledge) pp. 60-63

²⁶³ On this, see: Lybyer, Albert H. (1913) *The government of the Ottoman Empire in the time of Suleiman the Magnificent*. (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press) pp. 60-62 and Faroqhi, Suraiya. 'Crisis and Change: 1590-1699' in Halil İnalcık (ed.) (1997) *An economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp. 616-620.

them from establishing close connections with the local notables and gaining too much power in their provinces.

After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the Republic of Turkey was established based on ‘six principles’,²⁶⁴ one of them being statism (French: *etatism*), adopted from the German and French nationalist principles of the 18 - 19th centuries. Within this definition, the duty of the state within the context of human rights has been identified as “The individual has the right to protect and improve its life, material and moral being”²⁶⁵ and domestic policies have been based on this principle through the republican history. In fact, Turkey is a signatory to various international agreements that guaranteed human rights such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1949), the European Convention of Human Rights (1954 - which brought Turkey into the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights) and also, the European Convention on the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1988) as well as the European Union membership accession criteria (later known as the Copenhagen criteria). In discursive terms at least, Turkish state branches (including the military) have repeatedly declared their support for the human rights and international treaties. Successive governments too, had declared their determination to promote and protect human rights, even the rights of the individuals across the border. For example during the opening ceremony of the TGNA after the

²⁶⁴ Founding ideology of the Republic of Turkey – also known as Kemalism or Kemalist ideology – rests upon six pillars, represented by ‘six arrows’ on the Republican People’s Party flag. These six principles are republicanism (*cumhuriyetçilik*: representative democracy), populism (*halkçılık*: citizenship), secularism (*laiklik*), revolutionism (*devrimcilik*: need to replace Ottoman institutions), nationalism (*ulusçuluk*: nation-state, with homogenous citizenship) and statism (*devletçilik*: state regulation of economic activities). These principles take their roots from European positivism, rationalism and Enlightenment that have been penetrating Ottoman political system since mid-19th century through the ‘Young Turk’ movement originated through the writings of young Turkish intellectuals studying abroad in Paris, Berlin and London. For more on this, see: Hanioglu, Şükrü (1995) *Young Turks in Opposition*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press), Ramsaur, Ernest E. (1970) *The Young Turks: Prelude to the revolution of 1908* (Victoria: Abe Books) and Kili, Suna (1969) *Kemalism* (Istanbul: Robert College)

²⁶⁵ Turkish Constitution, article 17. The full text of the Turkish Constitution in English, see the Office of the Prime Minister, Directorate-General of Press and Information (accessed May 6, 2009): <<http://www.byegm.gov.tr/mevzuat/anayasa/anayasa-ing.htm>>

1994 elections, the leader of the True Path Party (and then prime minister) Süleyman Demirel pointed to the suffering of ethnic groups in Iraq: “Turkey could never overlook the atrocities suffered by the Kurds, Turcomans and Arabs after the Gulf War. Today, we are working to ensure the well-being of these brothers”²⁶⁶ hinting at Turkey's cooperation with the international aid agencies in order to provide security for non-Turkish citizens across the border.

As for the allegations of such human rights abuses within Turkey, the official Turkish defense has been pointing to the legal and constitutional safeguards prohibiting torture such as the article 17 of the Turkish constitution which reads “Nobody can be subject to torture and torment”, as well as to divert attention to the practice of torture in 'other countries'. In many ways, the predominant state discourse on human rights have traditionally been first, that *'torture in Turkey is legally prohibited with constitutional safeguards'* and second, that *'every country is guilty of human rights abuses, you cannot single Turkey out'*. In many ways a typical example of this type of discursive defense has been Süleyman Demirel's legalistic statement in the same sitting: “Every country is charged under allegations of human rights violations. Safe-guards in Turkey, against human rights abuses are not weaker than those existing in other countries [...] Nobody has the right to consider Turkey among partly-free countries by claiming that human rights violations exist in a country with a free regime, free press, free parliament [...], free judiciary”²⁶⁷. Here, a definitive discursive pattern is revealed: Just as the US military branch statements on Turkey's approach to human rights (that were always supportive) did not refer to the existence or non-existence of human rights violations, the official Turkish statements too, did not refer to why or how such violations happen as well as who was responsible for it. This ambiguity and avoidance

²⁶⁶ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 1: September 1, 1994

²⁶⁷ Ibid

in Turkish official statements lead to the popularization in the EU Parliament and the US Congress, of the belief that the state itself was responsible for these violations.

Although there was an abundance of official statements promoting human rights, human rights activists were not held so high in the TGNA. Especially, the Turkish Human Rights Foundation as an institution that had reported many Turkish security force violations in the Kurdish areas, was not regarded very favorably by some parliamentarians. On 28 September 1994²⁶⁸, parliamentarian Coşkun Gökalg (Republican People's Party - Kırşehir) referred to the Human Rights Foundation in his statement regarding an individual who was denied position as a civil servant: “[...] we infer from the background search that his father serves in the executive board of the Human Rights Foundation, which is the legal representative of the destructive and separatist groups of terror and has the capability to act against the state if he gets a chance”. Human Rights Foundation was not the only organization with which Turkey had problems with. Any organization that reported and publicized Turkish security force violations of human rights were regarded as ‘helping the propaganda activities of the terrorists’ by the way of ‘inciting unrest among the civilians against Turkish security forces’.

The crux of the conflict between Turkish officials and human rights activists, monitors and reporters can be inferred from a three-fold discursive pattern in the TGNA debates. First, parliamentarians had the belief that human rights monitors were concerned only with the rights of Kurds, while ignoring the suffering of Turkish citizens in the hands of the PKK. Frequently, parliamentarians expressed their frustration over human rights monitors not reporting or internationalizing PKK's village raids, burnings and killings. Second, it was also widely believed

²⁶⁸ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 12: September 28, 1994

that some of such organizations had direct contact with the PKK, while some other organizations were believed to be holding regular meetings with Abdullah Öcalan and the PKK leadership. Third, the parliamentarians were angry over portrayal of human rights violations as 'violation of Kurdish rights', which meant the recognition of Kurdish citizens as a separate entity within Turkey, while Turkey defined every Turkish citizen regardless of their ethnic background as 'Turks', with equal rights. Such an ethnicist approach by the human rights foundations were seen as a threat to Turkish territorial integrity as well as its traditional definition of nationhood.

However, there were a small number of parliamentarians in the Assembly who challenged the official defense against human rights allegations. For example Ali Arabacı (Democratic Left Party - Bursa) criticized this 'official' defensive discourse against torture allegations in his statement²⁶⁹, where he claimed that the fact that torture is regarded as illegal, was in fact being used by some officials to cover up torture incidents: “The administrators have a tendency to argue that torture is against the law, in periods when torture allegations increase. Every argument against the system can be refuted by hiding behind the counter-argument that torture is legally prohibited”. Arabacı further argued that such an attitude “prevents a complete [legal] settlement” and even worse, was leading to a political and legal situation where “ignoring and protecting torture has become a [state] policy”. Moreover, Arabacı directly accused security forces: “The regular policy is to torture every single convict; the aim is not just extracting information, but also pacification and correction. Apart from police and the gendarmerie, prisons also rely on torture”. Arabacı's statements are a part of the wider debate on how to address torture allegations coming from the international community; more notably the European Union (because of the EU candidacy process) and the United States (because of the economic and military loans). The fact

²⁶⁹ Term 21, Year 1, Sitting 58: August 26, 1999

that such heavily critical discourses originating from within the TGNA throughout the 1990s could be presented as a counter-argument against the beliefs of some MEPs in the European Parliament and US Congressmen that had portrayed the arrest of Leyla Zana and five other parliamentarians as the absence of credible opposition in Turkey. Such self-critical discourses within the TGNA were also multi-partisan. In the same debate Sebgetullah Seydaoğlu (Motherland Party - Diyarbakır) pointed to the universal application of torture in Turkey: “Especially in the last 20 years, in the east and the southeast, thousands of people were subject to torture, were crippled or disappeared under the pretext of protecting the country or maintaining order by the security forces”. These two excuses – ‘protecting the country’ and ‘maintaining order’ outlined by Seydaoğlu, had been the most frequent counter-arguments adopted against torture allegations in order to justify human rights abuses. Apart from ‘maintaining order’ or ‘protecting the country’, ‘difficult terrain conditions’, ‘proximity of villages to PKK camps’ or ‘possibility’ of the villagers aiding the PKK have been other arguments justifying human rights abuses. Although undoubtedly such conditions had existed through the fight against the PKK, over time, Turkish, European and American representatives have criticized the frequency and vagueness of such arguments to back up a large number of village burning, torture and extra-judicial killing incidents.

The MPs were initially shocked about constant reports on torture coming from the southeast in the early 1990s. Although many parliamentarians had initially dismissed these allegations arguing that they were certainly the doing of the PKK, by the mid-1990s the Assembly discourse slowly shifted towards which branch of the security forces committed these human rights violations and how best to prevent such abuses from happening again. By 1997, some Turkish parliamentarians were already advocating the establishment of an alternative official

institution directed specifically towards the monitoring of such incidents. One of them was Ömer Vehbi Hatipoğlu (Welfare Party – Diyarbakır) who argued: “A Higher Council for Human Rights and a Secretariat for Human Rights must be established in order to enable the protection and improvement of human rights as well as monitoring abuses”²⁷⁰. Although a Human Rights Investigation Commission was established within the TGNA on December 5, 1990 and this body had published numerous important reports, the extent of its access as well as its enforcement power over the security forces was deemed insufficient. Also, the publications of the Commission’s reports were sometimes delayed due to pressures from the military top brass. Such a call for the establishment of two different institutions to monitor human rights reveals the lack of trust within the TGNA towards ‘official data’ provided by the state branches as well as lack of domestic enforcement against abuses.

On the one extreme of the human rights discourses in the TGNA, some parliamentarians trivialized any accusation of the security forces, adopting a position of total confidence on the lawful and measured conduct during the operations. Within this discourse sub-group, accusations of misconduct were not even mentioned and completely rosy scenes of military operations have been drawn. While both the US Congress and European Parliament were highly critical of Turkey’s counterterrorism operations, Aykon Doğan (True Path Party - Isparta) adopted a more upbeat tone: “Differentiation between the terrorist and non-combatant is a principle that all countries should abide by during counterterrorism operations. The sensitivity of our armed forces on this matter and their warm approach to the non-combatants during domestic and cross-border operations [...] is commendable above anything else”²⁷¹. It is indeed interesting to see such a

²⁷⁰ Term 20, Year 3, Sitting 2: October 2, 1997

²⁷¹ Term: 20, Year: 2, Sitting: 7. October 15, 1996.

positive statement amidst frequent and harsh criticisms coming from both within and outside Turkey. Whether the reason for such optimism was a result of the parliamentarian belonging to the governing party, or if there are other structural influences behind this will be tested in the analysis chapter.

The survey of TGNA discourse on the human rights reveals the existence of many direct and self-critical arguments against the state branches by the parliamentarians. In that respect, the European Parliament and US Congress arguments on the lack of credible opposition in Turkey seems problematic. On the other hand, one can infer from TGNA statements that a serious lack of communication between some of the military – police branches and the parliament existed through the height of the insurgency. As I will demonstrate later in the chapter, there has also been a visible pattern of mis- (or lack of) communication even within the police and military branches. By following the argumentative patterns within the TGNA, one can argue that the main problem with human rights in Turkey has been lack of accountability by the military forces deployed in the south-east and their disregard for the civilian authority, where the lack of political authority that could match the intensity of the insurgency had lead to power vacuums that were amplified by the political instability stemming from frequent government dissolutions and successive weak coalition governments. Such absence of a centralized civilian direction could be presented as the primary reason for security force excesses in the southeast, since the members of the military or the police had to deal with a violent militant group, without clear orders from their superiors who were themselves under intense pressure because of the absence of clear directives coming from the civilian authority.

2.2. Democracy discourse

The Republic of Turkey was established as a democratic country and this principle was stated explicitly in the constitution. Democratic principles have been adopted in close connection with the secularist and statist principles and through the republican history, democratic values have been held high specifically against the spread of radical Islamism. In many ways, until the intensification and internationalization of the Kurdish question, democracy in Turkey was discussed and defined within the parameters of resistance against Islamic extremism and Communism. For the biggest part of the Cold War, as long as Turkey held elections, had a free market economy, kept Islam out of the state affairs and marginalized Communism, the democracy was deemed 'working'.

While Turkey's biggest military value to the NATO was its strategic position covering NATO's southern flank, its major political value was its standing as the only functioning Muslim democracy that could potentially exert influence over other Muslim countries in the region that were under the threat of Communist expansion or influence. However the end of the Cold War exposed Turkey's ideological backwardness from other NATO members with regard to the prevalence of an obsolete understanding democracy. For the United States and Western Europe, the Soviet collapse marked the triumph of the 'Western' values of democracy, civilian institutionalization, free-market, human rights and civil society, whereas human rights, civilian institutionalization and civil society were not integral components of Turkish definition of democracy. In many ways, the Turkish state saw no ill in adopting methods that were deemed 'undemocratic' by the EU or the United States, in order to protect the type of democracy as stipulated in Turkish Constitution in 1923. On this, Philip Robins commented: "Indeed, in many

respects, whether in terms of an authoritarian ideology, a deified political leader, the enduring role of the military and the primacy of the state, Turkey appeared more to resemble the former Eastern European states than their post-Communist successors”.²⁷²

TGNA, like two other legislatures analyzed in this dissertation, was caught off guard by the inevitable results of the major systemic change caused by the collapse of the Soviet Union; this shock was coupled with a looming Gulf War and economic-security challenges posed by 3 million Kurdish refugees piled on the Turkish-Iraqi border. Above anything else, TGNA was concerned with a sudden increase in foreign pressure and criticism (coming from countries that belonged to the alliance to which Turkey had served as a ‘frontier outpost’) related to the Kurdish question and how best to address the grievances of the south-eastern provinces struck by massive influx of refugees coming from northern Iraq as well as the PKK violence, which not only targeted security forces, but all elements of the Turkish state, including schools, hospitals and energy-supply constructions (such as power plants or dams). As the conflict between the PKK and the Turkish security forces intensified, village evacuations and burnings increased, rendering millions of people homeless within Turkey.

One variation of the democracy discourse within the TGNA focused on the effects of insurgency and counter-insurgency measures (such as forced migration) on demographic changes and local participation in elections, which is part of a larger debate on Kurdish representation and electoral rights. On 28 September 1994²⁷³, Şevket Kazan (Welfare Party - Kocaeli) pointed to the demographic changes in two south-eastern cities struck by forced migration and stated: “While the

²⁷² Robins, Philip (2003) *Suits and Uniforms: Turkish foreign policy since the Cold War*. (London: Hurst) p. 17

²⁷³ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 12. September 28, 1994.

population of Bismil was normally 40 thousand, today it is almost 100 thousand. While Lice's population was 11 thousand, today it is merely 800 [...] Will people who came to Diyarbakır from surrounding towns be able to participate in the elections?" pointing to the electoral challenges facing people that were subject to forced migration policies. He also criticized the government on this issue: "[...] these people are the constituents of Siirt or Şırnak [...] you are taking away three-fourths of their electoral rights" arguing that the local populace was forced to migrate without any plans of relocation.

Another element within the democracy discourse was the issue of allowing free expression of thought on the situation in the southeast. Just as the portrayal of human rights as 'Kurdish rights' was regarded as separatism, expressing or supporting views on granting a special status (like autonomy) to the predominantly Kurdish areas were discursively constructed outside 'democratization' by the Turkish official discourse. According to this view, there were limits to democracy and arguing in favor of granting special status to the region was 'not democracy, but separatism'. In October 1994, a parliamentary commission set up by the members of the TGNA undertook a fact finding mission, analyzing the 'situation in southeast Turkey' in consultation with local administrators, military officials and local notables. The conclusions of the report can be seen as 'progressive' since they conceded that a 'problem in the south-east' exists, and that this problem cannot be solved by a military-only approach. On 18 October 1994²⁷⁴, Mustafa Kul (Social-democratic People's Party - Erzincan) commented on the report of this parliamentary commission in an appraisal manner: "It is very encouraging [...] to see conclusions taking place in the report of the parliamentary commission, most of which used to have its proponents – although they want territorial integrity of this country more than others – labeled as 'separatists' or

²⁷⁴ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 20: October 18, 1994

'terrorists'". This report can be seen as a progressive move towards addressing the Kurdish question, or more formally 'the situation in the south-east', since it pursued issues of personal security, mystery killings, practice of the temporary village guard system²⁷⁵ within the context of the application of law and human rights violations.

Within the 'Kurdish rights' sub discourse, two dominant positions are observable; one that constructs Kurdish rights within the context of separatism and the other, within the context of democracy. The rationale behind the first construction is the belief that identification of Kurds as a separate entity within Turkey constituted a violation of the traditional definition of a nation and country within Turkish official discourse, which regarded all citizens of Turkey equally as 'Turks'. Democracy, according to this first construction, meant that Turkish state was obliged to grant the same rights for all Turkish citizens, holding them equal under the constitution and law, regardless of (and without an emphasis on) their ethnic origin. The second position on the other hand, constructed democracy within the context of free expression of opinion with regard to acknowledging and granting special rights to ethnic groups within Turkey. It might be argued that the difference in the discursive construction of democracy within this context stems from the difference between the very existence of two different 'democracies', one belonging to early 20th century that holds equality and secularism as the most important pillars and the other belonging to a more evolved understanding of democracy of the post-Cold War era that emphasized minority rights, freedom of expression, primacy of the individual and civil society.

²⁷⁵ Village guard system (*köy koruculuğu*) has been established under governmental decree in order to protect people in the remote villages from the PKK. Similar to the town militia system, the state armed volunteers of a village, paying them regularly and assigning them as irregular and local fighting forces in the remote rural areas. The village guard system attracted criticism, as there were some side effects such as some village guards turning into local warlords, participating in drug trafficking, extortion, or in some other cases, collaboration with the PKK. For more on this, see: Barkey, Henri J. and Graham E. Fuller (1998) *Turkey's Kurdish question*. (New York: Rowman and Litterfeld) pp. 28-45

Another debate within the democracy discourse regarding the Kurdish question focused on constitutional and penal code amendments. The Turkish Constitution still in effect is the 1982 constitution that was tailored by the military administration of the 1980 coup. This constitution is regarded by many as an 'emergency' constitution; undemocratic in nature and seeking to improve controllability and discipline of the state structure rather than individual rights and liberties. Indeed, the European Union accession process has dealt mainly with constitutional amendments, aiming to abolish parts of the Constitution that restricted personal freedoms. Turkish Penal Code on the other hand was adopted in March 1926 based on the Italian *Zanardelli* Code of 1889 and has evolved until today with many amendments.²⁷⁶ In April 1991, an 'anti-terror law' (*Terörle Mücadele Kanunu*) was adopted under the penal code which defined terrorism and what a terrorist is and providing a legal framework around which the state could combat it. The most controversial article 8 of the anti-terror law entitled 'Engaging in Propaganda Activities Against the Territorial Integrity of the State' stipulated:

*"It is forbidden to engage in written and oral propaganda as well as holding meetings, demonstrations and marches that target the territorial integrity of the state of the Republic of Turkey together with its nation [...] In the case of the crime being committed via printed or similar media, the responsible individuals as well as the owners of these media will be charged with imprisonment between 6 months and 2 years and heavy monetary fine between 100 million liras to 300 million liras"*²⁷⁷

The ambiguous terms of this article and the law in general raised a lot of questions by foreign as well as Turkish observers regarding the practice of democracy in Turkey. The debate concerning the amendment to the article 8 of the anti-terror law witnessed competing discourses on the

²⁷⁶ For an extensive analysis of the Turkish Constitution and Penal Code, together with the amendments, see: Alexander, Yonah, Edgar Brenner and Serhat Tütüncüoğlu (2008) *Turkey: Terrorism, Civil Rights and the European Union*. (London: Routledge)

²⁷⁷ Turkish Ministry of Justice developed software, which shows the old Penal Code and the new one, together with their amendments. The software can be reached through the Ministry of Justice website (accessed May 6, 2009): <<http://www.adalet.org/program/tck.php>>

freedom of expression within the context of democracy. On the one end İbrahim Kumaş (Welfare Party - Tokat) had stated: “[...] of course we favor freedoms but there are limits to freedoms [...] Who makes these people go up to the mountains and engage in terrorism? [Intellectuals] who impose that ideology; ones who make these people believe in that ideology, that belief, that idea. True, they don't use guns, they use pens; but they undertake a revolution with their pens”. On the other hand Bahattin Elçi (Welfare Party - Bayburt) told: “Friends, a French philosopher said '*je pense, donc je suis*' – I think, therefore I am. Our Prophet stated '*la ibadeteket tefekküri*', which means no prayer is [as good as] thinking” tying the religious quote to the discussions of democracy in Turkey: “The system of democracy has to be protected as a free-speech practice”. Existence of two competing views on democracy and free speech, in the same debate, by the parliamentarians of the same party is indeed noteworthy. This case suggests that TGNA discourses on the Kurdish question takes shape not based on party-affiliation, but depending on the constituency of the parliamentarian. This hypothesis will be tested in chapter 6.

Emergency rule practices were also criticized within the Assembly under the democracy discourse. TGNA adopted the Law #2935²⁷⁸ on State of Emergency (*Olağanüstü Hal*) on October 25, 1983, which gave the authority to the President and Council of Ministers by consulting the National Security Council, to declare curfews, increased security presence and appointment of an State of Emergency regional ‘super-governor’ (*olağanüstü hal bölge valisi*) to coordinate security force activities. The law defines a ‘State of Emergency’ in its article 3b as: “[...] the case of severe disruptions of the public order through serious acts of mass acts of violence that are aimed to eradicate personal freedoms and the free democratic system established by the constitution [...]”

²⁷⁸ Full text of the law can be accessed through the Ministry of Justice website (accessed May 6, 2009): <http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/652.html>

and states that emergency situation measures cannot be exercised for more than 6 months, giving the power to the TGNA to extend or abolish these measures not exceeding 4 months at a time. The fact that emergency measures, as well as emergency 'super-governorates' have been functioning in the cities of the south-east since 1983 reveals the number of extensions, as well as the reasons behind frequent criticisms towards these measures. Due to militaristic and repressive measures of the emergency rule, many domestic and foreign observers argued that these measures alienated local population and frustrated them so deeply that they ended up joining the PKK. Such an argumentative position was not foreign to the TGNA. Social-democratic People's Party MP Algan Hacaoğlu (Istanbul) had argued²⁷⁹ that the emergency rule was not decreasing the amount of violence: "Just as our gendarmerie forces and our gendarmerie commander knows, the emergency rule is not a measure that provides security against terrorism. I recall clearly that during a National Security Council meeting, the commander of the gendarmerie forces opposed the extension of the emergency rule" adding that the measure was promoting anti-democratic practices: "The emergency rule is a product of a system organized in the region, which allocates money to various shady groups and makes way to various [anti-democratic] political undertakings". The last argument shows another unintended, but very real consequence of the emergency rule.²⁸⁰

The Office of the 'emergency super-governorate', was established by the 'Decree Law on the Establishment of Emergency Rule Regional Governorship' (*Olağanüstü Hal Bölge Valiliği*

²⁷⁹ Term 23, Year 2, Sitting 73: March 26, 1997

²⁸⁰ Philip Robins had argued that, the emergency 'super-governors', village guards, some members of the armed forces and the police had connections with mafia networks and even PKK militants involved with opium trade, as the conflict zone stretched across the historic 'Opium road' or the 'Golden route', which is the land route through which opium originating from Afghanistan has been transported through Iran into south-east Turkey, making it to European markets since the Ottoman times. Such a relationship became public in 1996 when a Mercedes carrying the Chief of Istanbul police, a parliamentarian in charge of the largest village guard clan in the south-east and a criminal wanted by the Interpol's red list had an accident in north-western Turkey, exposing a seemingly impossible relationship. For more on this, see: Robins, Philip 'Back from the Brink: Turkey's Ambivalent Approaches to the Hard Drugs issue'. *The Middle East Journal*. Vol. 62, no. 4. Autumn 2008.

*İhdası Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararname*²⁸¹) #2935 on July 1987, establishing an Office for a single 'super-governor' in charge of the cities of Diyarbakır, Bingöl, Elazığ, Hakkari, Mardin, Siirt, Tunceli ve Van. The emergency governor reported directly to the Minister of Interior and had prominence over other mayors and city governors and were authorized to command and control regional security forces. Article 4-b of the decree law stipulated "Emergency governors have the authority to control regional security forces by himself or transfer control of these forces to city governors" as well as giving these governors the authority to impose curfews. The 'shady groups' argument adopted by Hacaloğlu refers to fluid and vaguely defined networks of state, military and 'non-institutional' figures that follow a relaxed set of rules to 'get the job done'. During the writing of this dissertation, there was a major ongoing legal case against one of these networks called '*Ergenekon*', which included military officers, business and political figures as well as notorious mafia members.²⁸² One of the charges pressed by the prosecutors of the case was that the Gendarmerie Intelligence and Counterterrorism and Special Operations Office branches (*Jandarma İstihbarat ve Terörle Mücadele – JİTEM* and *Özel Harp Dairesi*; two elite branches²⁸³ within the military and police forces) in a large list of human rights abuses, were also involved in drug trafficking and weapons smuggling, rendering these branches the primary suspects of a decade-long criticism on Turkey's human rights practices and large number of cases submitted against Turkey in the European Court of Human Rights and European Court of Justice concerning the Kurdish question in Turkey. The 'fog of war' caused by the proliferation of such sub-branches

²⁸¹ The full text of the decree law can be accessed through the Ministry of Justice website (accessed May 6, 2009): <http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/10025.html>

²⁸² I have provided an extensive analysis of the 'Ergenekon case' and the history of this alleged network in: Ünver, H. Akin. 'Turkey's deep-state and the Ergenekon conundrum'. *Middle East Institute Policy Brief Series*, No. 23, April 2009. Available online (accessed May 6, 2009): <http://www.mideasti.org/files/turkey-deep-state-ergenekonconundrum.pdf>

²⁸³ These elite branches were founded in the 1950s, as a part of NATO's 'stay-behind' groups; elite-auxiliary units that would 'stay behind' in the case of a Soviet invasion and conduct espionage, sabotage, assassination and bombing missions in order to slow down Soviet advance into Europe. All NATO countries had such branches. I have made an extensive review of this in: Ibid.

and networks that filled the authority gap caused by successive weak coalition governments, lead to confusion within the TGNA as well as higher echelons of the military and police branches regarding who was actually committing these mass violations.

2.3 Excessive Force discourse

Excessive force discourses in the TGNA focused on security force misconducts and disproportional uses of power. For the most part of the 1990s, excessive force discourses covered village burnings, forest destructions, torture deaths and forced migrations; also TGNA appeared unable to reach a discursive consensus on whether the security forces or the PKK members were responsible for such acts of violence. Although a pattern of self-criticism can be observed, it was countered by a very loud denialist discourse, fed by the uncertainty of the fog of war, as well as denials made by the executive branches, sometimes in order to conceal the weak chain of command between some branches of the security forces. Yet, such denials met increasing skepticism as MPs of the southeastern cities gave very clear accounts of excessive force reports in the TGNA sittings. For example on 6 October 1994²⁸⁴, Vahdet Sinan Yerlikaya (Social-democrat People's Party-Tunceli) criticized commando violence in Tunceli:

“We know that the PKK [commits atrocities], it burns forests, it burns villages, it burns schools, it shoots teachers. We are not denying them. The organization is doing these. However the recent burning of the 15 villages in Ovacık has been done in the middle of the day. All the village folk, almost 500 people have witnessed the burning of the villages by the commando paratrooper brigades stationed in Kayseri and Bolu”.

This was one of the clearest reports on military misconducts in the TGNA and was difficult to

²⁸⁴ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 16. October 6, 1994.

refute. It is also one of the very few instances where Turkish army violence was discursively constructed on par with PKK violence. It is also noteworthy since the statement was made by a coalition partner, not an opposition member; opposition criticisms of such security misconducts were more frequent, in order to make the argument that “the government is unable to lead the army”, whereas such a criticism coming from the coalition partner shows the non-partisan character of the excessive force discourses, as well as the weakness of the government in terms of exerting sufficient civilian control over the armed forces. Yerlikaya's statement continued with another rare discursive construction of army violence as 'state terrorism'; a definition that had been frequently used by the parliamentarians of the Islamist Welfare Party (*Refah partisi*) and its successor, Virtue Party (*Fazilet Partisi*) to define Israeli approach to the Palestinian issue. This time, that definition was applied to Turkey by Yerlikaya: “We refer to PKK's raids on villages that kill tens of people, as terrorism; it is true, it is terrorism; but isn't it a state terrorism when the state burns villages against human rights, force people to migrate, apply food embargo on the region, burn forests and destroy nature?” Here, an important note has to be made with regard to the discursive construction of the excessive force arguments. A sub-discourse within the terrorism discourse (construction of the Kurdish question as one of terrorism), an important theme exists, which is namely the 'terrorist sanctuaries' or 'terrorist havens' discourses. Within TGNA's construction of the 'terrorist havens' discourse, northern Iraq in general and Cudi or Qandil mountains in particular held great importance. Within this context, a Turkish MP could propose a military solution to end PKK terrorism by suggesting that Cudi and Qandil mountains have to be bombed; or a cross-border operation into northern Iraq would have to be made. However, parliamentarians who dubbed Turkish security force abuses, as ‘state terrorism’ did not elaborate on the origin or source of such acts. For example, while the PKK terrorism 'came from Qandil', or

Cudi or northern Iraq, which security branch was responsible for the alleged 'state terrorism' was not identified within mainstream discourse. Such open-ended nature of this discourse type often left the entire armed forces, as well as all of the police and gendarme forces under scrutiny, making it easy for these institutions to refute such claims.

A human rights monitoring fact finding mission was set up in the TGNA in October 1994 in order to investigate the allegations of village burnings by the security forces. A very interesting exchange took place between state minister Azimet Köylüoğlu (Social-democratic People's Party-Sivas) and other parliamentarians on 11 October 1994²⁸⁵. In that session, Köylüoğlu had to endure the taunts of the opposition MPs who loudly criticized him because of his recent interview with a Turkish newspaper in which he accused the Turkish executive branches for village burnings. Köylüoğlu tried to assert that his findings were based on facts: "[Our fact finding group] went to Ovacık from Tunceli; we listened to the municipal of Ovacık. Mr. Yerlikaya, who said that the villages have been burned by the security forces". Under heavy protests from the parliament, Köylüoğlu continued:

"20 muhtars²⁸⁶ who had witnessed the incidents were there. I called them [...] and asked what the situation was. Muhtars said: 'Security forces came and ordered the evacuation of our villages within ten minutes' [...] 20 village muhtars in the southeast claimed that their houses were burned by the security forces [...] PKK doesn't want villages to be burned since it gathers materials and supplies from them."

Here, a frequently used rationalistic discourse was adopted that generalizes PKK's outlook towards

²⁸⁵ Term 19, Year 4, Session 18. October 11, 1994.

²⁸⁶ Muhtar (Arabic: 'chosen' or 'elected'): head of the smallest administrative region. They are village administrators in the rural areas, neighborhood (*mahalle*) administrators in the cities. They generally assume tenure through local elections, although some muhtar-hoods have been hereditary and tribe-based in the Kurdish villages of Turkey.

the villages. There were frequent reports on PKK gathering supplies from the villages and the 'possibility' of the PKK to supply from other villages in the south-east had been used as a justification for village evacuations and burnings. The last sentence in Köylüoğlu's statement is a counter-argument against the positions in the TGNA that asserted *'it is impossible for Turkish soldiers to burn Turkish villages'* and that *'if a village is burned, the PKK must have done it'*. Also, the emphasis on the 'meeting with muhtars' in Köylüoğlu's statement had been made to strengthen his argumentative position, since muhtars were the lowest level administrators and thus, were more aware of micro-level events going on in their villages or districts, mostly overlooked by more senior administrators. Indeed "I spoke to numerous muhtars" has been a frequently adopted discourse by the parliamentarians who spoke on the Kurdish question in order to challenge and refute facts provided by the state officials. This exposes the fact that the parliamentarians sought an alternative channel of communication with the local populace since there is an observable feeling of mistrust to 'official' statements such as those coming from the Ministry of Interior or regional super-governorates. Especially through mid- to late- 1990s parliamentarians have increasingly mentioned their visits to the region and their exchanges with the local muhtars and mayors as opposed to regional super-governor or the commander of the local security forces, in order to support their arguments when they were against the official discourse.

A major sub-discourse within the excessive force arguments has been 'mis-' or 'lack of communication' discourse. In this context, parliamentarians have frequently complained about not being able to find the actual perpetrators of the reported incidents of misconduct. Specifically the reports on the village burning incidents were almost always followed by confusion over the actors

of the incidents. An example to this can be given in the statement on 19 October 1994²⁸⁷ made by Kazım Ataoğlu (Welfare Party-Bingöl) concerning yet another incident of village burning incident. He stated that he got numerous calls – again – by the local muhtars, on June 23rd and 24th reporting military burning incidents on several villages, which he later confirmed with the emergency super-governor Ünal Erkan and the mayor of Bingöl, Abdülkadir Sarı. After investigating the sites of the burned villages and confirming they were actually burned by the security forces, Ataoğlu pointed to the communication problems within the military and confusion over area of responsibility of the security forces: “Military and civilian officials in Bingöl told us that the incidents took place outside their authority and perpetrated by the commando brigade in Diyarbakır, which is not under the command of Bingöl regiment”. The argument remains open-ended again, since there is no elaboration on whether Diyarbakır commando brigade has the authority to engage in Bingöl, whether the brigade had acted without any orders from their superiors or which commanding general had ordered these burnings. However the statement indirectly suggests that there was an acute lack of communication between the emergency governor Ünal Erkan (who was in charge of the military forces in his area) and Diyarbakır commando brigade, which was under his command as stipulated by the Decree Law on Emergency Governorships, as well as between the Diyarbakır commando brigade and the army regiment stationed in Bingöl. Apart from the miscommunication discourse, Ataoğlu also adopted another frequent discourse; ‘state neglect’ of excessive force reports. He criticized the government and the state branches for their lack of attention: “However, although I have reported this incident to the President, Prime Minister, Minister of Interior, I couldn't get any replies so far [...] Do these citizens have to march to Ankara for their voices to be heard by the government?” Indeed, it was exceedingly difficult to come up with a criticism of Turkish security force misconducts by the

²⁸⁷ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 21. October 19, 1994

Minister of Interior, Prime Minister or the President. This follows the same pattern with the European Union and the United States, where critical bureaucratic or state branch discourses with reference to Turkish security misconducts were much less frequent (almost non-existent) than parliamentary discourses. More interestingly, the 'state is not listening' discourse has been adopted both by the parliamentarians of the governing coalition and the opposition parties. This suggests that the existence of another level of political stratification, where 'transcendental' or higher decision-making offices were functioning 'above politics', especially with regard to the Kurdish question.

Another sub-discourse within the excessive force strand pointed to the danger of village evacuations and burnings benefiting the PKK in the long run. Among many of its variations, this mainstream sub-discourse stated that the delayed re-location of the inhabitants of the evacuated or burned villages, were frustrating the populace and especially younger members of the refugee families could be recruited by the PKK. The statement of Mustafa Balçılar (Motherland Party-Eskişehir) can be an example to this: “around 2,200 villages have been evacuated [...] if you tell these people to 'go wherever you go', they will go and relocate into the suburbs and ghettos of Diyarbakır or Adana. These people without an income, without a job, without a home become recruits to terrorism and this is the reason for the recent increase in terrorism in the cities”.²⁸⁸

Another widely adopted sub-discourse was related to the grant of too much power to the military with little accountability expected. Within this sub-discourse, parliamentarians criticized some branches of the security forces for their abuse of power, ignoring the chain of command or

²⁸⁸ Term 19, Year 5, Sitting 17: 28 October 1995

covering up their abuses. For example, Hüseyin Yıldız (Virtue Party-Mardin) criticized²⁸⁹ heavy-handedness of the security forces with reference to broad authorities exercised by the lower military ranks. Referring to a recent parliamentary report by the Democratic Turkey Party on the village evacuations, he adopted both the 'excessive authority' and 'miscommunication' sub-discourses:

“Page twenty of this report says *'I even saw a soldier with the rank of major who ordered a village evacuation on the basis of security concerns. When I mentioned this to the mayor, he said he had no information on this'*. As you see, the terrifying aspect of the problem is explicit. Even a major, against the legal system, can say 'empty this village!'”

This was also part of the larger debate on military-civilian relations and the extent of security forces authorization when the political authority is absent or impaired. Yıldız further commented on the excessive policing measures of the army: “People without any means of protection have been held under custody without a trial just because they gave a piece of bread to the terrorists; they were taken from their children in the middle of the night and their dead bodies were found the next morning”. This sub-discourse is also the highlight of the dilemmas facing the inhabitants of Kurdish villages who suffered in the hands of the PKK when they supported Turkish army and in the hands of the Turkish army when they supported (or had to support) the PKK.

2.4 Security discourse

The 'security' discourse is one of the two parent-discourses that are unique to this chapter although it somewhat converges with the section on ‘discourses that converged with that of the Turkish state’ in the EP and US Congress chapters. Security discourses highlighted security

²⁸⁹ Ibid

deficiencies, PKK violence and the duty of the state to protect its citizens at all costs. From whichever perspective one might look from, the PKK has been posing the biggest security problem to Turkey since Eruh and Şemdinli raids that took place on 15 August 1984²⁹⁰. On 18 October 1994²⁹¹, Mustafa Kul (Republican People's Party-Erzincan) portrayed the security situation in the south-east as follows: "[...] time to time when we [parliamentarians] go to our districts, our constituents ask for roads, water, electricity, hospital or irrigation channels [...] people in the south-east don't have such desires. Their only request from us is "we want to live". Kul's discursive construction of the plea for security within the context of representative-constituency relations resembles the discourses adopted in the Israeli Knesset by representatives of the cities that suffer most from violence such as *Sderot* or *Ashkelon*.

As much as security concerns within the context of the Kurdish issue was mostly visible in the south-east, the street riots that took place in the Alevi²⁹²-Kurdish Gaziosmanpaşa and Ümraniye districts of Istanbul from 12th till 16th of March 1995²⁹³ raised concerns over security through whole of Turkey and showed that security concerns were not limited to the south-east. The event also showed that officials could be very quick in calling any kind of social unrest as

²⁹⁰ Eruh and Şemdinli raids are considered as the first acts of violence committed under the name PKK. While other branches within the organization had engaged in armed violence before these raids, Turkish state considers Eruh and Şemdinli attacks as the beginning of the conflict.

²⁹¹ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 20: October 18, 1994

²⁹² Alevis are a religious, community in Turkey, which descends from the Bektashi Sufism of the Hacibektaş Veli; a saint of the 13th century.

²⁹³ Riots started on March 12, 1995 after unidentified gunmen attacked a coffee house in Gaziosmanpaşa, killing one and wounding 25. A mob quickly started to march towards the local police headquarters accusing the police to intentionally respond late. The policemen from the headquarters fired upon the crowd, killing one demonstrator. Although the initial demonstration was suppressed, next day, around 15,000 people from the neighborhood gathered to protest the killings. Inevitably clashing with the police forces controlling the protest, the demonstrations turned into an all-out neighborhood rebellion, necessitating the involvement of the army. In a four-day micro-rebellion 23 people died and around four hundred of them wounded. For more on the Gaziosmanpaşa incident, see: Houston, Christopher (2001) *Islam, Kurds and the Turkish nation state*. (Basingstoke: Berg Publishers) p. 8 and Dural, Tamaşa F. (1995) *Aleviler ve Gazi olayları [Alevis and the Gazi incidents]*. (Istanbul: Ant)

'PKK provocation' or 'terrorism'. During the sitting of 14 March 1995²⁹⁴, Minister of Interior Nahit Menteşe called the assaults as “PKK provocations”²⁹⁵ in order to explain the momentum which ended up swallowing two large neighborhoods. Menteşe further argued: “The fact that a group of 500 people attacked the Gazi[osmanpaşa] police station within a short period of time like 15-20 minutes despite the shock of the first assaults, indicate that these riots were designed to be provocations”. Gazi incidents showed that first, security concerns created by the PKK insurgency and extra-judicial counter-insurgency measures were not confined to the south-east. Secondly, it showed the tendency of the state officials to discursively construct any acts of violence as 'PKK provocation', although the incident had more to do with an Alevi neighborhood, rather than a Kurdish one. Another security concern related to this incident was that the policemen had not responded to coffee house attacks, as well as the march of the Alevi citizens on time, revealing severe security deficiencies in the biggest city of Turkey. On this, Mehmet Keçeciler (Motherland Party-Konya) criticized the Istanbul police chief for his excuse following the riots, that much of the policemen in the region were on duty at a soccer match: “In a centre like Istanbul, saying '*we didn't have enough policemen, they were deployed for a soccer match*' as an excuse for not responding to a 500-man assault on a police station is not an excuse, not correct behavior”. While this argument was made in order to highlight the difficult situation in which the Gaziosmanpaşa policemen initially found themselves, it had unintentionally revealed that the complaints of the Alevi citizens over the late response of the police forces were justified.

Although security discourses were abundant, there wasn't too much variance of sub-

²⁹⁴ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 85: March 14, 1995

²⁹⁵ More recently, these attacks were attributed to the alleged 'Ergenekon network', ordered by some state officials in order to justify increased military presence in these districts. For more on this, see: NA. 'Gazi olayları Ergenekon'a dayandı [Gazi incidents are attributed to Ergenekon]'. *Sabah newspaper*. July 4, 2008.

discourses within this type. The most frequent type of security discourse has been citing official data on PKK's acts of violence. In one of many examples of this sub-discourse, Minister of Interior Murat Başesgioğlu reported that: "So far the PKK has raided and killed people in 483 villages. [The PKK] has also forced 1992 villages to evacuate via various measures. The separatist organization has burned and destroyed 182 schools, 47 mosques, 17 small hospitals and 6651 homes".²⁹⁶ This method of quoting statistical data had been used in the European Parliament and the US Congress, mostly under the 'excessive force' sub-discourse, as a portrayal of Turkish military misconducts. However, while the statistical discourse of the EP and the Congress converged with that of Turkey over village evacuations and burnings (although the former two argued that they were doings of Turkish security forces, whereas Turkish official discourse stated that the PKK was the sole responsible), MEPs and Congressmen focused more on the statistics of torture, disappearances and killings under detention, whereas Turkish discourses focused on destruction of schools, mosques and hospitals. The reason for this was to emphasize the argument that the PKK was against education, religion²⁹⁷ and provision of health services, amplifying the discursive construction of the PKK as a terrorist organization, against the well-being of the Kurds.

2.5 Economic – developmental discourses

There are competing theories regarding how predominantly Kurdish areas of south-eastern Turkey have remained poor and underdeveloped. While some of these theories point to general

²⁹⁶ Term 20, Year 3, Sitting 96: June 2, 1998

²⁹⁷ Although this may not make sense initially given the fact that Kurds are a Muslim community, the violence was undertaken by the PKK, which was a Marxist-Leninist organization that had adopted anti-spiritual/religion measures and targeted religious institutions in the region on par with Stalin's measures in the Soviet Union. "In short, it was the PKK that ended the mutually constitutive relationship between Islam, tribe and nationalism in favour of the latter". Shatzmiller, Maya (2005) *Nationalism and minority identities in Islamic societies*. (Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press) p. 241

poorness of the Anatolian (including non-Kurdish) rural areas²⁹⁸, some other theories point to intentional²⁹⁹ and unintentional economic neglect of the region because of remoteness to the administrative capital, whereas other theories point to the traditional family formation of the Kurdish tribes that emphasizes tribal leaders and accumulation of the capital around them, rendering peasants and other villagers dependent on him.³⁰⁰ The latter theory also explains why the emergence of the PKK as an organization frequently adopting a class-based discourse³⁰¹, which emphasizes peasant and worker rights against the oppression of the feudal organization became so much popular in those areas initially. After the intensification of the insurgency, economic aspects of the question such as backwardness, poverty and underdevelopment has been one of the favorite argumentative positions of the Turkish state in order to define the origin of the problem.³⁰²

The biggest state initiative aimed at improving the economic situation in the Kurdish areas was the Southeast Anatolia Project (Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi - GAP); an integrated project under which numerous dams, hydro electrical power plants, irrigation facilities have been constructed on the Euphrates and Tigris rivers, including side-projects aimed towards improving the rural infrastructure such as transportation, industry, education and health services. While the project was devised in the 1960s, the key facility of the GAP, Atatürk Dam was completed in 1990

²⁹⁸ See for example: Tatlıdil, Füsün, İlkey Dellal and Gülşen Keskin. 'A case study on the risk of rural pverty in semi-arid region of Turkey'. *Tarım Bilimleri Dergisi*. Vol. 15(1) issue 1. January 2009

²⁹⁹ "There is no question that decades of economic neglect have fuelled unhappiness of Turkey's Kurds". Barkey, Henri J. and Graham E. Fuller (1998) *Turkey's Kurdish question*. (New York: Rowmand and Litterfeld) p. 187

³⁰⁰ See: McDowall, David (2004) *A modern history of the Kurds* (London: I.B. Tauris)

³⁰¹ The PKK is often labeled as a 'Marxist-Leninist organization', in reference to – Öcalan, Abdullah (1995) *PKK 5. Kongresine Sunulan Politik Rapor* [Political Report Submitted to the PKK's 5th Convention] (Berlin: Güneş Ülke Yayıncılık) – where he devoted a whole chapter praising Marxist-Leninist ideals and their importance to the Kurdish national cause. On page 18 of the volume published by Güneş Ülke Yayınları, Öcalan states: "Our movement takes its roots from Marxism and Leninism, since our first rebellion in the Faculty of Social Sciences (Ankara University) [...] and will remain the sole socialist outlet in existence".

³⁰² An excellent analysis of the Kurdish question within Turkish state discourse, see: Yeğen, Mesut (2009) *Devlet Söyleminde Kürt Sorunu [Kurdish problem in State discourse]*. (Istanbul: İletişim)

and became functional in 1991, overlapping with the intensification of the insurgency. Throughout the 1990s, most of the economy-development discourses focused on the GAP and the project was regarded as an integral part of the solution of the 'terror problem'. For example on 18 October 1994, Ömer Lütfi Coşkun (True Path Party-Balıkesir) expressed this belief: “Unemployment is the main problem underlying terrorism” and conveyed his optimism regarding the GAP: “The economic impact of the South-east Anatolian Project will be difficult to ignore. The project [...] will completely eradicate unemployment and make contributions to the nation's economy”.³⁰³

As a variation to the GAP argument, some parliamentarians had argued that increased spending on rural economies by the way of subsidizing or providing grants would eradicate the problem. The chairman of the Welfare Party Necmettin Erbakan had argued, “[in order to stop terrorism] we have to spend an additional 3.5 billion dollars on top of 5.5 billion we are already spending”. The items on Erbakan's 'counter-terror' list concerned the development of the region. He identified: “we have to compensate farmer debts, [...] we have to purchase farming surpluses, [...] and revive animal farming [...] in short we have to spend a total of 7.464 billion dollars to our farmers.”³⁰⁴ In fact Erbakan was not arguing in favor of the creation of an additional fund for farmer subsidies since total budget allocation was already set, but indirectly suggested a re-allocation of the military budget into these subsidies. In many ways, criticizing the army budget and suggesting that military spending is a luxury, has been one of the key aspects of the economic-developmental discourse.

There were also other sub-discourses that had emphasized education as the main issue

³⁰³ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 20. October 18, 1994.

³⁰⁴ Term 20, Year 1, Sitting 38: April 17, 1996

underlying the Kurdish question. Proponents of this position argued that the region's youth were joining the PKK because of ignorance and the PKK was attacking schools specifically for this purpose. This discourse group suggested that building adequate educational infrastructure in the region would stop defections to the PKK. An example of such discussion was the statement of Erdoğan Toprak³⁰⁵ (Democratic Left Party-Istanbul): "The crux of terrorism in the south-east is economic conundrum and lack of education. The situation is so dire that an entire generation is being brought up without any exposure to education since the terror started". He added that 2000 village schools were closed and a total of 131 village teachers were killed by the PKK. He then conveyed his belief that "these ignorant children provide the source for terrorism". The 'education' and 'development' sub-discourses are part of a global discourse of developmentalism. Arturo Escobar³⁰⁶ had highlighted a proliferation of developmentalist discourses (defining countries based on their level of development) since the end of World War II, which lead to a global perception of the West as 'developed' and most of the world 'underdeveloped'. The developmentalist discourses have gradually spilled-over the terrorism discourses in order to irrationalize the acts of terror, claiming them to be doings of 'uneducated', 'underdeveloped' individuals. This same pattern is also observable in Turkish state discourse where PKK members are monolithically defined as 'uneducated' and 'ignorant'.

A controversial topic in Turkish education system has been the status of Imam-Hatip³⁰⁷ schools. These are high-school level educational institutions, established in 1913 to educate imams and other Islamic clerical officers. After the educational reform of March 1924, their mission was

³⁰⁵ Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 11: 23 October 1996

³⁰⁶ Escobar, Arturo (1995) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press) p. 9

³⁰⁷ Hatip comes from Arabic *khatib*, which means 'the deliverer of the *khutba* (friday sermon)'

changed to raising religious officials adamant against Islamist extremism and with a strong loyalty to Republican principles, especially secularism. Closed in 1930 due to 'lack of demand', they were re-established in 1949 and remained a controversial issue in Turkish politics due to allegations of promoting Sharia law and advocating anti-secularist activities.³⁰⁸ The status of Imam Hatip schools vis-à-vis other secular educational establishments have been an issue within the context of the Kurdish question. An interesting argumentation was adopted regarding these schools during the debate on 15 August 1997³⁰⁹, where Imam-Hatip schools were defended by Yahya Uslu (True Path Party-Manisa): "I ask: how many terrorists did these schools produce? Were Abdullah Öcalan³¹⁰ or Deniz Gezmiş³¹¹ graduates of these schools?". This notion was shared in the same debate by Hüseyin Yıldız (Virtue Party-Mardin) who also adopted a similar discourse: "These schools have raised valuable politicians and scientists, became leading institutions in every branch, were never involved in terrorism and became prime examples of tolerance". Yıldız also believed emphasis on Islamic education would be the solution to the Kurdish problem: "Had there been an emphasis on Islamic education in the south-east, emphasis on religious [identity], we wouldn't have this problem now". Yıldız, takes the 'ignorance' discourse a step further, and by emphasizing Islamic education, implies that ignorance that brings about the Kurdish problem has more to do with the ignorance of Islamic principles, rather than secular-scientific education.

2.6 Legalistic discourses

Turkish official definition of terrorism has been made in length under Law #3713 on

³⁰⁸ For an English-language source on the Imam Hatip schools, see: Kramer, Heinz (2000) A changing Turkey: the challenge to European and the United States (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press) pp. 55-85

³⁰⁹ Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 136. August 15, 1997

³¹⁰ Leader of the PKK

³¹¹ Political activist, a prominent leader of the Turkish youth-student movements in the late 1960s – early 1970s. Belonged to the Marxist-Leninist youth movement in Turkey and engaged in numerous activities such as participating in the demonstrations against the American sixth fleet stationed in the Aegean Sea and leading several student riots. He was executed in May 1972.

Combating Terrorism.³¹² Among the offenses that constitute terrorism are 'trying to change the legal system' and 'the characteristics of the Republic as specified in the Constitution'. To many in Turkey, terrorism constitutes a 'state of lawlessness'; a situation in which legal and judicial powers of the state can no longer be exercised. From this perspective, in legislative terms, the PKK problem has been defined within the parameters of a legal – judicial context, whose solution lied within improving either the laws or the enforcement of the laws. For example, on 11 October 1994, State Minister Azimet Köylüoğlu (Social-democratic People's Party) argued that the solution to terrorism would come from a law-based system: “Solution to terrorism is not burning houses, emptying villages; rather the solution comes through law and applying the principles of a legalistic state [...] This problem can’t be dealt with through purely militaristic, purely policing measures; we shall apply the methods of the law”. Köylüoğlu had suggested that the problem was within Turkey's own laws and what he meant by 'methods of the law' constituted the other end of the continuum from 'purely militaristic' measures. In this statement, the discursive construction of the Kurdish question within the parameters of law is quite similar to the democracy discourse, where the solution is argued to be lying within liberal measures, as well as laying the groundwork of the legal safeguards on these liberties.

Although the definition of terrorism had been made in the Law on Combating Terrorism, the parliamentarians had frequently disagreed on what constituted 'terrorism' and who a terrorist was, exposing problems in legal application of the notorious article 8 of this law. Such differences in definition of terrorism and the terrorist, created problems during the constitutional and penal

³¹² Full text of this law in Turkish, can be accessed through the Ministry of Justice website: <<http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/809.html>>

code amendment debates. For example below is an interesting exchange³¹³ between Mahmut Alınak (Social-democratic People's Party - Şırnak), Seyfi Şahin (Welfare Party-Kayseri) and Cengiz Bulut (Motherland Party-Izmir), where Alınak asked a series of rhetorical questions (whose answers, according to him were 'no') on the definition of 'terrorist', which were agitatively answered by Şahin and Bulut:

Alınak: If a politician comes up here and reverses the truth, he will be deceiving 60 million people. Is Ahmet Altan³¹⁴ a terrorist?

Şahin: Yes!

Alınak: Is Yaşar Kemal³¹⁵ a terrorist?

Şahin: Yes!

Alınak: The president of the Democracy and Change Party, İbrahim Aksoy was indicted yesterday, he came from abroad. Now he is jailed in the Ulucanlar prison. The only thing he said was 'Kurds'...

Bulut: Don't confuse separatism with peace!

[...]

Alınak: Let's analyze the files of people indicted under the article 8; let's first look what we have there. Let's not take these things for granted

Bulut: Who killed all of these [innocent civilians]?

The exchange revealed the confusion over the legal definition of 'terrorist' as well as a tendency of some parliamentarians to construct 'terrorism' within the parameters of Communism or adherence to leftist views. Although this has partly to do with the fact that the PKK was a Marxist-Leninist organization, a late-Turkish version of McCarthyism in the 1950s' United States appeared to be holding ground in the TGNA in which sympathizers of any leftist ideology were called 'Communists' and all Communists were 'PKK sympathizers'.

While legalistic discourses adopted on the Kurdish question were generally self-critical, there were occasional doses of optimism after reform periods. An upbeat tone regarding the

³¹³ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 149. August 16, 1995.

³¹⁴ Acclaimed Turkish novelist, columnist and professor of economics

³¹⁵ One of the most famous Turkish novelists, criticized during the Cold War for his leftist views

amendments on the Law on Emergency Governorates was adopted by Bekir Aksoy (True Path Party-Çorum): “We are aware of the state's responsibility to adhere with legal and judicial rules while trying to prevent cruelty. We are decisive in pursuing this matter within the legal framework, defending law, supremacy of the constitution [...]”³¹⁶ highlighting the fact that the detention period in cities under emergency rule was brought down from 4 days to 48 hours on individual crimes and from 30 days to 48 hours on organized crimes. Aksoy defined 'legal and judicial rules' as conducting counter-terrorism operations 'within the legal framework' (which reveals his belief that there were instances in which such operations were *not* conducted within a legal framework), as well as 'defending the law and supremacy of the constitution', as the government tried to 'prevent cruelty' (which also suggests that Aksoy believed law and constitution were *not* defended during counter-terrorism operations). Post-legal reform discourses such as Aksoy's generally highlight and portray pre-amendment measures as legally 'inefficient', even though such measures might have been defended before the reform period. His highlight of the reduction in detention periods can be regarded as an example to this.

Within the majority of the legalistic discourses, some (mostly social-democratic) parliamentarians argued that counter-terrorism campaigns brought additional responsibilities to the state in terms of protecting personal rights and freedoms. Algan Hacaloğlu (Republican People's Party-Istanbul) frequently reminded the parliament that combating the PKK has to take place within a legal and democratic framework: “While fighting terrorism, the state cannot take a step back or make concessions on the basic principles of a legal state, human rights” adding that “the fight against terrorism brings legal obligations and responsibilities to the state”.³¹⁷ This type of

³¹⁶ Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 73: March 26, 1997

³¹⁷ Ibid

sub-discourse emphasized the connection between democracy, adherence to human rights and law, as opposed to many other discourses that had evaluated these concepts in isolation. In isolation, this type argument is built on a 'rights and freedoms' discourse; however when analyzed together with other discourses on the duty of the state, it brings us to the *raison d'être* of the state as discussed in the theory chapter of this dissertation. While one end of the continuum constructs 'state responsibility' within the context of providing security and assuring state perpetuity no matter the costs, Algan Hacaloğlu presents the other end of this continuum, which constructs state responsibility within the context of adherence to law and democracy.

2.7 Autonomy – ethnicity – culturalist discourses

Kurdish identity is one of the most delicate and controversial issues in Turkey. For many years until recently, this debate ensued not at the level of whether Kurdish rights must be granted or not, but at the point of whether 'such a thing as Kurd' exists. Kurds have been an integral part of the Ottoman Imperial elite and the War of Independence; therefore Turkish-Kurdish history has many overlapping themes. Within Turkish definition of nationhood, Kurds were regarded as 'Turkish citizens' and one of the founding groups of the Republic. According to the official Turkish discourse 'Turk-ness' is a supra-identity that is given by default to every citizen of Turkey regardless of his or her ethnic origin. Within this definition, a Circassian, a Kurd or an Arab that is a citizen of Turkey is 'first a Turk' (a citizenship identification) and then a Circassian, a Kurd or an Arab. This contrasts with 'Turkish-ness' (an ethnic identification) and/or 'Turkic-ness' (a linguistic identification). In the Lausanne Treaty of July 1923³¹⁸ the Kurds weren't defined as a minority

³¹⁸ The treaty between the Republic of Turkey after the War of Independence which internationally recognized the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, as well as annulling the Treaty of Sevres of August 1920, which was signed between the Allied powers and Turkey at the end of the World War I.

group; according to Mustafa Akyol³¹⁹, this was a direct result of the collective rejection of the Kurdish parliamentarians of the early TGNA, to be identified as a 'minority'. The statement of one of those Kurdish parliamentarians, Yusuf Ziya bey (representative of Bitlis) in this regard:

*“The Europeans say: The largest minority in Turkey are the Kurds. I am a Kurd, coming from a Kurdish lineage. In this capacity, I can assure you that the Kurds don't want anything. We Kurds, have smashed those rights and laws given by the Europeans within the Sevres rubbish and returned to those who want to give them to us... the same way [Turks and Kurds] had fought together at the Al-Jazeera hill, the same way we shed blood with the Turks; we don't want to be separated from them”.*³²⁰

However, within the course of the republican history there was 29 Kurdish rebellions against the Ankara government and the different types of sub-discourses have proliferated under Kurdish identity debate. While the infamous statement of General Kenan Evren after the 1980 military coup: “There is no such thing as a Kurd. They are mountain Turks. It is a concept derived from the *kart-kurt* sounds produced while our citizens in the south-east were walking on snow. That is why they were referred with that name”³²¹ appears to be marginalized, there were many other state discourses strongly arguing that 'Kurds are in fact Turks'.

A somewhat relaxed version of the one end of this continuum was Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel's statement during the opening ceremony of the TGNA after 1994 elections³²², where he claimed: “It is true that ethnic variety contributes to a country's cultural richness.

³¹⁹ Akyol, Mustafa, 'Kürtler Azınlık Olmayı Lozan Döneminde Reddettiller' [Kurds have refused to be 'minority' during the Lausanne period] *Referans*, October 6, 2004. The original article can be reached at Akyol's personal website (accessed May 7, 2009):

<www.mustafaakyol.org/archives/2004/10/kurtler_azinlik_olmayi_reddettiller.php>

³²⁰ November 3, 1922. As quoted in Kuneralp, Sinan (1999) *Son dönem Osmanlı erkan ve ricali, 1839-1922 [High officials and dignitaries in late-Ottoman era]*. (London: Isis) p. 22

³²¹ As quoted in: NA. 'Kart-Kurt'tan Eyalet'e' [From Kart-Kurt to State], *Sabah*, February 28, 2007. Available online (accessed May 7, 2009)

<www.sabah.com.tr/2007/02/28/gnd120.html>

³²² Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 1: September 1, 1994

However, the existence of different ethnicities doesn't always necessitate giving them minority status. If all the distinct ethnic groups in a country act as if they are separate nations, the world cannot be saved from turmoil and conflict". Demirel's argument of unrest and turmoil converges with the findings of Ineke Van Der Balk whose study on political discourse on ethnic minority issues³²³ revealed that that right-wing political discourses discursively constructed immigrant groups "first, as an out-group; second, as different or even deviant; and third, as threatening"³²⁴. However, Demirel's linkage between recognition of a minority and the subsequent 'turmoil' appears problematic since on the one hand, the primary source of criticism did not concern whether the Kurds should be given a minority status or not, but rather, it concerned the denial of the very existence of the Kurds in Turkish state discourse. On the other hand, the country was already in turmoil and conflict; therefore, the connection between recognition of identity and danger of turmoil or crisis appears to be a weak link. Furthermore here, another discursive tendency can be observed which is the portrayal of recognition of an ethnicity as 'recognizing *them* as a nation'. According to this rationale, recognition of 'Kurds as Kurds' would mean recognizing them as a country and a nation, such as Kurdistan. Such discursive 'spill-overs' and a binary outlook towards political possibilities have been one of the primary argumentative methods of the proponents of the official state policy on Kurdish identity.

However parliamentary discourse in Turkey had more variance than the state in this issue. While there were – predictably – many supporters of the view that 'Kurds are Turks', some other parliamentarians – again – from right-wing political parties favored recognition of the Kurdish

³²³ van der Valk, Ineke (2002) *Difference, deviance, threat? Mainstream and right-extremist political discourse on ethnic issues in the Netherlands and France*. (Antwerp: Het Spinhuis)

³²⁴ Ibid. pp. 1-15

identity. On 18 October 1994³²⁵, Fetullah Erbaş (Welfare Party-Van) pointed to the “peaceful co-existence of Kurds and Turks in history” and highlighted unwavering loyalty of the Kurdish tribes through the Ottoman Empire, especially during the World War I by refusing to revolt despite British instigations. While this might be directed as a counter-argument to Van Der Valk's findings on party influence over minority discourses, Erbaş added a historicist position to his arguments, making the distinction between Turkish republican history and the Ottoman Empire, claiming: “70 years of the republican history has witnessed the Turkification of the region and Kurdish resistance to this assimilation. The crux of the problem is the recognition of the Kurdish identity”. This position was a part of the larger argumentative family in Turkish politics that focused on the historical aspect of the Kurdish issue, where the Ottoman Empire was praised for its imperial policies regarding the Kurds. Erbaş also drew a similarity between Turkish nationalism and Kurdish nationalism:

“[The supporters of the PKK] answer the question “why do you support such an organization?” as follows: “the official name of the country is Turkey, official language is Turkish, language of education is Turkish, press - TV and radio broadcasts are in Turkish, history books write the history of Turks, there are Turkish nationalist parties that have a supporter base [...] while we have none of those, why do you consider our sympathy with the PKK too much?”

Here Erbaş took a step further than the mainstream 'liberal' discourses on the Kurdish question and suggested that the PKK was an outlet of Kurdish national aspirations in the absence of cultural-educational outlets. Indeed, EU and US legislators too, had argued that not recognizing Kurdish rights had led the local populace to join or support the PKK. Also, Erbaş's statement is the direct opposite of Demirel's argument; while Demirel argued that granting Kurdish rights would

³²⁵ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 20. October 18, 1994.

strengthen PKK, Erbaş claimed *not* granting such rights was benefiting the organization.

Within the conservative discourses on the Kurdish question, a particular line of argument held that the very 'Kurdish-ness' of the Kurds was an artificially created phenomenon by the PKK. A slightly changed version of the 'Kurds are actually Turks' discourse, this line further argued that only the PKK would define Kurds as Kurds. For example, Nevzat Ercan (True Path Party-Sakarya) argued³²⁶ that it was “The separatist terrorist organization” that argued “since the beginning of 1984” that “some of our citizens in the east and the south-east with whom we lived together through history, belong to a different race with a different language and culture, that their territory is under invasion and their rights violated” and that it was the PKK that “defined our citizens as originally Kurdish”. Here, it is important to distinguish between two types of 'Kurds are actually Turks' discourses. The first type of such discourses completely denies the existence of the very existence of 'a thing called Kurd' and further asserts that they are in fact ethnic Turks, who hold an artificially constructed self-identification that imposed by 'dark, foreign powers'. The above quote from Nevzat Ercan and General Kenan Evren's 'Kart-Kurt' discourse can be regarded as two examples to this. The second type of 'Kurds are Turks' argument however, recognizes the ethnic existence of the Kurds, however refer to them as Turks within the context of Turkish citizenship. Within the latter discourse, Kurds were generally referred as 'Turkish citizens of Kurdish background' and the emphasis was made on the equality of their citizenship rights, asserting that granting any special status to any stratum of the society was 'out of question'.

3. Discourses of Inter-Turkish criticism

This section will cover critical discourses within the TGNA directed towards other MPs,

³²⁶ Term 19, Year 5, Sitting 8: October 13, 1995

the state-executive branches, the military and political parties. Although critical discourse types were briefly mentioned in the preceding sections together with supportive discourse types, here I will look exclusively at issues that served as flashpoints for the competing discourses in the TGNA.

The most frequent discourse of inter-Turkish criticism concerned lack or absence of security. It was generally the opposition parliamentarians or representatives of the south-eastern cities that had criticized either the governing party or the state for their inability to provide protection against the PKK. For example, on 13 September 1994³²⁷, Musa Demirci (Welfare Party-Sivas) criticized the government's inability to establish security in the city of Sivas, challenging the earlier promise of the governing coalition that they would 'establish security even on top of a needle': "[...] where are the people who used to claim that the government could establish authority on the top of the needle? Entire Anatolia is burning today, let alone the needle". Through the early to mid 1990s, the biggest security criticism was the late arrival of the security forces to respond to PKK attacks against villages. This was explicit in Demirci's accusation of the security force response to a PKK attack: "[...] the [PKK] massacre in Selimiye village began at 21:00 before sunset. The incident was reported to the county office at 03:30. Not a single security official came to the village until morning. [The villagers] waited until 09:00, 10:00 and security forces still did not arrive, and then one of the [relatives of the deceased] stacked 9 bodies on a pick-up truck [...] and delivered them to the hospital morgue".

Security was a delicate issue since both the lack of it and 'too much' of it was criticized. As certain parliamentarians criticized the government and the security forces for their inability to

³²⁷ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 5: September 13, 1994

respond to PKK attacks on time, some parliamentarians criticized the security forces for their excessive approaches. An example of such a variation to the security discourse was the 5 October 1994³²⁸ statement of Ziya Halis (Social-democratic People's Party-Sivas) who had criticized the police chief of Istanbul for his lack of disciplinary actions against policemen who had killed several suspects during a police pursuit, without trying to arrest them: “[...] some officials may [criticize the 'revolving door' policy of the prisons] and therefore believe executions without indictment may be justified [...] even the Istanbul police chief may be proud of having ordered such executions. However, this mentality is wrong and diseased, and is also archaic”. Halis also adopted the 'state terrorism' discourse, this time against the domestic police forces: “we are against all forms of terrorism, including state terrorism”, in order to support his point that some security force measures were on par with PKK’s methods. Finally, Halis criticized the rules of engagement of the police: “According to our law [...] the primary duty of the police is to arrest a suspect and deliver him to judicial institutions and ensure his trial. Unfortunately our policemen are not doing this”.

A second line of criticism in the parliament was directed towards parties or parliamentarians who were believed to be seeking political capital by exploiting the PKK issue. Most such critics accused rival parties for portraying the struggle against the PKK not as a national struggle, but as an accomplishment of a party, within the context of party-politics. On this, Mehmet Keçeciler³²⁹ (Motherland Party-Konya) argued: “We have to stop approaching [the fight against terrorism] as a matter of party politics [...]”. He then conveyed the message of the leader of the Motherland Party, Mesut Yılmaz who had declared his willingness to allow the

³²⁸ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 15: October 5, 1994.

³²⁹ Ibid

governing party to reap all the benefits of stopping terrorism: “Our chairman declared from this podium - it is in the parliamentary records - *'Eradicate; stop terror in that region, then you can use all the political capital that comes with it'*”. Keçeciler's next statement included a third type of critical discourse in the TGNA, which focused on the lack of communication and consistency in the statements coming from two state ministers of two partners of the governing coalition: “Who burned these villages? Was it the PKK? According to our minister of interior it was the PKK. According to the state minister in charge of human rights [it is the] security forces – the state – who burned them”. Keçeciler was referring to a press statement of the state minister in charge of human rights and the official response of the minister of interior. Highlighting such inconsistencies in statements was a frequently used tactic of the opposition parliamentarians in order to expose weaknesses in the governing coalition.

The fourth type of critical discourse is similar to the second variation of the first type, which deals with security force misconducts. Although the army was arguably the most respected institution in Turkey especially in the fight against terrorism, there were also instances in which the Assembly was critical of the lack of military accountability. Although some parliamentarians were always supportive of the armed forces claiming that 'they wouldn't do such a thing', On 10 October 1996, Atallah Hamidi (Motherland Party-Batman) and 22 other parliamentarians submitted a written question³³⁰ to the Assembly presidency on reports on corruption and extra-judicial activities committed by some army members. The inquiry asked for the clarification of a seemingly impossible set of relations elaborated in detail in Philip Robins' article on the Turkish 'deep-state' published thirteen years later³³¹:

³³⁰ Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 6: 10 October 1996

³³¹ Robins, Philip 'Back from the Brink: Turkey's Ambivalent Approaches to the Hard Drugs issue'. *The Middle East*

1- The incident in which members of a drug and arms smuggling gang in Diyarbakır - whose other member included personnel of the Special Operations Team and the village guards – are arrested and put to jail by the State Security Court

2- The incident in which three policemen from the Special Operation Team have been involved with the killings of the ‘Casino king’³³² Ömer Lütfü Topal, Yener Kaya and Nesim Malki.

[...]

4- The fact that six members of an arms smuggling gang were policemen and army officers

5- The fact that an organized crime network - which included one [special operations] team leader and four policemen from Hakkari Police headquarters, twelve village guards and one [PKK] informant – have been involved in numerous incidents of mystery killings, arson, extortion and theft, was reported by the officials”

Parliamentary inquiries of this much depth weren't taken very well by the state establishment since making such inquiries could be constructed within the discourses of 'separatism' or 'discouraging security forces'; both serious crimes. Also, getting into detail in written inquiries were generally ‘unwelcome’ by the state officials as they question data and figures presented by the state organs.

The fifth line of critical discourse has been directed towards governing party policies towards foreign militant organizations that other countries considered as ‘terrorist’. This was particularly relevant during the tenure of the Welfare Party from 1995 to 1997, with an agenda of rapprochement with the Islamic countries of the Middle East. However during some official visits, the party was criticized for holding talks with certain groups that Turkey and other countries in the region regarded as 'terrorists'. Following the official visit to Egypt in October 1997, the Republican People's Party submitted a written inquiry³³³ to the parliamentary presidency asking why “[...] some members of the Turkish delegation undertook meetings with the members of the

Journal. Vol. 62, no. 4. Autumn 2008.

³³² A mafia-esque figure, owner of a chain of casinos in Istanbul; his killing was believed to be a result of his involvement with the drug smuggling ring in the south-east.

³³³ Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 4: October 8, 1996

Muslim Brotherhood, which is considered a terrorist organization by Turkey”. The critique was also directed towards the indifference of the Turkish delegation towards Muammar Qaddafi’s humiliating approach to Turkey’s PKK problem: “[During the delegation’s meeting with Muammar Qaddafi] Qaddafi has explicitly stated that he did not recognize the PKK as a terrorist organization and nobody from the Turkish delegation has reacted”. A similar criticism was expressed in the written inquiry by Bitlis representative Kamran İnan (Motherland Party): “[...] the policy of rapprochement with the Islamic countries turned into a complete catastrophe, individuals who undertake terrorism in their respective countries were praised and were invited to Turkey”.³³⁴ This approach was also criticized by the political left in Turkey, on the grounds that the Welfare Party was engaging in a 'blind policy of Islamism', establishing formal connections with foreign terrorist organizations 'just because they are Muslim'. The same discourse was adopted by the Republican People's Party after the visit of Khaled Mashal of the Hamas organization on an invitation by the Justice and Development Party in February 2006 with the argument: 'what are we going to say when Israel invites the PKK leadership to Jerusalem?'

The Welfare Party was also harshly criticized for engaging in a rapprochement with Iran, despite the fact that Iran had directly supported the PKK through the 1990s.³³⁵ The Welfare Party invitation of the Iranian minister of foreign affairs *Ali Welayati* by the Republican People's Party. Ali Dinçer asked: “What is the Iranian minister of foreign affairs Velayeti doing [in Turkey]? [...] We know that PKK's hit squads are stationed in Iran” highlighting the fact that Velayeti could not visit Germany because Germany considered Iran to be involved in terrorism. Such accusations of double-standards towards terrorism have been one of the most frequent inter-Turkish critical

³³⁴ Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 4: 8 October 1996, pg. 19

³³⁵ On this, see: Howard, Roger (2004) *Iran in Crisis? Nuclear ambitions and the American response*. (New York: Zed books) pp. 79-80.

discourses.

4. Criticism of the US, EU and other foreign entities: The ‘dark powers’ discourse

As discussed earlier, Turkish memories of the Sevres Treaty of 1920 that sought to partition Turkey can be regarded as still very much alive and the latent psychosis behind Turkish foreign policy. The fact that the Sevres Treaty sought to create separate states out of the defeated Ottoman Empire based on ethnic-linguistic borders, created a 'Sevres syndrome'³³⁶ in Turkey that regarded any foreign involvement, statement or declaration on the minorities of Turkey as 'inciting separatism' and a threat to its territorial integrity.

Within this framework, there were many lines of criticisms towards the United States in the 1990s. First of such discourses focused on the US Congress measures that sought to cut and limit aid to Turkey by pointing to its human rights abuses.³³⁷ During the opening ceremony of the TGNA in 1994, Süleyman Demirel criticized a recent decision of the US Congress to restrict military loans to Turkey “[...] what the United States provides to Turkey is not grant, but loan [...] these loans will be paid back together with interest [...] Under these circumstances, I am sorry to see that the US Congress has conditioned this loan upon Cyprus and human rights violations and that the President has confirmed this cut”.³³⁸ Through the course of foreign aid programs towards Turkey (either by the US or EU) highlighting the payback clauses of such programs became a popular argumentative position either in order to de-emphasize the importance of these aids, or to refute allegations coming from opposition parties that political concessions being given in

³³⁶ Jung, D. 'The Sevres Syndrome: Turkish Foreign Policy and its Historical Legacy', in Bjorn Moller (ed.) *Oil and Water: Cooperative Security in the Persian Gulf*, London: I.B. Tauris, 2001

³³⁷ This is dealt with extensively in Chapter 4 on the US Congress

³³⁸ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 1: 1 September 1994

exchange for foreign financial support.

The launch of the Operation Provide Comfort (OPC) in March 1991 through UN Resolution 688, gradually became the main focus of Turkish criticisms towards the United States as the right wing politicians had argued that the no-fly zone established over the Kurdish areas of Iraq would eventually destabilize Turkey. The general sense of the Assembly was that the OPC was contributing to the aggravation of the security situation within Turkey, specifically vis-à-vis the PKK. For example on 7 October 1994³³⁹, Esat Bütün (Great Union Party-Kahramanmaraş) argued that: “[Turkish south-east], especially after the Gulf War, became much like a busy tavern” indicating the massive influx of refugees without proper identification and passport controls. Bütün also expressed the mainstream conservative discourse in Turkey which drew a connection between the no-fly zone in northern Iraq and the PKK: “[...] terrorist acts have increased because of the power vacuum in northern Iraq”.

Since the OPC operations were executed by American and British jets stationed in the Incirlik airbase in Adana, Turkey, the extension or suspension of the operation depended the voting in the TGNA. However, since the OPC was unpopular with a majority of the parliamentarians in the TGNA, despite the fact that it was well-known that this cooperation served as the basis of strategic partnership between the US and Turkey, legislative sessions on OPC extension votings were very heated. On 28 October 1995³⁴⁰, Abdüllatif Şener (Welfare Party-Sivas) criticized constant extension of the OPC and argued the operation was fuelling the insurgency:

³³⁹ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 17: 7 October 1994

³⁴⁰ Term 19, Year 5, Sitting 17. October 28, 1995.

“65 million [Turkish citizens] are against it, the parliamentarians are against it; but just because the United States wants it, the term of the OPC gets extended here every six months. Just a little while ago you were asking 'why hasn't terror stopped, why doesn't it stop?' [...] but if the mentality is wrong, the direction is wrong, if you listen to [Bill] Clinton's directions, terror can't stop in this country, it can't be stopped”.

This line of criticism of the opposition aimed to portray governing parties as if they were acting on direct orders from the United States, hence not capable of exerting authority over Turkish foreign policy. Moreover, such arguments were often followed by related expressions of belief that the US supported the PKK and that this support for the PKK was the official policy of the United States. In the same debate, Cevat Ayhan (Welfare Party-Sakarya) pointed to three cases involving the reports on adverse effects of the OPC on Turkey. The first one was the reported incident where “a British officer on duty under the OPC had slapped the local municipal in the face”, whereas the second one was another reported incident in which “the United States helicopters dropped aid materials to the terrorists pinned down in the Cudi mountains” and the third one being “the harassment of the helicopter of Eşref Bitlis³⁴¹ by American helicopters”. As much as the criticism of the OPC was multi-partisan in the TGNA, the Islamist Welfare Party and its successors spearheaded much of the discursive efforts to prevent extension of the operation.

In a variation of this position, the United States was constructed within the more general 'dark foreign powers' discourse, indirectly mentioned by not actually spelled. The obscurity of the 'foreign powers' discourse often constructed a global system where 'the whole world is against Turkey', a belief, which is fed by the Turkish far-right nationalist motto 'There is no friend to the Turk, except the Turk'. This view constructed even the United States and Iran within the same

³⁴¹ Then commander of the Gendarmerie forces.

'alliance', conspiring against Turkey, since the United States sought to enable favorable conditions for the development of an autonomous Kurdish region in northern Iraq and Iran was actively supporting the PKK. For example Erdoğan Toprak (Republican People's Party-Istanbul) argued, "Since the Gulf war, Turkey has been experiencing the greatest depression of its history" adding "The Kurdish state 'game', organized by the foreign powers, is fuelling [terrorism]; the dirty cooperation against Turkey is being explicitly laid down"³⁴².

The European Union was also frequently criticized by conservative parliamentarians in the TGNA. A major line of argument ran in parallel with the 'Sevres syndrome' discourses and basically stated that the European Union accession process was a covert tactic adopted by 'Europe' in order to partition Turkey. This line of argumentation also highlighted ethnic conflicts within Europe, leading to argumentative 'counter-attacks' along the lines of 'they have the same problem too' and that, Turkey wasn't doing anything more with regard to its Kurdish problem, than the Europeans are doing with regard to their own problems. This type of discourse was more frequently adopted before periods of reform, during which conservative parliamentarians objected reform suggesting 'we are doing reform because the EU wants it'. In addition, these discourses often constructed a 'threat from within' – Turkish liberals or pro-EU groups – that were complaining about Turkey's shortcomings to Europe. Some in the TGNA believed that the reason why European Union conditioned acceptance of Turkey into the Customs Union to the amendment of the anti-terror law was because of these 'certain groups' inside Turkey. Erdoğan Toprak had claimed: "We are not intervening to Spain's Basque issue, France's Corsica issue, UK's IRA issue. When officials of the West come to Turkey, our semi-intellectuals ask them to tie the Kurdish

³⁴² Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 11: October 23, 1996

question to the customs union”.³⁴³

After Öcalan had fled to Italy in late-1998 after Syria expelled him, parliamentary criticism of the European Union intensified. The Assembly belief on what Öcalan was doing in Italy showed a difference in perception with that of the Italian members of the EP as mentioned in Chapter 3. Algan Hacaloğlu (Republican People’s Party-Istanbul) claimed³⁴⁴ that: “[Abdullah Öcalan] first went to Russia from Syria, then settled into a villa in Italy” adding that “The separatist organization leader, [is] now enjoying his life in that villa in Italy [...]”. While some Italian MEPs had criticized the Italian government for letting Öcalan out of the country too soon and whereas some other Italian MEPs criticized the government for even admitting Öcalan into Italy, Turkish parliamentarians believed Italy’s admission of Öcalan was a proof that PKK’s attempt to politically re-configure its separatist aims in Europe was meeting positive signals from the EU. It would be amusing - if the connotations of this problem weren’t so problematic – to see that while Italian MEPs were frequently reminding Turkey of its international obligations and treaties vis-à-vis its conduct towards the Kurds, Hacaloğlu too, was reminding Italian MEPs of Italy’s international obligations, claiming: “Italy has to fulfill its obligations under international treaties to which it is a party to, of being a legalistic state and being our ally under NATO”. Even more interesting, Hacaloğlu was accusing an EU member by quoting Human Rights Watch, hitting back at the European Parliament by its own methods: “In their letter to the Italian presidency dated 21 November 1998, the Human Rights Watch based in New York [...] has highlighted that Öcalan was the leader of a terrorist organization responsible for many innocent deaths in Europe, that he has to be arrested and put to trial because of this and that his denounce of terrorism now, wouldn’t

³⁴³ Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 11: 23 October 1996

³⁴⁴ Term 20, Year 4, Sitting 23: 24 November 1998

nullify his earlier offenses [...]” adding “if Italy doesn't take us seriously, they should listen to the prestigious Human Rights Watch”. This was one of the very rare instances in which a human rights organization was praised in the TGNA.

The 'dark foreign powers' discourse had many variations and sub-discourses. One of the more observable variations was to refer to 'dark powers' within the context of their collective 'aim' of creating a greater Armenia or even a greater Israel by using the Kurdish problem. Since the terms of the Sevres Treaty sought to establish a greater Armenia, such an argument belongs to the 'Sevres Syndrome' discourse family. However, the inclusion of Israel into the discourses has more religious undertones than the mainstream nationalist discourse. However, the fact that Turkey and Israel have traditionally been allies and partners, construction of the 'greater Israel' discourse - which is an Islamic fundamentalist argument – within the context of the Kurdish question suggests that this has been a party-specific (i.e. Islamist) discourse, not shared by the rest of the parties in the TGNA. For example on 13 September 1994³⁴⁵, parliamentarian Musa Demirci (Welfare Party-Sivas) criticized 'dark powers' for what he believed to be their aim of carving out a greater Armenia or Israel using the PKK: “By the support of the dark powers, terror has [...] come to Sivas. What are the projects [of dark power]? A greater Armenia east of Sivas; or a greater Israel? [...] Each time different methods are being used, forests are burned, villages are destroyed, people are killed”. Through this line of argumentation the earlier TGNA obscurity over who undertook the village burnings was safely exported to unspecified 'dark powers'; perhaps the most frequently adopted explanation of any unexplained negativity in Turkey.

Arguments linking Greece or Armenia to the PKK were not rare. The Armenian ASALA

³⁴⁵ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 5: September 13, 1994

(the Armenian Army for the Secret Liberation of Armenia) organization was created in 1975 in Lebanon and undertook numerous bombing operations on Turkish targets in Europe, as well as assassinating a large number of Turkish Foreign Service officials.³⁴⁶ On the other hand Greece directly supported the PKK through the 1990s too as Öcalan's capture on his way out of the Greek Embassy in Nairobi shows³⁴⁷. The PKK received ample support from Armenia and Greece since its establishment and this support gradually evolved into an Armenian and Greek state policy in order to keep the Turkish army occupied. On 18 October 1994³⁴⁸, Seyfi Şahin pointed to this foreign support to the PKK; but this time with an exaggeration by arguing the PKK was actually created by Armenia: “In the near past, we had ASALA. When they understood they couldn’t succeed, they [with a feeling of vengeance] created PKK instead of ASALA and unleashed it on Turkey. It is supported by Greece, and unfortunately our close neighbors Armenia and Syria and their big brothers³⁴⁹”. While Şahin argued that the PKK was founded by “[...] originally Armenian, Abdullah Öcalan³⁵⁰ [...] to create a Kurdistan, destroy it and then create a greater Armenia”, he expressed his belief that “In order to eradicate this problem, Turkey should take every social, psychological, military, policing measures, create a special division and should destroy this Armenian – not Kurdish – organization at its home”, suggesting military action against Armenia.

A final example to the discursive construction of the 'siege mentality' suffered by Turkey

³⁴⁶ For more on ASALA, see: Kurz, Anat and Ariel Merari (1985) *ASALA: Irrational terror or political tool?* (Jerusalem: JCSS Press).

³⁴⁷ An extensive review of the Greece’s involvement and support for the PKK, see: Marcus, Aliza (2007) *Blood and Belief: the PKK and the Kurdish fight for independence* (New York: NYU Press) pp. 277-230

³⁴⁸ Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 20: October 18, 1994.

³⁴⁹ Meaning the United States and the European Union.

³⁵⁰ The speaker does not specify his sources regarding the ethnic background of Abdullah Öcalan, but Aliza Marcus claims: “The area where he grew up was populated by Kurds, Turks and Armenians and the different peoples mixed easily, going to school together, doing business, and among the Muslim villages at least, also intermarrying. Öcalan’s grandmother on his mother’s side, in fact, was a Turk and he once claimed that his mother was as well.” Marcus, Aliza (2007) *Blood and Belief* (New York: NYU Press) p. 15

was İsmail Köse's (True Path Party-Erzurum) statement³⁵¹, who highlighted the assistance given to the PKK by Turkey's neighbours: "We know that Greek parliamentarians hold meetings with the PKK, that the PKK executes certain operations in Syria, and our neighbors allow certain PKK establishments in their countries" additionally highlighting Iranian involvement with the group quoting a statement from a general he did not identify: "We understood [from Iranian radio transmissions] that we were actually fighting the Iranians while we thought we were engaging the PKK. We killed 2 [Iranian soldiers]". Köse also quoted the leader of the northern Iraqi faction Kurdistan Democratic Party, Mustafa Barzani on his statement on the EU aid: "[From a recent statement] we understand from Barzani, that all German and EU humanitarian aid ends up in PKK's hands"

5. Conclusion

This chapter aimed to provide an overview of the major discourse-context families in the Turkish Grand National Assembly on the Kurdish issue. I have identified these discourse-contexts as human rights, democracy, excessive force, economic-developmental, legalistic and cultural rights-ethnicity-identity.

In terms of the human rights discourse, TGNA was divided. On the one hand there was a sub-discourse in which parliamentarians argued that Turkey respected human rights, even of the Iraqis across the border and on the other, another sub-discourse, which converged with the critical discourses of the EU Parliament and US Congress. One conservative sub-discourse on human rights focused on the safeguards in the Turkish legal system that prevent torture and other abuses, arguing that 'it is impossible for such abuses to exist in Turkey'. The second conservative sub-

³⁵¹ Term 20, Year 3, Sitting 125: 21 July 1998

discourse pointed to the human rights abuses in other countries, asserting that there was 'nothing wrong' with Turkish approach to the Kurdish question. Human rights monitors or organizations were also constructed as 'separatists' within the conservative discourse, who helped the 'propaganda activities of the PKK'. The primary liberal discourse on human rights on the other hand criticized the conservative argument that pointed to the legal safeguards in the constitution and argued such 'easy escape' prevented any conclusive settlement on the identification of the torturers. The second line of liberal discourse argued that torture was systematic and now 'an everyday thing' with the prisoners or convicts. Third line of liberal discourse criticized the security force excuses on torture: 'we did it because of security concerns / to maintain order', arguing for the necessity of the establishment of governmental institutions that could provide an alternative channel of observation.

Discourses on the democracy aspect of the Kurdish question also showed variance. First line of liberal discourse focused on the danger over electoral rights of the constituents of the emptied villages, arguing in favor of adding them to the constituencies of the cities they had migrated to. A conflict between the liberal and conservative definitions on democracy was also explicit in terms of the recognition of 'Kurds as Kurds'. While the liberal line constructed democracy within the context of free expression and recognition of minorities, the conservative discourse on democracy was focused on 'equality and Turkish-ness' of all citizens. First line of distinctly conservative arguments favored the existence of 'limits to democracy' since 'too much' of it would lead to the disintegration of the country. The liberal variant of this, favored debate and free discussion of 'even separatist ideas' even though one might not identify with them. The crux of this distinction appears to be acceptance of two different versions of democracy, one favoring

the early 20th century European version, which emphasized equality and citizenship and second adopting the post-modern definition, which emphasized recognition, identity political and free expression. Based on this difference, the Emergency measures or Emergency rule super-governorships were constructed as 'democratic' within the conservative discourse (since they tried to establish security equally to all citizens), whereas within the liberal discourse they were exceedingly 'undemocratic' (since they had bypassed Constitutional rights and engaged in a wide-array of counter-terrorism methods, from limiting freedom of expression to authorizing arrests without indictment).

Excessive force discourses were generally adopted by the liberal parliamentarians. While some parliamentarians constructed security force abuses as 'state terrorism', some others constructed it within the context of 'government incompetence'. Village burnings were an important topic of excessive force arguments. In terms of such burnings, the liberal argument pointed to the utility of villages for PKK's methods such as supply or accommodation, arguing that 'the PKK wouldn't want those villages to be burned', an argument which sharply contrasts with the conservative argument 'if a village is burned, it is the doing of the PKK'. In parliamentarians' reports on excessive force, quoting or mentioning meetings with regional administrators were an observable trend. While this tendency indirectly showed parliamentarians' lack of trust to official statements that explain village burnings through PKK violence, it also became a discursive tactic in which liberal parliamentarians defended their arguments against conservative politicians who adopted the official state discourse. Liberal parliamentarians generally explained practice of excessive force by pointing to lack of communication between super-governors and the military branches, as well as within the military branch itself. Moreover,

such reports of misconduct generally ended with a statement criticizing the decision-making bodies because of their disregard of these abuses. While the parliamentarians of the liberal line argued that village evacuations benefited the PKK in the long run, they also complained about the 'lack of accountability' of the security forces.

The security discourse was another multi-partisan discourse, albeit with more preference by the conservative parliamentarians. One type of argumentative method constructed security within the context of parliamentarians' obligations towards their constituencies, highlighting the state's responsibility in providing security. Within this parent discourse, military and police chiefs were criticized for their lack of awareness and preparedness, as well as governing coalitions were told to 'step down' if they couldn't provide security. In defense to security deficit criticisms, the governmental discourses have focused on the 'difficulty of combating the PKK' even in violent incidents irrelevant with the group. Security discourses were also generally supported by statistical data such as villages or hospitals destroyed by the PKK in order to highlight the difficulties in fighting terrorism.

Economic-developmental discourses focused on the poverty aspect of the Kurdish question. According to proponents of this discourse, the source of the Kurdish problem was economic in nature and if sufficient amount of money could be injected into the region, the problem would be solved. Southeastern Anatolian Project (GAP) was constructed as a 'savior of the region' in economic terms and was thought to be capable of bringing an end to PKK terrorism through creating jobs. Independent from this project, other parliamentarians favored reallocation of funds from the military branch into the farming and agricultural sectors. A second type of

developmental discourse focused on education. Within the educational discourse, one type of sub-discourse constructed the Kurdish problem as a 'problem of education', whereas the second type constructed this problem within the context of religious education, favoring expansion and proliferation of the Imam-Hatip schools towards the Kurdish region in order to prevent PKK recruitment.

The sixth parent-discourse contained legalistic arguments, constructing the Kurdish question within the parameters of law and constitution. One variation of the legalistic discourse referred to the Kurdish question as a 'problem of law' because of the belief that Turkish state approach towards the issues was not 'legal', whereas the second variation identified Kurdish question as a legal problem because of the challenge to the government authority in the region. There were also confusions over the definition of terror and terrorist; a confusion, which was, manifested itself during parliamentarians' exchanges discussing whether public intellectuals associated with the political left were supporters of terrorism or not. Additionally, post-legal reform discourses generally highlighted and portrayed pre-amendment measures as legally 'inefficient', even though such measures might have been defended before the reform period. Finally, the fourth variation of the legalistic discourses constructed state obligations within the context of a 'new set of constitutional requirements' when counter-terrorism operations are taking place.

Autonomy-ethnicity-culturalist discourses expressed the tension and problem over the Kurdish identity in Turkey, with regard to identity. While the far-right conservative discourse denied the existence of 'a thing called Kurd', the mainstream conservative discourse in Turkey

(which is also the official state perspective) identified Kurds as 'Kurds, but Turkish by citizenship'. According to the mainstream conservative discourse, the existence of Kurdish ethnicity was recognized but was deemed irrelevant, since before law everybody was Turkish and equal. One variance of the liberal discourse on Kurdish identity argued that Kurds were subject to 'Turkification' and only solution to the problem would come from identifying Kurds as a distinct minority group. The far-left variant of this argument maintained that PKK was an outlet to the nationalist aspirations of the Kurdish people since Kurdish media, textbooks, or schools did not exist. While according to the conservative position, grant of cultural rights would strengthen PKK, liberal variant argued that not granting such rights were keeping the PKK alive and justified in the eyes of Kurds. Some variant of the far-right conservative discourse also maintained that 'Kurdishness' did not exist and was an invention of the PKK.

The most frequent inter-Turkish criticism concerned security. Opposition members frequently criticized the government and the state for their inability to provide security. The MPs of the governing parties on the other hand, had blamed the opposition government arguing that they have 'inherited a ruin'. This discourse was more frequently adopted by the parliamentarians of the southeastern cities that suffered most from the PKK. A second line of inter-Turkish criticism concerned extra-judicial practices of the security forces such as killing suspects without trial. On this, not only policemen but also police chiefs and governors were also criticized for not disciplining security personnel who act against the law. A third line of criticism concerned political profiteering over the PKK issue. Most opposition parties criticized ruling parties for seeking political capital over the fight against terrorism and demanded that the Kurdish issue should not be used for party-political purposes. In addition to this, the opposition parties also

criticized governing coalition parties because of occasionally inconsistent statements made by the members of either party regarding the Kurdish question. This inconsistency was most evident during the period of uncertainty over who was behind the village burnings. Another line of criticism concerned governmental meetings with foreign organizations that other countries regarded as terrorists. Welfare Party's meeting with the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and their invitation of the Iranian foreign minister while Iran supported the PKK can be provided as examples to this.

In terms of foreign criticisms, the most frequent targets were the United States and Europe. In terms of the United States, criticism focused on the Congress restrictions of financial assistance, the establishment of the no-fly zone over northern Iraq that created a de facto Kurdish autonomous region in northern Iraq and also the behavior of British or American military personnel towards their Turkish counterparts. On the other hand, the EU was criticized for using the Kurdish question in order to extract concessions from Turkey through the EU candidacy process, allowing PKK's acolyte organizations in EU capitals and directly aiding the PKK under the pretext of humanitarian aid. Other than the United States and the EU, Greece, Armenia, Iran, Syria and Italy (for harboring the PKK leader Öcalan) were also frequently criticized in the TGNA.

5.1 How did discourse affect policy in the TGNA with regard to the Kurdish question?

Of the three legislatures analyzed in this study, the Turkish Grand National Assembly comes out as the least powerful in terms of its discourses' concrete policy-making power. Indeed, some may consider the TGNA through the 1990s as a 'talking shop' in this regard, having very little (if any) policy influence over the Kurdish question. However, this shouldn't be interpreted as

the TGNA's inactivity or unwillingness to exert influence over the Kurdish question. In fact, especially the Social-Democratic Left Party and Welfare Party members have frequently challenged the hegemonic discourse and in doing so, became the primary participants in the TGNA's policy powers as granted by the Turkish Constitution. In such instances members of the Assembly have submitted formal inquiries to the government members on the human rights violations in the south-east, called for and spearheaded parliamentary fact-finding studies and in some cases succeeded in mounting serious challenges to the official state discourse on the Kurdish question.

However, during my survey of the 1990-99 period of the TGNA discourses, I have arrived at the conclusion that much of the incidents that took place in the south-east suffered a 'fog of war': I infer from the debate transcripts that the TGNA had too little information about the details of the events that daily took place in the region, let alone having any sort of authority to influence these events. This lack of information was partly deliberate; many TGNA members frequently complained that the military apparatus was hiding information coming from the region on purpose; because it considered itself as the sole authority in charge of the operations in the region. In that sense, any incident that happened there was considered as 'wartime intelligence' and thus was not shared with the civilian authorities. The military leadership did inform the public about the events in the south-east through official reports, however such reports receive criticism from the TGNA members for 'not reflecting the truth'. This is why in 1996 and 1997, mistrust towards the military in particular and the state apparatus in general, grew so intense that some of the TGNA members offered to set up an independent parliamentary fact-finding and monitoring group. But still, such independent fact finding groups faced severe restrictions on what they can

observe and report in the south-east and met a hostile reaction from some of the military leadership there. One of the most important cases of this is the incident in the winter of 1997 when a TGNA fact-finding mission investigating forced village evacuations in Bitlis was fired upon by a tank belonging to the Bitlis mechanized brigade. The details of this incident can be found in the TGNA open session transcript dated November 11, 1997. Although of course, firing upon the elected representatives of Turkey has never been an official policy of the Turkish Armed Forces, I have come across evidence in the transcripts that there was a major and serious chain of command problem between the military headquarters in Ankara, the main Gendarmerie headquarters in Diyarbakır and smaller command outposts scattered through the emergency region. I can infer from the evidence in the transcripts that many of the village burning and evacuation incidents were carried out through a separate and I must say independent chain of command within the Turkish military apparatus. The best example to this can be provided in the village burning incidents in 1994 Bitlis, carried out by the commando paratroopers from Diyarbakır and Bolu bases, without the knowledge of the commander of the Bitlis regiment, who was in charge of all military operations in this province. This is why, many members of the Turkish Armed Forces, as well as the Armed Forces as an institution, came under criticism and scrutiny due to military activities carried out under their area of operations, but not *by* their command or knowledge. That is why the ‘fog of war’ in question was not only valid for the TGNA members, but also for the military leadership in Ankara, whose ability to co-ordinate and supervise all military activities in the region was apparently limited, allowing certain elements within the armed forces to develop a separate agenda and act on their own.

This is why, the TGNA was unable to exert its authorities as granted by the Constitution

and although some parliamentarians did spend much effort towards this end, the TGNA was also widely polarized, scattered and disorganized to be able to make any difference on the Kurdish question. Due to the ‘fog of war’ in the region that even the armed forces could not cope with, the discourse in the TGNA generally took the form of nationalistic rhetoric without any policy implications.

The following chapter will offer a quantitative analysis of chapter 3, 4 and 5 and offer a comparative perspective of the discourses in the European Parliament, US Congress and the TGNA.

CHAPTER 6

Quantitative Analysis

Impact of ideology and agenda on legislative perceptions of the Kurdish question

In chapters 3, 4 and 5, I have presented an overview and qualitative analysis of the discourse types in the European Parliament, US Congress and Turkish Grand National Assembly, respectively. This chapter is a comparative quantitative analysis of the data gathered from these last 3 chapters and offers a rather unorthodox approach to discourse analysis by adopting a statistical methodology. All of the data used in this chapter (unless stated otherwise) are part of my own dataset, gathered through detailed analysis of the legislative transcripts from three legislatures analyzed in this dissertation. The reader can find more details on how the data was gathered and coded in the Appendix section.

There is an ongoing debate within the literature on political science methodology, where one position argues that discourse analysis is a strictly qualitative study as a ‘methodological meta-other’ of quantitative methods such statistics³⁵², the competing position maintains that statistical analysis and quantitative results it produces can be practiced as an alternative method to mainstream discourse analysis³⁵³. I hold the view that qualitative and quantitative approaches to

³⁵² This is especially valid for what is referred as ‘Foucauldian discourse analysis’. See for example: Alvesson, Mats. ‘Varieties of discourse: On the study of Organizations through discourse analysis’. *Human Relations*. Vol. 53, no. 9. Winter, 2000. pp. 1125-1149, Graham, Linda. ‘Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault’. Paper presented at Australian Association for Research in Education. November 27, 2005 and Miller, Gale and Robert Dingwall (1997) *Context and method in qualitative research*. (London: Sage)

³⁵³ See for example: Munck, Gerardo and Jay Verkulien. ‘Conceptualizing and Measuring democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices’. *Comparative Political Studies*. Vol. 35 Issue: 1. February 2002. pp. 5.34, Henry, Dean E. ‘The numeration of events: studying political protest in India’ in Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (eds)

discourse analysis are in fact complementary, let alone being mutually exclusive methods. In that sense, classical/mainstream discourse analysis can be fed perfectly by adopting appropriate statistical methods, especially with the studies on institutional discourse over an extended period of time. In many ways, studies of legislative discourse are excellent case studies for the adoption of this two-tier methodological approach.

The workflow of the quantitative analysis of discourses as presented in this chapter pursued a two-tier methodology:

- 1- **Identifying a hypothesis:** Our primary concern in this dissertation is to identify similarities in independent variables between recurring discursive constructions of the Kurdish question. To come up with underlying sub-hypotheses, I analyzed all of the open legislative session debates in three legislatures mentioned in this dissertation, from January 1990 to December 1999 and identified recurring discursive themes (discussed in detail in the last three chapters). I have also conducted interviews with around forty experts and senior staff working on or in three legislatures analyzed in this dissertation, which helped a great deal in terms of refining and doing preliminary tests of sub-hypotheses. As a result of this data collection/verification process, I have come up with three hypotheses to be tested with regard to three legislatures:
 - a. **Ideology and agenda (country affiliation) in the European Parliament:** In the political continuum of left-right, as a MEP's position approaches the political right,

(2006) *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. (Sharpe). pp. 187-202, Paxton, Pamela 'Women's Suffrage in the measurement of democracy: Problems of Operationalization' *Studies in Comparative International Development*. Vol. 35, Issue: 3. Fall, 2000 pp. 92-111 and Blanchard, Eric 'Beyond Geertz: Discourse Analysis as a Qualitative Method'. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. February 4, 2002.

s/he constructs the Kurdish question increasingly within the state discourse (terrorism, territorial integrity, perpetuity of the state and security). If a MEP's position approaches to the political left on the other hand, s/he constructs the Kurdish question increasingly within the context of liberties and emancipation (human rights, democracy, state violence and identity recognition).³⁵⁴ Second, I will also test whether MEPs representing particular countries, and thus have a non-partisan, nationalist agenda have performed differently than others.

- b. **Agenda in the US Congress:** The ideological difference between the Republican and the Democrat parties in the US Congress has less effect on the discourse with regard to the Kurdish question. The main determinant of a Congressperson's discourse on the Kurdish question appears to be his/her caucus memberships. Therefore I propose that: "If a member of the Congress belongs to a legislative group or a special interest caucus whose agenda overlaps with the Kurdish interest (for example, I will test affiliation with the human rights, Hellenic and Armenian caucuses), s/he constructs the Kurdish question within the context of liberties and emancipation. If a member of the Congress does not belong to any of such groups, s/he will construct the Kurdish question increasingly on par with the State discourse
- c. **Ideology (party-affiliation) and agenda (constituency) in the TGNA:** Ideology and agenda also play some role in the TGNA discourses on the Kurdish question, however I propose that: "If a legislator represents cities that are under the jurisdiction of emergency super-governorate, s/he will construct the Kurdish question within the context of liberties and emancipation, whereas if they come

³⁵⁴ An extensive review of the State versus emancipatory discourse can be found in Chapter 2: Theoretical overview.

from non-emergency regions, they construct the Kurdish question within the context of terrorism, state security and territorial integrity.”³⁵⁵

- 2- **Operationalization:** The primary operationalization method was counting and sorting the aggregate number of discourses according to their type. Then, I have re-sorted these discourse types by legislative session in order to do a time-frequency analysis of the change in discursive patterns over time. Another re-sorting was necessary, this time by the corresponding legislator, in order to come up with an analysis of the discourse type and frequency of the Kurdish question by party-affiliation, caucus-affiliation and constituency.

The rest of the chapter will discuss these variances in quantitative terms, whereas detailed supporting statistical documentation is provided in the appendix. I will follow the chapter order, starting with the European Parliament, and then looking into the US Congress and finally, the TGNA.

1. The European Parliament

In my analysis of the European Parliament discourse on the Kurdish question, I will first look at how agenda (country affiliation: which member country MEPs represent) affects legislative discourse. Later, I will test whether party (ideology) affiliation has any effect on this.

1.1 Agenda: Country-affiliation

In the EP, total number of references to the Kurdish problem within the discourse types

³⁵⁵ An extensive discussion of the emergency super-governors can be found in Chapter 5 on TGNA.

mentioned in chapter 4 has been 563 (total number of n = discourse). Agenda, as defined by country activity in the EP can be measured in two ways. First, one can look at the total number of discourses adopted by each country. The most active countries have been in terms of total number of n are:

	Aggregate discourses	Activity in percentage
Germany	112	19.89%
Greece	111	19.71%
United Kingdom	71	12.61%
France	63	11.19%
Netherlands	60	10.65%

Table 1 - European Parliament (EP): Activity by Country (See Appendix I, pp. 2-11)

These countries are followed by Italy, Belgium, Sweden, Austria, Spain, Ireland and Denmark in descending order of n .

Two prevailing hypotheses may help explain the frequency of an EU country with regard to its MEPs' speech activity on the Kurdish issue. First hypothesis will be '*MEPs of a country with large Kurdish population have adopted more discourses on the Kurdish issue*'. To test this, an analysis between the dependent variable (aggregate number of discourses) and the independent variable (Kurdish population) has to be made. This will provide us with a general pattern within the EP with regard to this hypothesis, as well as outliers that render this hypothesis insignificant. The following a regression analysis which tests the relationship between the number of discourses of a country and that country's Kurdish population. The estimated numbers of Kurdish population are collected from the Paris Kurdish Institute:

	Estimated Kurdish population ³⁵⁶	Number of MEP discourses	Kurdish Population represented per discourse
Germany	550,000	112	4910.71
France	110,000	66	1666.67
Netherlands	75,000	60	1250.00
Belgium	55,000	35	1571.42
Austria	55,000	14	3928.57
Sweden	27,000	21	1285.71
United Kingdom	22,000	71	309.85
Greece	22,000	110	200.00
Denmark	9,000	7	1285.71
Italy	3,500	40	87.50
Finland	2,500	1	2500

Table 2 - EP activity and Kurdish population represented

In terms of ‘Kurdish population represented per discourse’ measurements, German MEPs (most notably Claudia Roth of the Green group) have indeed produced most of the discourse on the Kurdish question, while hosting the largest Kurdish Diaspora in Europe. However, a hypothesis asserting, “MEPs of the countries with large Kurdish population produces more discourses on the Kurdish question” appears not to be true for the rest of the EU countries. Two of the countries that follow Germany in terms of MEP activity on the Kurdish question (Greece and United Kingdom) host one of the smallest Kurdish Diasporas in Europe – an estimated 22,000 Kurds each. These two countries are also runners-up in the ‘Kurdish population represented per discourse’ measurements; however counter intuitively, Italian MEPs stand out as being the most representative of Italy’s Kurdish Diaspora, representing 87.5 Kurds per discourse.

Therefore, the first hypothesis seems to be flawed: the size of the Kurdish Diaspora in an EU country doesn’t necessarily affect its MEPs’ activities in the EP. Germany confirms our hypothesis in the sense that German MEPs have produced the most discourses on the Kurdish

³⁵⁶ These figures are taken from Institut Kurde de Paris web-page on the ‘Kurdish Diaspora’, (accessed May 29, 2009) <<http://www.institutkurde.org/en/kurdorama>>. Estimates are as of October 2008.

question while Germany was the country with the largest Kurdish Diaspora in Europe, but the fact that Greek, British and Italian MEPs have represented the smallest group of Kurds in their country, per discourse they have uttered, is a counter-fact against this hypothesis.

Second hypothesis that may explain an EU country's activity in the EP would be: '*Countries with more seats in the EP produce more discourses on the Kurdish question*'. To measure this hypothesis, we have to have 'discourse per MEP' measurement, which will provide us how many discourses a country uttered divided by its seats in the European Parliament. To do this we look at the ratio of the total number of discourses (n) to the arithmetic mean (AM) of the number of the Members of the Parliament (MEP) of each country in two EP election terms, revealing the 'discourse per MEP' measurements. With this measurement, Greece tops the list:

	Number of discourses	Average mean of MEPs through 1990-1999	Discourse per MEP
Greece	111	24	4.62
Netherlands	60	27	2.22
Belgium	35	24	1.46
Germany	112	99	1.13
Sweden	21	19	1.10

Table 3 - EP activity: Average and Discourse per MEP

Therefore Greece has been the most active country in the EP on Turkey's Kurdish question both by being just behind Germany based on aggregate discourses (19.71% of total discourses) and 'discourse per MEP' measurement (4.62 discourses per MEP). Other active countries are Germany, UK, France and Netherlands on the aggregate scale and Netherlands, Belgium, Sweden and Germany on the 'discourse per MEP' measurement, all in descending order.

A country-based analysis of the EP discourses on the Kurdish issue gives us very little recurring patterns to come up with a successful hypothesis. However, the lack of such an overarching pattern supports our claim that agenda (as defined by country) did play some role in the European Parliament. Among all of the EU member countries however, Greece stands out as the most extreme outlier with regard to the Kurdish question in Turkey, topping the country activity lists both in terms of ‘Kurdish population represented per discourse’ and ‘discourse per MEP’ measurements. It is safe to argue therefore, that European Parliament had become a forum in the 1990s, where Greece could internationalize its problems with Turkey by hijacking the Kurdish question debates; perhaps not necessarily aiming to improve the situation of the Kurds any more than to portray Turkish state as an excessively militaristic and undemocratic entity. To conclude, Greek MEPs’ perceptions of the Kurdish question come out primarily as agenda-oriented.

This finding is supported by looking at a break-down of country discourses by discourse types:

	HR ³⁵⁷	Dem	ExF	Trmil	PKK-t	iEUc	Country total
Austria	7	7	1	-	2	-	17
Belgium	11	9	5	-	5	3	33
Denmark	4	3	-	-	-	-	7
Finland	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
France	23	20	9	-	10	1	63
Germany	32	32	21	5	13	9	112
Greece	35	30	30	1	1	14	111
Ireland	5	-	1	-	2	-	8
Italy	18	9	3	3	5	2	40
Neth.	18	19	14	3	5	1	60
Port.	2	1	1	-	1	-	5
Spain	8	5	-	1	-	-	14
Sweden	8	4	4	1	2	1	20
UK	26	22	15	1	6	1	71
Discourse total	197	163	104	15	52	32	<u>563</u>

Table 4 - Discursive context and Country activity (see Appendix I, pp. 2-11)

This overview shows that Greece was the most frequent critic of Turkey's Kurdish question, especially within the human rights and excessive force discourses. In contrast, Greek MEPs have criticised the PKK violence least among other MEPs, while they are also the most frequent critics of the EU policy with regard to Turkey's Kurdish question. Overall, the most frequently adopted discourse in the EP has been the human rights discourse, which is followed by the democracy and excessive force discourses. Although the excessive force discourses are more frequent than criticisms of the PKK as a terrorist organization, the EP focused less on the Turkish military as the source of this excessive force and generally used rounded arguments that were directed towards all of the security forces (gendarme, police or secret service, together with the military). In many

³⁵⁷ These acronyms (from left to right) refer to discursive contexts: human rights, democratization, excessive force, criticism of the Turkish military, condemnation of the PKK, intra-EU criticism

ways, one can argue that prevalent TGNA belief regarding EP supporting the PKK, data shows to the contrary. While Greece comes out as the only country whose criticisms of the Turkish military overwhelmingly surpassed its criticisms of the PKK, the rest of the EU countries appear to have criticized the PKK more than the Turkish military. While Greece has been the most frequent critic of Turkey's human rights practices, Germany was the most dominant country constructing the Kurdish issue within the context of democratization. Greece was again the most frequent critic of Turkey's security practices against the Kurds, while it has criticized the PKK only once through the 1990s. Germany and France on the other hand, have been the most frequent critics of the PKK as a terrorist organization. Germany also criticized the Turkish army as the source of the Kurdish problem more frequently than any other country, perhaps as a result of the usage of German-origin weaponry in Turkey's military presence in the south-east.

Since there is not a clear correlation between a particular MEP's discourse activity on the Kurdish question and either a) the number of Kurds living in that particular country, or b) the number of seats that country has in the European Parliament, we move on to analyze this legislature based on party-affiliation (ideology), with our main finding from this section that agenda played a big role in how Greek MEPs perceived and talked about the Kurdish question. While we cannot use the findings based on a country-based analysis, this method is very valuable in terms of pointing to the outliers; countries that had either over- or under-performed based on the main trend in the European Parliament.

1.2 *Ideology: Group activity*

One of the primary hypothesis of this dissertation is: ‘party affiliation and ideology determines a parliamentarian’s discourse on the Kurdish issue’. In order to test party activity within this context, a similar calculation to the one in the first section has to be undertaken. First, the overall party activity in the European Parliament based on the total number of discourses (n) based on aggregate n for all the groups in EP = 555³⁵⁸.

Group	Aggregate number of n	Percentage
<i>Socialist Group, PSE</i>	175	31.53%
<i>Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, GUE-NGL</i>	129	23.24%
<i>Group of the Greens</i>	76	13.69%)
<i>Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe, ALDE</i>	70	12.61%
<i>Group of the European People’s Party (Christian Democrats) and European Democrats, EPP-ED</i>	63	11.35%
<i>Independence – Democracy Group, I-D</i>	42	7.56%

Table 5 - EP: Party-group Activity (see Appendix I, pp. 11-20)

In order to complement this list of party/group aggregate activity, it is important to look at ‘discourse per MEP’ measurement again; this time based on party-affiliation. MEP figures used in these calculations are the average mean of a group’s number of seats after the parliamentary elections in 1989 and 1994.

³⁵⁸ Excluding the Council and Commission discourses

	1989 seats³⁵⁹	1994 seats³⁶⁰	Average MEPs	Discourses per MEP
GUE-NGL	42	28	35	3.68
Greens	30	23	26.5	2.81
I-D	27	27	27	1.59
ALDE	49	43	46	1.52
PSE	180	198	189	0.92
EPP-ED	155	184	169.5	0.37

Table 6 - EP elections and discourse per MEP measurements

This means that every single MEP from the European United Left – Nordic Green Left group has – on average – adopted 3.68 discourses on the Kurdish question, rendering MEPs of this group most active in the Kurdish question in Turkey. The second group with most active MEPs on the Kurdish question is the Green group, whereas Independence-Democracy group, Alliance of Liberals and Democrats and the Socialist Group follow. The Christian Democrat – European Democrat MEPs come out as the least active group on the Kurdish question.

The hypothesis ‘*as the number of a group’s MEPs increases, so does the group’s aggregate discourses on the Kurdish question*’ appears to be weak. However, the groups that fit into this model are the European Socialist Group and Alliance for Liberals and Democrats for Europe, whose discourses on the Kurdish question appears to be on par with their seats in the EP. Yet the curve estimation is valuable in the sense that it allows us to see the outliers to the main trend: Independence - Democracy and the Christian Democrat – European Democrat group appear to be ‘uninterested’ on the Kurdish question, whereas Greens and Nordic left have been the most active groups. Therefore, this curve estimation analysis confirms our findings in the cross-

³⁵⁹ For a break-down of European Parliament seats based on party-affiliation (1989-1994) see: Europe Politique webiste (accessed May 15, 2009) <<http://www.europe-politique.eu/elections-europeennes-1989.htm>>

³⁶⁰ For a break-down of European Parliament seats based on party-affiliation (1994-1999) see: Europe Politique webiste (accessed May 15, 2009) <<http://www.europe-politique.eu/elections-europeennes-1994.htm>>

tabulation.

The break-down of the discourses by content, including those of the members of the Council or Commission present during the debates is as follows:

	HR³⁶¹	Dem	ExF	Trmil	PKK-t	iEUc	
PSE	61	58	33	4	16	3	175
EPP-ED	22	14	7	4	12	4	63
ALDE	25	22	11	5	7	0	70
GUE-NGL	38	35	30	4	7	15	129
Greens	15	25	19	6	6	5	76
I-D	18	9	7	0	5	3	42
Council-Commission	19	12	3	1	18	0	53

Table 7 - EP Party-Group activity per discursive context (see Appendix I, pp. 11-20)

This overview shows that European Socialists have constructed the Kurdish question within the context of human rights, democracy and use of excessive force more than any other group. It is also the most critical group in the EP towards PKK violence. The Green party has identified the Turkish military as the cause of the Kurdish problem more than any other group, whereas the United – Left / Nordic – Left was overwhelmingly the most critical group of the EU policies and stance of the European institutions towards the Kurdish question. While all other EP groups have constructed the Kurdish question within the context of human rights, the Green group has primarily referred to the Kurdish problem as an issue of democracy / democratization. Nordic-Green Left also constructed the Kurdish question as a problem of excessive force far more than any other group in the EP as a percentage of total discourses adopted per group. Council and Commission members too have constructed this problem as an issue of first, human rights, and

³⁶¹ These acronyms refer to (from left to right): human rights, democracy, excessive force, criticism of the Turkish military, condemnation of the PKK, intra-EU criticism.

then democratization. However these bureaucratic bodies did seldom refer to the excessive force dimension of the Kurdish problem and regarded the Kurdish question essentially as a ‘PKK problem’, which is the second most dominant type of discourse adopted by the Council and Commission.

Therefore our primary hypothesis for the European Parliament has some validation here. Ideology does play an important factor in terms of the discursive construction of the Kurdish question. Two of the leftist groups in the European Parliament (Nordic-Greens and Greens) share the discursive pattern of emphasizing Turkish security forces violations and playing down PKK terrorism, whereas the center-right European People’s Party referred less on Turkish military excesses and constructed this issue more within the domain of PKK terrorism. This center-right trend also converges with the executive organs of the EU (Council and Commission), which had also emphasized PKK violence and Turkey’s territorial integrity, overlooking Turkish military excesses in discursive terms. Therefore, our data validates our hypothesis: ‘In the political continuum of left-right, as a MEP’s position approaches the political right, s/he constructs the Kurdish question increasingly within the state discourse (terrorism, territorial integrity, perpetuity of the state and security). If a MEP’s position approaches to the political left on the other hand, s/he constructs the Kurdish question increasingly within the context of liberties and emancipation (human rights, democracy, state violence and identity recognition)’. On the other hand, there is no clear pattern of data that can validate a hypothesis regarding country-affiliation and Kurdish discourse; however still, we can infer a lot from looking at outliers to our test hypothesis. Although Germany had produced the most discourses on the Kurdish question in Turkey, this conforms to our test hypothesis since Germany has the largest Kurdish Diaspora in Europe and

also the largest number of MEPs in the European Parliament. It must be stated however, Claudia Roth, the chairwoman of the Green group, produced a great majority of German discourses on the Kurdish question in Turkey; so Germany's dominance in the European Parliament owes more to Roth's activism than Germany's sensitivity to the Kurdish question. In other words, Germany's discursive dominance has in fact an ideological dimension, since Green MEPs in the EP provided much of German discourses on the Kurdish question. Greece, on the other hand comes out as the most extreme outlier both in terms of 'discourse per MEP' and 'Kurdish population represented per discourse' measurements, rendering Greek MEPs clearly the most active (and also harshest) critics of Turkey's approach to the Kurdish question. However still, Greek MEPs' activity should not be attributed to country-affiliation, as Nordic-Green MEPs of Greece produced an overwhelming majority of Greek discourses on the Kurdish question in Turkey, whereas right-wing Greek MEPs were generally silent. When we look at 'discourse per MEP' measurement, Dutch MEPs follow Greece as the most active in terms of country-affiliation. Italy, France and Finland on the other hand, come out as the least active countries in 'discourse per MEP' measurement, whereas Austria and Finland come out as the least active countries in 'Kurdish population represented per discourse' measurement.

In terms of EP's discursive output in relation to its textual output, there doesn't appear to be a clear connection. Through the 1990s, the maximum number of resolutions adopted by the EP on the Kurdish question was 5, and corresponds to the years 1992, 1993 and 1994. However, only in years 1992 and 1994 did the EP match this text output in terms of discursive output; while the aggregate discourses in the EP was 106 in 1992, it reached its all-time high in 1994: 121 discourses. However in 1993 (another year with 5 resolutions), the EP did not discuss the Kurdish

question at all and produced no discourses in the legislative floor. On the other hand in 1994 was the second busiest year in terms of discursive activity by 114 discourses, while that year the EP did not pass any resolutions on the Kurdish question. This state suggests that there was not a clear relationship between discursive output and textual output and further studies can explore what caused this disconnection between discourse and practice in the EP.

	Aggregate yearly discursive output	Aggregate yearly resolution output³⁶²
1990	0	0
1991	1	3
1992	106	5
1993	0	5
1994	121	5
1995	114	0
1996	87	0
1997	11	0
1998	9	1
1999	116	3

Table 8 - EP: The relationship the between discourses and the resolutions

Therefore, we infer from this analysis that Kurdish discourse in the EP (as well as criticism of Turkey) in the 1990s was shaped along the statements of Greek MEPs of the Nordic-Green Left and German MEPs (most specifically Claudia Roth) of the Green group. To conclude, it was

³⁶² These resolutions have been sorted, classified and sent to me by the European Parliament Archive and Documentation Unit (CARDOK) and refers to the resolutions coded: B3-1865-91, B3-0740-91, B3-0556-91, B3-1579-92, B3-1208-92, B3-0488-92, B3-0301-92, A3-0192-92, B3-1275-93, B3-1051-93, B3-1023-93, B3-0691-93, B3-0559-93, B4-0515-94, B4-0111-94, B4-0302-94, B3-0341-94, B3-0304-94, B4-0037-98, B5-0006-99, B4-0223-99 and B4-0465-99

mostly ideology and party-affiliation that determined how a MEP ‘talks about’ the Kurdish question in Turkey in the EP, whereas country-affiliation had lesser influence on discourse (with the slight exception of Greece). Later in this chapter, I will compare EP’s discourse on the Kurdish question with that of the US Congress and TGNA.

2. The United States Congress

In this section, I will look at how discourse on the Kurdish question in Turkey was shaped in the US Congress, by separately analyzing three lines of demarcation: membership to the Senate or the House of Representatives, party-affiliation and caucus membership.

2.1 Ideology: Democrats vs. Republicans

In this section I will look at how party-affiliation within the context of Senate or House membership affected Congress discourses on the Kurdish question in Turkey. For our analysis, I have adopted a discourse count-and-sort methodology similar to that made in the above section on EP.

	HR ³⁶³	Dem	ExF	Trmil	iUSC	PKK-t	party total
Senate-Dem	57	40	34	16	3	36	186
Senate-Rep	4	4	6	3	0	0	17
House-Dem	74	40	62	12	12	7	207
House-Rep	53	29	52	13	10	16	173
Discourse total	188	113	154	44	25	59	583

Table 9 - US Congress (USC) cameral activity and discursive context (see Appendix II, pp. 26-36)

The House of Representatives come out as the most active floor regarding the Kurdish question in Turkey with an aggregate 380 discourse-types adopted, as opposed to 203 adopted in

³⁶³ These acronyms (from left to right) refer to: human rights, democracy, excessive force, criticism of the Turkish military, intra-Congress criticism, condemnation of the PKK

the Senate. However, we see that Democratic Senators have an overwhelming majority over their Republican counterparts in the Senate, as Democrats have adopted 186 of the aggregate discourses in the Senate, whereas the Republicans have adopted a mere 17. Just as Claudia Roth had almost singlehandedly produced the majority of the German discourses in the EP, Senator Dennis DeConcini (D-AZ) had produced the overwhelming majority of the Senate Democrats' discourses. In many ways, one can argue that through the 1990s, Senator DeConcini had shaped Senate discourses on the Kurdish question in Turkey. Although Democrats have been also active in the House of Representatives, party activity is more balanced in the House than it was in the Senate; House Democrats have produced 207 of the discourses, whereas Republicans responded with 173.

The US Congress has constructed the Kurdish problem primarily within the context of human rights both within the Senate and the House. Democrat members of the House and the Senate have been the most dominant advocates of the human rights issue; it was also the most frequently adopted position by the Republican representatives at the House. The second most frequently adopted discourse in the Congress has been the 'excessive force' argument, which deviates from the pattern in the European Parliament, where 'democratization' discourses were the second most frequently adopted discourse. The Republican representatives of the House have adopted this position almost equally as much as the human rights discourses, whereas it is the most frequently used argument of the generally inactive senators of the Republican Party. One can infer from this pattern, that the Republican members of the Congress were more concerned about the excessive force aspect of the Kurdish question, constructing this conundrum essentially as a matter of unnecessary violence. While constructing the Kurdish issue within the context of democracy – democratization has been the third most frequent tendency in the Congress, it was the

second choice of discourse of the Democratic Senators. While the Democratic Senators have been the most critical of the PKK as a terrorist organization, Republican Senators haven't made any reference to the organization. Democratic representatives of the House have been least critical of the PKK after Republican Senators, while being the most critical ones on Turkey's military approach to the issue. Democrat representatives of the House have also been the most critical group of the US policy, the President and the executive branches on the Kurdish question, whereas the Republican Senators have refrained from criticizing any of them. The criticism of the Turkish military as the main cause of the problem appears to be a bi-partisan tendency in the Congress, whereas the Republican Senators have least criticized the Turkish military. However this is also a part of the general disinterest of the Republican Senators and their lack of activity on this issue.

The US Congress discourse on the Kurdish question however, shaped not along party-affiliation, but along individuals; there has been a considerable amount of discourse concentration on certain members of the Congress. The amount of concentration in the Congress has been more significant than it was in the European Parliament and Turkish National Assembly, to the extent that a handful of members of the Congress have been the primary outlets of Congressional discourse on the Kurdish question. This makes a party-based discourse analysis insignificant and brings about the necessity to focus on individuals, narrowing the level of analysis down to agency.

In the US Senate, senators who brought the Kurdish question to the floor were all senior. The fact that the Kurdish question was brought to the Senate floor through senior senators only reveals the perceived importance and the impact of this issue in this body. The most active figure on Turkey's Kurdish question has been Dennis De Concini, the Democratic Senator from Arizona

who served between 1977 and January 1995. Senior Senator De Concini dominated the US Senate on Kurdish issue in Turkey, producing half (50.2%) of the discourses in the Senate and 17.49% of the entire Congressional output on Kurdish question. Other prolific senators on the Kurdish issue were Claiborne Pell (Senior – D – RI) and Patrick Leahy (Senior – D – VT); both members of the Democratic Party.

	Senior S-D-Az		Senior S-D-RI
	Dennis DeConcini		Claiborne Pell
	supportive / critical		supportive / critical
11-Apr-91	0 / 1	05-Sep-95	5 / 6
13-Nov-91	2 / 0	15-Sep-95	2 / 8
02-Mar-94	4 / 21		Senior S-D-VT
17-May-94	3 / 14		Patrick Leahy
23-Jun-94	2 / 18		supportive / critical
04-Aug-94	1 / 8	29-Jun-94	1 / 12
11-Aug-94	6 / 5	22-Sep-95	2 / 6
30-Nov-94	2 / 15		

Table 10 - USC: Most active Senators

The most active Senators have also produced ‘pro-Turkish’ discourses, often in order to encourage or praise a reform process. On the basis of aggregate number of discourses, De Concini has been the most appraisal senator of Turkey as well as being its most frequent critic. However, Claiborne Pell comes out as adopting the highest percentage of appraisal discourses (33% of her total discourses) compared to rest of the senators. It must also be noted that three of the most prolific senators have been most active through 1994-95 period.

While the Democrats have dominated the Senate and House discussions on Turkey’s Kurdish question, two Republican members have been the most active figures of the House. While Edward Porter (Senior – R – IL) comes out as the most active representative of the House (58

discourses), Christopher Smith (Senior – R – NJ) has been equally active (57 discourses). They are followed by two Democratic representatives: Frank Pallone (Senior - NJ) and Lee Hamilton (Senior-IN). Again, the Kurdish cause was championed in the House by senior Representatives.

	Senior. H-R-IL		Sen. H-R-NJ
	Edward Porter		Christopher Smith
	supportive / critical	28-Mar-95	0 / 4
05-Oct-92	0 / 3	28-Jun-95	1 / 6
05-Jan-93	0 / 7	26-Jul-95	4 / 1
02-May-95	0 / 10	09-Nov-95	2 / 11
22-Jun-95	0 / 2	12-Dec-95	2 / 19
28-Jun-95	0 / 20	26-Mar-96	0 / 1
17-Nov-95	0 / 3	05-Jun-96	0 / 6
26-Mar-96	1 / 1		Sen. H-D-Indiana
10-Nov-97	0 / 8		Lee Hamilton
11-Mar-99	0 / 3	06-May-92	0 / 2
	Sen. H-D-NJ	03-Oct-92	2 / 6
	Frank Pallone	10-Feb-94	2 / 2
01-May-97	0 / 12	07-Sep-95	0 / 3
25-Mar-99	0 / 11		
11-May-99	0 / 3		
08-Jun-99	0 / 13		

Table 11 - USC: Most active Representatives of the House

While the most active senators had used a combination of discursive ‘carrots and sticks’, the House of Representatives statements have been concentrated more on the critical side, with very little reference to positive developments on the Kurdish question. The most critical representative in this context has been Edward Porter (R-IL) who had praised Turkey only once in response to then Turkish Prime Minister Mesut Yılmaz’s statement on the impossibility of solving the Kurdish question through military means. Senator Porter also comes up as the most frequent participant of the debates on the Kurdish issue, producing 33.52% of the Republican arguments on the Kurdish issue in the House of Representatives. The Republican runner-up, Christopher Smith (NJ) has adopted slightly more supportive positions than Porter, which form 15.78% of his

discourses. The third most active representative of the House (also the most active Democratic representative) was Frank Pallone (NJ), who is also the only representative in the list with no positive reference to Turkey's policies on the Kurdish question. Another active representative, Lee Hamilton (D – IN) comes up as the 'most pro-Turkish among the most anti-Turkish', whose appraisal discourses constituted 23.52% of his total references to the Kurdish question.

Therefore our primary hypothesis: 'party and ideology are the primary determinants of parliamentary discourse' appears to be not valid for the US Congress as both criticism and praise has been bi-partisan and equally present in the Senate and the House. As the party affiliation is not a statistically significant way of explaining Congress members' activity on the Kurdish issue, we need to look for a different connection between the members of the Senate and the House, as well as the Democratic and Republican parties.

2.2 Agenda: Caucus-affiliation

Based on pointers received during the interview process, I will present and test my second hypothesis, which refutes party membership as the primary determinant behind discourse on the Kurdish question. Our second hypothesis instead states that 'Congressional caucus memberships (agenda) are the main influence over how a Congressman talks about the Kurdish question'. Again, based on pointers I received during the interview phase, I will test Congressional membership to three caucuses: Human rights, Hellenic and Armenian Caucuses. Here, I will test if (how) membership to these caucuses affects the percentage of a Congressman's critical discourses, based on a list of Congressmen who have spoken on the Kurdish question more than once through the 1990-99 period.

Name (senior-junior)	Human Rights ³⁶⁴	Armenian ³⁶⁵	Hellenic ³⁶⁶	% of critical discourses
Edward Porter (S)	+	-	-	98.20%
Christopher Smith (S)	+	+	-	84.20%
Frank Pallone (S)	+	+	+	100%
Lee Hamilton (S)	-	-	-	76.40%
Carolyn B. Maloney (S)	+	+	+	100%
Elizabeth Furse (S)	-	-	-	100%
George Gekas (S)	+	+	+	100%
James Bunn (J)	-	-	-	0%
Michael Bilirakis (S)	+	+	+	100%
Peter John Visclosky (S)	+	+	+	100%
Richard A. Zimmer (J)	-	-	-	100%
Steny Hoyer (S)	+	+	-	100%

Table 12 - Caucus affiliation and criticism in the Congress

The list shows that while appraisal/criticism dynamics were more fluid in the Senate, discourse within the House of Representatives has been completely rigid, either entirely critical or entirely supportive. Also, with the exception of Lee Hamilton, all three Senators were members to the human, rights, Hellenic and/or Armenian caucuses. In the House of Representatives, 5 out of 7 100% critical representatives were members of one or more of the three caucuses analyzed here: the human rights caucus, Hellenic caucus and Armenian caucus. Also, 4 of those critical-only representatives were members to all three of the caucuses. James ‘Jim’ Bunn comes out as the only non-critical representative and was not a member to any of these caucuses. In addition to this, with the exception of Richard Zimmer and James Bunn, all of the Representatives were senior

³⁶⁴ Founded in 1983

³⁶⁵ Founded in 1995

³⁶⁶ Founded in 1996

when they spoke on the Kurdish question. The outliers of this test were:

- **Senator. Edward Porter**, who stands out as the only representative that was only a member of the Human Rights Caucus and not of the Armenian or Hellenic Caucuses.
- **Congressman Lee Hamilton**, although he has the least critical percentage in the Senate, still, he was overwhelmingly critical, though was not a member to any of the caucuses.
- **Congresswoman Elizabeth Furse and Congressman Richard A. Zimmer**, who weren't members to any of the caucuses, yet adopted 100% critical discourses.

Edward Porter's case is best explained through his duty as the founder and the co-chair of the Congressional human rights caucus and personal relationships as his wife, Kathryn Cameron Porter³⁶⁷ (president of the Leadership Council for Human Rights; an NGO focusing on Kurdish women's rights³⁶⁸) who had testified during the trial of Kani Xulam (founder of the American Kurdish Information Network; a body with allegedly close ties to the PKK³⁶⁹, although this was repeatedly denied by the network³⁷⁰) charged on identity forgery.³⁷¹ Kathryn Cameron Porter had also organized a hunger strike in front of the Congress together with Kani Xulam on July 20, 1995; an event that was also mentioned during the Congressional debates. Therefore Senator Porter is perhaps one of the very few representatives whose criticism of the Kurdish question stems not from influences of the Greek or Armenian lobbies, but from his direct and genuine

³⁶⁷ Her bio can be reached at United States Committee for the United Nations Development Program website (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://undp-usa.org/about/board/porter.html>>

³⁶⁸ The NGO's projects and texts of Kathryn Porter's Congressional testimonies on the Kurds in Turkey can be accessed through its website (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://www.leadership-council.org/about.html>>

³⁶⁹ Turkish government had declared him as a 'terrorist'. For more information on this, see: NA. 'Pro-PKK activist's brother dies in US plane crash'. *Today's Zaman*. September 5, 2007. Available online (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://www.todayszaman.com/tz-web/detaylar.do?load=detay&link=121283>>

³⁷⁰ From Dan Rather's interview with Xulam. CBS Evening News. February 6, 2007. This interview can be viewed through American-Kurdish Information Network website (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://www.kurdistan.org/>>

³⁷¹ The official transcript of the case (LEXSEE 84 F.3D 441), as well as Kathryn Cameron Porter's testimonial can be reached through the Association of Federal Defence Attorneys website (accessed May 20, 2009): <http://www.afda.org/web/afda/news/Case_Xulam.pdf>

interest in the Kurdish question itself.

Although Lee Hamilton was not a member of the Armenian or Hellenic Caucuses, his involvement with the Kurdish question stems primarily from his Congressional duty as the Chairman of House Foreign Affairs Committee between 1993 and 1995. In that capacity, he was responsible with conveying written questions from the House to the executive branches, and many of his discourses on the Kurdish question were produced through his chairmanship. However, there are also accounts of his connections with the ‘Balkan lobby’ during the Kosovo crisis, which may suggest a heavy Greek influence over Hamilton’s Kurdish discourse. On this, political sociologists Cushman and Meštrović state:

“In twenty months, Congressman Lee Hamilton accumulated significant campaign contributions from Balkan lobbyists and political leaders associated with Manatos and Manatos³⁷². The 1993, 1994 and 1995 reports from the Federal Election Commission record that Hamilton received \$47,141 in itemized contributions from leaders of the Serbian American and Greek American communities. A number of those donating to Hamilton’s campaign account could be easily identified with Andrew Manatos – in fact, many of the contributors were Manatos’s clients and ethnic leaders who had specific political agendas to promote.

[...]

On April 25, 1994, Hamilton received a further \$9,525 through multiple contributions from twenty-five members of the Greek and Serbian communities. This included \$2,000 from two [political action committees] notable the pan-Hellenic Dynamis Federa. [...] Contributors again included [...] both leaders of the Greek and Cypriot communities, Andrew Athens and Philip Christopher, respectively.”³⁷³

³⁷² A registered lobbying firm headed by Andrew Manatos, a former Assistant Secretary of Commerce during Jimmy Carter administration and his son Mike Manatos. Andrew Manatos was active within the Greek-American community in the US and served on the board of several Hellenic organizations, such as the Hellenic-American Heritage Council and the Coordinated Effort of Hellenes.

³⁷³ Cushman, Thomas and Stjepan Gabriel Mestrovic (1996) *This time we knew: Western Responses to genocide in Bosnia* (New York: NYU Press) p. 214

Indeed the Federal Election Commission records³⁷⁴ do show that Hamilton had received contributions from the above donors. Additionally the *Dynamis* lobbying firm (whose motto as stated on their website: “Advocacy in Defense of Hellenism”³⁷⁵) explicitly states that Lee Hamilton is among the candidates supported by the firm, together with other active members of the House on the Kurdish question such as Greek-Americans Michael Bilirakis, Nicholas Mavroulas and Mike Pappas, as well as non-Greek Americans such as Lee Hamilton and Olympia Snowe.³⁷⁶ Therefore, Hamilton’s performance on the Kurdish question can best be explained through his role as House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman, overlapped by his agenda influenced by Greek lobbying/constituent effects.

³⁷⁴ As quoted in: Ibid. pp. 216 – 219. I have also verified these figures through Federal Election Committee website’s Enforcement Query System (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://eqs.nictusa.com/eqs/searcheqs>>

³⁷⁵ This can be seen on the entry page of Dynamis website (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://www.dynamis.org/>>

³⁷⁶ The full list can be reached at Dynamis website <<http://www.dynamis.org/>> (accessed October 14, 2008)

Campaign Contributions to Lee Hamilton, September 29, 1993	
Contributor	Amount
Robert Adler	\$ 500
John Alexander	\$ 250
Bob Asher	\$1,000
Daniel Asher	\$1,000
Helen Asher	\$ 500
Nathan Asher	\$1,000
Andrew Athens	\$1,000
Paul Athens	\$1,000
Michael Bakalis	\$1,000
Gilbert Blechman	\$ 500
George Bogdanich	\$ 250
Thomas Capps	\$ 500
Lester Crown	\$1,000
Ilija Djurisc	\$ 250
Marko Duric	\$ 500
Sidney Epstein	\$ 500
Sid Feiger	\$1,000
Richard Fleisher (Kartin and Fleisher)	\$ 250
Martin Gecht	\$ 400
Manny Giannakakos	\$ 250
Julius Hemmelstein	\$ 250
Andrew Hochberg	\$ 250
Bernard Jaffee	\$1,000
David Kahn	\$ 250
Charles Kanakis	\$ 250
Andrew Lappin	\$ 250
Stuart Levine	\$1,000
Lorry Lichtenstein	\$1,000
Milos Ljuboja	\$ 250
John Marks	\$ 250
Robert Mazer	\$1,000
Clara Moranis	\$ 500
Arnold Newberger	\$ 250
John Ostojic	\$ 250
Kenneth Pontikes	\$1,000
Milo Popovic	\$1,000
Milan Rakic	\$ 250
Sol Rosen	\$ 300
Peter Samardzija	\$ 500
Roger Schoenfeld	\$ 250
Eli Sreckovic	\$ 500
Thomas Stacy	\$ 500
Chris Tomaras	\$ 250
Nicholas Trkla	\$ 250
Branko Tupanjac	\$ 500
Irving Wein	\$ 250
Richard Weinberg	\$ 500
SOURCE: Federal Election Commission	

Campaign Contributions to Lee Hamilton, April 25, 1994			
Contributor	State of Origin	Amount	
Individuals			
Michael and Vasiliki Angelakis	MD	\$	300
Andrew Athens	IL	\$	300
Panayiotis Baltatzis	MD	\$	300
John Billinis	MD	\$	300
Demetri Boosalis	VA	\$	300
Philip and Christina Christopher	NY	\$	1,000
Michael Djordjevich	CA	\$	150
Michael Djordjevich	CA	\$	1,000
William Karas	MD	\$	300
George Kartsioukas	CA	\$	250
E. N. Koulizakis	VA	\$	300
Panos Koutrouvalis	VA	\$	300
Charis Lapas	VA	\$	300
Ana Maria Laveglia	MA	\$	300
Efstratios Likakis	MD	\$	300
Charlie Marangoudakis	NY	\$	300
Constantine Marinakos	VA	\$	300
Alekos Maroudas	DC	\$	300
Chris and Tula Mouroufas	CA	\$	250
Konstantinos & Susan Papadopoulos	MD	\$	300
Ronald Radakovich	CA	\$	225
Panagiotis Silis	VA	\$	300
George Siskos	CA	\$	250
Despina Skenderis	MD	\$	300
Paul Vangelow	VA	\$	300
PACS			
Allied			\$1,000
Dynamis			\$1,000
NOTE: These contributions were made to Lee Hamilton on the same day Andrew Manatos testified on behalf of United Hellenic American Congress before the House Appropriations and Foreign Operations Committee.			
SOURCE: Federal Election Commission			
Balkan Campaign Contributions to Lee Hamilton, January 1-June 30, 1995			
Contributor	Amount		
June 26, 1995			
Michael and Vasiliki Angelakis	\$	250	
Andrew Athens	\$	500	
John Charalambous	\$	1,000	
Hunter Johnson (Jones and Walker)	\$	1,000	
Stelios Kimilis	\$	250	
Margery Kraus	\$	500	
Charles Lapas	\$	250	
Andrew Manatos	\$	250	
Lloyd Meeds	\$	871 (in kind)	
Constantine Papavizaz	\$	250	
James and Wanda Pedas	\$	250	
George Tsentas	\$	250	
Total	\$	5,621	
June 30, 1995			
Robert Keefe	\$	500	
Gregory Keever	\$	250	
Peter Krist	\$	1,000	
Peter Krist	\$	1,000	
Elias Kulukundis	\$	1,000	
Yannis Kulukundis	\$	1,000	
Roger Loomis	\$	250	
Milan Panic	\$	1,000	
William Tavoulareas	\$	1,000	
William Tavoulareas	\$	1,000	
Total	\$	8,000	
SOURCE: Federal Election Commission			

Table 13 - Representative Lee Hamilton's received campaign contributions; 1993-95. (Source: Federal Elections Commission)

Richard (Dick) Zimmer's (R-NJ) case is also similar, but it is difficult to statistically assert that Zimmer's stance on the Kurdish issue was purely a result of the Greek-American influence. Although Zimmer was not a member to the human rights, Hellenic or Armenian caucuses, he was nonetheless affiliated with the Greek-American community through auxiliary channels. For example another prominent Greek-American lobby, American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA) had given Zimmer an 'A-plus' on its 1995 regular Congressional scorecard on "representatives' *friendliness* towards Greek-American issues". As stated on the Hellenic Resources Network³⁷⁷, the A-plus list also included all of the representatives mentioned in the previous list of most active representatives on the Kurdish question. Additionally, Richard Zimmer was close rivals with Robert Toricelli, who was Zimmer's Democratic challenger from New Jersey's same district. Both representatives had accused each other for 'taking mob money'³⁷⁸ and therefore both of them in need of legitimate contributors such as ethnic American interest groups. The counter argument to Zimmer's case might be pointing out the fact that his rival Robert Toricelli, who received more contributions from the Greek-American lobby, did not produce any discourses (doesn't mean he did not speak – I have made an elaborate discussion of the differences between speech and discourse in Chapter 2) on Kurdish issues during the House debates. Yet, Toricelli was no stranger to the Kurdish issue, since – based on the New York Observer article – he was involved with the issue since 1993:

But perhaps the best Torricelli-tantrum story is the one that has him cursing out border guards as he returned to Turkey from a 1993 visit to Kurdish refugee camps with his then-girlfriend Bianca Jagger, who was told that she needed a new visa. Mr. Torricelli was reportedly

³⁷⁷ Akinci, Ugur. 'Grassroots of Anti-Turkism in America'. Turkish Daily News, March 10, 1996. Available through Hellenic Resources Network (accessed May 20, 2009) <<http://www.hri.org/news/turkey/trkn/1996/96-03-10.trkn.html>>

³⁷⁸ Gugilotta, G., 'Campaign Primer's First Lesson: Cash Flows from Contacts', *Washington Post*, May 18, 1997. Available online (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/special/campfin/stories/cf051897.htm>>

*sufficiently profane for Turkish officials later to complain to the State Department about his use of "ethnic slurs." Mr. Torricelli denied using profanity, later telling the Bergen Record, "If I didn't, I should have," and citing the incident as an example of Turkish discouragement of human rights activists working on behalf of Kurds.*³⁷⁹

Also, Toricelli had introduced and texted several House bills on the Kurdish question and also a signatory of several Congress letters to Bill Clinton, urging him to ‘do something’ with Turkey’s stance against the Kurds. Yet, for the purposes of our study on legislative discourse, he will be considered as ‘inactive’, due to the fact that he did not contribute to Congressional discourse on the Kurdish question in Turkey.

Finally, the case of Elizabeth Furse – who had adopted only critical discourses on Turkey’s Kurdish question – is particularly interesting. While not being a member to any of the caucuses mentioned, she had participated in a ‘special order’ in the Congress, sponsored by the Greek-American Gus Bilirakis, which later pushed for and passed a resolution limiting military aid to Turkey “until it withdraws its troops from Cyprus.”³⁸⁰ While Furse did not have the explicit involvement with the Hellenic Caucus as did other previously mentioned representatives, her interest in the Kurdish question also has a non-Greek or non-Armenian dimension. Furse had spoken on the Kurdish question solely within the context of the imprisonment of the female Kurdish member of the Turkish Parliament, Leyla Zana, first on June 5, 1996 and later on October 13, 1998. As Zana’s trial and indictment was the only ‘trigger’ for Furse’s statements, one can evaluate this tendency within the context of Furse’s stance on women’s electoral rights and her

³⁷⁹ Durkin, T. ‘The Great Toricelli – Man of Mystery’, *The New York Observer*, June 6, 1999. Available online (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://www.observer.com/node/41573>>

³⁸⁰ For more on this, see: Embassy of Cyprus (Washington, DC) Newsletter. ‘US Congress marks invasion anniversary’. *Hellenic Resources Network*. August 5, 1996. Available online (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://www.hellenic.org/news/cyprus/cyemb/96-08-05.cyemb.html>>

involvement with several women's self-help projects in Watts, Los Angeles³⁸¹. In other words, while Furse adopted a completely critical discourse on the Kurdish question, her motivation to speak on this matter had gender and women's political participation issues dimension, specially directed towards the isolated case of the imprisonment of the female Kurdish parliamentarian Leyla Zana. Therefore, she can be evaluated as an outlier, being one of the two representatives (along with Edward Porter) who adopted critical discourses on the Kurdish question, not because of the influence of Hellenic or Armenian caucuses, but through their unique interest in the subject.

The case of James Bunn (R – Oregon) also reveals that party affiliation was not a determinant of discourses; rather such discourses were shaped along legislators' agenda, influenced by caucus affiliation and ethnic lobby pressures. James Bunn had been targeted both by the Armenian and Hellenic caucuses and lobbying groups for his allegedly 'pro-Turkish' leanings. On this Samuel Huntington had stated:

*The Armenian National Committee of American gets some credit for the defeat in 1996 of two representatives whom it had labeled among the most pro-Turkish members of Congress: Jim Bunn (Rep-Oregon) and Greg Laughlin (Dem.-Texas). Bunn's successful opponent, Darlene Hooley, praised the ANCA "for mounting a nationwide campaign in support of my candidacy".*³⁸²

Indeed, James Bunn's stance on Turkish issues and the response of Hellenic and Armenian nationalist lobby groups not only shows how Kurdish discourses in the Congress stemmed from anti-Turkish sentiments rather than pro-Kurdish ones, but also how the stance of a particular representative on Turkey could affect larger issue of American politics through special interests of

³⁸¹ Elizabeth Furse's bio can be reached through The Institute for Tribal Government website (accessed May 20, 2009): <http://www.tribalgov.pdx.edu/bio_furse.php>

³⁸² Huntington, Samuel P. (2004) *Who are we? The challenges to America's national identity* (New York: Simon and Schuster) p. 289

ethnic lobbying groups.

To conclude, although party and ideology were the primary determinants of how legislators spoke about the Kurdish question in the European Parliament, neither party membership, nor being a member to the Senate or the House had any effect on how legislators talked about the Kurdish question in the US Congress. We understand that primary influence over legislative discourse in the US Congress was legislators' agenda (shaped by their caucus membership, constituency or origin of campaign contributions) and within this context, Greek and Armenian interest groups (rather than Kurdish ones) have been hugely influential over US Congress discourse on the Kurdish question. In many ways, one can argue that Greek and Armenian interests exerted a heavy influence over US-Turkish relations through the 1990s by hijacking the topic of Kurdish question in Turkey, creating seemingly impossible issue linkages across the Kurdish question, Cyprus invasion, Armenian genocide, US support for Turkey's EU membership and US arms sales to Turkey. Therefore, the US Congressional discourse had a heavier Greek-Armenian bias, than a genuine Kurdish or human rights perspective.

3. Turkish Grand National Assembly

In this third section, I will present my quantitative findings on the discourse in the TGNA with regard to the Kurdish question in Turkey. A comparative quantitative analysis of all three legislatures will be presented in section four. Here, I will test whether and (how) party-affiliation (ideology), constituency (agenda) and belonging to a governing or opposition party affects a legislator's discourse on the Kurdish question in Turkey.

3.1. Ideology: party-affiliation

Ideology in the Turkish National Assembly through the 1990s could be summed up as follows:

- Motherland Party (ANAP): Center-right, moderate nationalism, economic liberalism, populism
- True Path Party (DYP): Center-right, moderate nationalism, economic liberalism, populism
- Social-democratic People's Party (SHP): Social-democracy, center-left, secularism and Republican People's Party (CHP): Kemalism, center-left, social-democracy (SHP joined CHP in 1995)
- Welfare Party (RP): Conservative, right-wing, Islamism, economic isolationism
- Nationalist Action Party (MHP): Right-wing nationalism
- Democratic Left Party (DSP): Center-left, Kemalism, moderate nationalism

Within this context, I will test whether our previous finding on the effect of party-ideology on legislative discourse in the European Parliament, is also valid for the TGNA.

	HR ³⁸³	Dem	Ethn	Law	Sec	Ed-Dev	Foreign	iTRc	SF/VG	ExF	Total
ANAP	15	15	8	2	10	36	13	48	53	12	212
DSP	9	5	1	1	11	16	25	0	6	0	74
S-C/HP	25	22	13	20	18	20	20	12	25	44	219
RP	16	15	14	8	36	23	91	31	22	17	273
DYP	8	6	7	4	22	22	32	14	5	0	120
MHP	2	1	3	0	5	2	10	5	1	0	29
State	13	14	5	17	50	28	45	1	8	0	181
Total	88	71	51	52	152	147	236	111	120	74	1108

Table 14 - TGNA: Discursive context choices by party-affiliation (see Appendix III, pp. 52-76)

³⁸³ These acronyms refer to (from left to right) the discursive contexts of: human rights, democracy, ethnic difference, law-related, security, educational-developmental, foreign dark powers, intra-Turkish criticism, criticism of the security forces/village guards, excessive force.

In aggregate discourses, the Islamist Welfare Party (RP) comes out as the most active party on the Kurdish question (273), followed by the Social-democratic People's Party – Republican People's Party (SHP-CHP: 219) and the Motherland Party (ANAP: 212). However, as 1990s witnessed one of the most politically fragmented periods in Turkey, we have to verify this activity on a 'discourse per MP' measurement, since TGNA's composition frequently changed due to collapsing coalition governments. (While total number of MPs was 450 until 1995, after this year, it was raised to 550 MPs).

	1991	1995	1999	Average
DYP	178	135	85	132.6
ANAP	115	132	86	111
SHP-CHP	88	49	0	45.6
RP	62	158	111 ³⁸⁴	110.3
DSP	7	76	136	73
MHP	0	0	129	43

Table 15 - Elections and TGNA composition (Turkish Higher Council for Elections data)

Based on the average MP chart³⁸⁵, we can come up with a 'discourse per MP' measurement as we did for the European Parliament.

³⁸⁴ Welfare Party was closed in February 1997 by a military decree, accusing the party for becoming 'a focus of anti-secular activities'. After its closure, most of the party's members switched over to the 'Felicity Party' and joined 1999 elections. Felicity Party was closed later in 2001 for the same reason with the Welfare Party. The figure shown here belongs to the successor 'Felicity Party'.

³⁸⁵ Data derived from the TGNA webpage on parliamentary composition by year (accessed May 23, 2009): <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/develop/owa/secimler.genel_secimler>

	Number of discourses	Average number of MPs	Discourse per MP
DYP	120	132.6	0.905
ANAP	212	111	1.909
SHP-CHP	219	45.6	4.802
RP	273	110.3	2.475
DSP	74	73	1.013
MHP	29	43	0.674

Table 16 - TGNA discourse per MEP measurement (see Appendix III, pp. 52-76)

When we level party discourses according to their average number of sears in the TGNA through 1991-1999, we understand that MPs of the left³⁸⁶, most specifically SHP and after 1995, CHP were clearly the most active on the Kurdish question in Turkey. They were followed by the Islamist Welfare Party and the Motherland Party respectively. Therefore, our hypothesis on ideology and discourse appears to be partly valid for the TGNA. It is true that the most active MPs belonged to the SHP-CHP, which are both center-left parties; however, the runner up is a right-wing/conservative Welfare Party, followed by a center-right Motherland Party. TGNA also conforms to the trend in the European Parliament (as you go left in the political continuum, there is more interest on the Kurdish question and if you go right, there is less interest) with regard to the disinterest of the right-wing Nationalist Action Party, which is the least active party based both on aggregate discourses and ‘discourse per MP’ measurements. However, the political left-right pattern is not clear in the TGNA. In other words, although the most active party belonged to the center-left, and the least active party belonged to the right, does not necessarily validate the claim

³⁸⁶ In our case, center-left. Military coup of 1980 eradicated far-leftist groups and outlawed such ideology, necessitating any leftist party to redefine its ideology along Kemalist undertones. Therefore all the center-left parties had adopted a certain degree of Kemalist discourse, in order to function within the political system without being marginalized by the establishment. Therefore center-left parties were ‘as left as Turkey could go’ in the 1990s.

“as you go left in the political continuum, there is more interest on the Kurdish question” or vice versa. Most specifically, another party of the center-left, Democratic Left Party is among the least active of the parties in the TGNA on a ‘discourse per MP’ measurement. On the other hand (as discussed earlier) another right wing Welfare Party is among the most active parties of the Kurdish debates in the TGNA.

Before moving on to the second hypothesis, I would also like to comment on the content of the discourses according to party affiliation. A quite surprising – yet somewhat intuitive – finding of my study on the TGNA reveals that the most frequently adopted discourse in the TGNA through the 1990s was – with a clear dominance over others – has been the ‘dark foreign powers’³⁸⁷ discourse of the Welfare Party. In many ways constructing the Kurdish question as a ‘*doing of dark, foreign powers*’ and the PKK as being ‘*supported by these powers to partition Turkey*’ has been the most frequently adopted discursive tendency in the TGNA, exporting the responsibility of the Kurdish conundrum entirely onto unidentified ‘foreign powers’. Indeed, the ‘foreign powers’ discourse has been adopted 271 times in total in the TGNA debates between 1990 and 1999, rendering this type of discourse prominent even over the security discourse which was adopted 178 times in total. This ‘dark foreign powers’ discourse was adopted overwhelmingly by the Welfare Party (91), followed by the Motherland Party (ANAP: 48) and the state discourse (45). In percentile terms, the ‘foreign powers’ discourse has been the most frequently adopted discourse in the TGNA by constituting almost the quarter (24.46%) of the total discourse adopted in the TGNA. However, we can’t get a clear picture of how ideology affects ‘foreign powers’ discourse unless we look at this trend within each party in percentile terms.

³⁸⁷ This discourse type was elaborate in detail in Chapter 5 on TGNA.

ANAP	DYP	CHP-SHP	DSP	RP	MHP	State
6.13%	26.7%	9.1%	33.8%	33.3%	34.5%	24.9%

Table 17 - TGNA: Foreign Dark Powers discourse as a percentage of party-aggregate

This type of discourse was adopted most frequently (as a part of its corresponding aggregate discourse) by the Nationalist Action Party (MHP), followed by the Democratic-Left Party (DSP) and the Welfare Party (RP). While DYP and the State have adopted this discourse in a lesser percentage of their aggregate discourses, CHP-SHP and ANAP come out clearly as the least adopter of the ‘foreign powers’ argument. This provides us with an interesting finding: parties of the far-right have adopted the ‘foreign powers’ discourse as a higher percentage of their aggregate discourses, whereas parties of the center-left have relied less on it. Democratic Left Party (DSP) and ANAP come out as outliers here, as DSP being a center-left party, was one of the fiercest critics of the foreign powers in their alleged involvement on the Kurdish question, whereas ANAP, being a center-right party had criticized foreign powers least.

A similar trend can be observed with regard to the ‘security discourse’, which was the second most frequently adopted discourse in the TGNA, constituting 13.72% of the aggregate discursive output. The state was clearly the most frequent adopter of the security discourse, providing 32.89% of the aggregate output on this position, followed by the Welfare Party (RP: 23.68%) and the True Path Party (DYP: 14.47%).

ANAP	DYP	CHP-SHP	DSP	RP	MHP	State
4.71%	18.33%	8.21%	14.86%	13.18%	17.24%	27.62%

Table 18 - TGNA: Percentage of security discourses of political parties

Also, as a percentage of its aggregate discursive output, the state – again – had adopted the security discourse more frequently than the political parties, followed by the True Path Party (DYP: 18.33%) and the Nationalist Action Party (MHP: 17.24%). The Democratic Left Party (DSP) again, comes out as having performed like a right-wing party, whose security discourses constituted 14.86% of its discursive output, whereas SHP-CHP and ANAP were –again- the least frequent adopters of the security discourse (8.21% and 4.71% respectively).

With regard to the third most frequently adopted discourse (educational-developmental), the Motherland Party (ANAP, during whose governance the South-east Anatolian Project³⁸⁸, GAP was completed) emerges as the chief advocate of this position (36), followed by the state (28), Welfare Party (RP: 23) and the True Path Party (DYP: 22). This finding supports Arturo Escobar³⁸⁹ who had highlighted a proliferation of developmentalist discourses (defining countries based on their level of development) since the end of World War II, which lead to a global perception of the West as 'developed' and most of the world 'underdeveloped', later spilling-over the terrorism discourses in order to irrationalize the acts of terror, claiming them to be doings of 'uneducated', 'underdeveloped' individuals. This same pattern is also observable here, as developmentalist discourses within the TGNA appears to have concentrated along political conservative parties and the state that had defined the Kurdish question as originating from

³⁸⁸ For more on GAP and how developmental discourses were shaped with regard to the Kurdish question, see Chapter 5 on the TGNA.

³⁸⁹ Escobar, Arturo (1995) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press) p. 9

regional poverty and lack of education. As a part of their aggregate discursive output however, the situation among the parties somewhat changes:

ANAP	DYP	RP	S-CHP	DSP	MHP	State
16.98%	18.33%	8.42%	9.13%	21.62%	6.89%	15.46%

Table 19 - TGNA: Percentage of educational-developmental discourses

Democratic Left Party (DSP) emerges as adopting the highest amount of educational-developmental discourses, followed by the True Path Party (DYP), Motherland Party (ANAP) and the state.

The political left on the other hand (SHP, until it joined CHP in 1995) did monopolize certain discursive positions in the TGNA. They have provided an overwhelming majority (60.27%) of the ‘excessive force’ discourses, which criticized Turkish security forces for their violent methods in the south-east, whereas the state, Nationalist Action Party (MHP), True Path Party (DYP) and Democratic Left Party (DSP) never criticized Turkish security forces. With regard to the criticism of the Turkish military and the village guard system,³⁹⁰ the Motherland Party (ANAP) comes out as the most active party (44.16%), followed by the political left (SHP-CHP: 20.83%) and the Islamist Welfare Party (RP: 18.33%). CHP and SHP also come out as being the most frequent advocate of the human rights, democratization, law and ethnicity discourses, conforming to our successful hypothesis with regard to the European Parliament.

Therefore, while we can infer that party affiliation and ideology plays a role in how a

³⁹⁰ More information on the village guard system can be found in Chapter 5.

legislator ‘talks about’ the Kurdish question, we still do not have a consistent pattern. Discourse types such as security, ‘dark foreign powers’ and educational-developmental appear to be right-wing discourses within the TGNA. On the other hand excessive force, human rights, democratization, ethnicity and law discourses concentrate along the political left. However, there are also many outliers to this case. For example, as a conservative, right-wing party, the ANAP comes out as the most frequent critic of the Turkish military and the village guard excesses. Also the Islamist conservative RP comes out as one of the most frequent critic of excessive violence and the Turkish military excesses, in addition to being the chief advocate of recognizing Kurdish identity. With regard to highlighting the legalistic aspect of the Kurdish question on the other hand, the political left and the state discourses converge. A very interesting observation might be that the Democratic Left Party (DSP) did not behave at all like a party of the political-left; rather its discourses converged with that of the nationalist far-right especially with regard to security, educational-developmental and ‘foreign dark powers’ arguments, perhaps making it somewhat easier to understand why DSP had established a coalition government with the Nationalist Action Party (MHP) in 1999.

In the following section, I will present and test another hypothesis, which will enable us to see these discursive fault lines better.

3.2 Agenda: constituency

In the previous section, I have discussed how ideology and party-affiliation shaped MPs’ discourses in the TGNA through the 1990s. Here, I will introduce a second hypothesis with regard to a legislator’s agenda, shaped by its constituency. I will present the hypothesis as: “If a legislator

represents a district (city), which is under emergency law, s-he will construct the Kurdish question within the context of emancipation and rights, whereas if a legislator does not represent such a district s-he will define the Kurdish question as a security and territorial integrity problem”.

Cities of south-east Turkey (Diyarbakır, Mardin, Siirt, Batman, Şırnak, Van, Hakkari, Bingöl, Muş, Tunceli, Bitlis and Elazığ) were brought under the emergency law and the jurisdiction of the ‘Emergency super-governor’³⁹¹ in 1987 by the decision of the Council of Ministers. Here, I will compare discourse preferences of the parliamentarians representing these cities, with representatives of the rest of Turkey. Below is a chart, showing discourse types sorted according to representing emergency region (ER) or not (non-ER).

	HR ³⁹²	Dem	Ethn	Law	Sec	Ed-Dev	For	İTRc	SF-VG	ExF	Total
ER	28	7	3	11	21	29	30	18	24	31	202
Non-ER	66	62	37	52	222	99	240	94	45	51	968

Table 20 - Discursive priorities between emergency and non-emergency region representatives

We see that emergency region representatives have provided 17.26% of the discourses in the TGNA on the Kurdish question. While emergency region representatives focused on excessive violence, security force and village guard misconducts and human rights, they were also very critical of the foreign countries, as well as pointing to the underdevelopment of their region. Non-emergency region representatives on the other hand, have focused mainly on foreign country

³⁹¹ Emergency law and emergency super-governorates were discussed in Chapter 5.

³⁹² These acronyms refer to the discursive contexts (left to right): human rights, democracy, ethnic conflict, legalistic, security, educational-developmental, foreign dark powers, intra-Turkish criticism, security force/village guard criticism, excessive force

criticism and security aspect of the conflict, while not paying much attention to the ethnic aspect or excessive force application of the security forces or the village guards.

Measuring the percentage of each discourse type within the aggregate output of both emergency and non-emergency region representatives, and pointing convergence-divergence dynamics on a radar-graph will also be useful. We infer from the graph, that emergency-region representatives focused much more on the human rights (HR), excessive force (ExF) and security force-village guard misconducts (SF-VG), whereas non-emergency region representatives have focused on criticism of foreign countries (For), security aspect of the conflict (sec), as well as – counterintuitively – mentioning democracy and ethnic recognition issues. It can also be said that representatives had a general agreement over the legalistic aspect of the conflict as they have mentioned this discourse type equally frequently.

3.3 Continuity and change in Turkish state/government discourse

So far, we have identified how ideology (party-affiliation) and agenda (constituency) affect parliamentarians' discourse in the TGNA debates. In this third section, I will test whether discourses of those parliamentarians change when they are in government or in opposition. In our analysis 'state discourse' refers to the members of the TGNA that are performing a ministerial duty in the governing cabinet; in that this type of discourse comes from the Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister of Interior, or other state ministers. Therefore in my analysis, I have separated a party's non-ministerial discursive performance with the performance of its ministers. The latter is mentioned as 'state discourse', whereas former is mentioned under a party's discourse.

The most striking difference between ‘state discourse’ and party discourse is not the quantity of discourses, but their content. For example, while a particular party and the state officials may refer to the security aspect of the Kurdish question, party officials may criticize the security situation, whereas the state officials may paint a completely rosy picture, mentioning that the security forces are capable of establishing security in the region. It is particularly for this reason that I have also identified support-criticism / legitimization – de-legitimization dynamics within each discourse. The difference in content between governmental/state and non-state/opposition discourses is striking. For a comparative time-frequency analysis between the state/government discourse and party discourses, I will pick two discourse types: security and educational-developmental discourses.³⁹³

3.3.1. Security discourse

Figure 1 - Time/series graph showing Turkish state discourses 1990-99

We infer from the above graph, that the state officials have referred to the security situation in a negative manner only three times through the course of 1991-99. Generally, the

³⁹³ Although ‘foreign dark powers’ discourse is the second most frequently adopted position by the state/government, since it is always critical, we cannot test support-opposition dynamics for this particular discourse type.

state/government officials have portrayed the security situation as positive (27 times) and often ‘improving’ or ‘in transition’ (20 times). We can also infer that the ‘state’ had spoken most frequently between October 11, 1994 and December 21, 1997; the most violent phase of PKK insurgency and largest cross-border responses by the Turkish military. Between January 1991 till October 11, 1994, state officials (at that time all Motherland Party-ANAP members) have spoken only twice, whereas state officials of the coalition governments led by the True Path Party (DYP) have preferred to be involved with parliamentary policy debates. The likelihood of state officials’ involvement with such debates diminish after the demise of the True Path Party, since the state officials of the succeeding coalition governments led by the Motherland Party and Democratic Left Party again did not contribute to these parliamentary debate sessions. We also infer that, all other parties’ state officials (with the exception of the True Path Party) had relied solely on positive security discourses, portraying the situation in the south-east as ‘safe’; officials of the coalitions led by the True Path Party on the other hand had adopted more variant in their discourses, portraying the situation either as ‘bad’ or as ‘in transition’. When we compare this content with non-ministerial/non-state members of these governing parties, we come up with an interesting pattern. From November 1989 to November 1991, all of Motherland Party’s discourses on the Kurdish question came through their ministers in the government, whereas other party members had refrained from speaking on this matter independently from the party’s position. A similar party discipline can be observed during November 1991 – May 1993 phase, when the True Path Party was led by Suleyman Demirel. However, after the death of then president Turgut Ozal and appointment of Demirel as the president, the party was taken over by Tansu Ciller, who appears to have had problems imposing the same kind of party discipline exercised by Suleyman Demirel.

Figure 2 - True Path Party's security discourse

On the other hand, we see that DYP's security discourse has intensified during exactly the same period when it was a part of the governing coalition. Prior to the mid-1990s we observe that DYP deputies preferred not to speak much on the security aspect of the Kurdish question, but this reluctance turned into more participation during the party's governance. We can also observe that DYP deputies had referred to the security situation as negative, mostly when they were in the opposition, whereas the content of their security discourse changed to 'positive' or 'in transition' when they were a part of the government.

Figure 3 - ANAP's security discourse

ANAP on the other hand, followed an opposite pattern. While its deputies refrained from speaking on the security aspect of the Kurdish question during ANAP's governance, they have spoken in an overwhelmingly negative fashion concerning DYP's handling of the security question. Therefore, we observe that ANAP's security discourses intensified during the mid-1990s, just like DYP, however, ANAP deputies used the security discourse in order to criticize DYP's governance.

Figure 4 - RP's security discourse

The same pattern fits RP discourse on security. While RP had adopted an overwhelmingly critical discourse on security when it was in the opposition, its discourses changed to 'in transition' when it was the governing party between June 1996 and June 1997.

Therefore in many ways, security discourse within the TGNA has been one of the biggest flashpoints between the consciousness of the State and that of emancipation. With the exception of the political left (SHP-CHP, that rarely adopted a security discourse), most of the deputies in the TGNA have challenged the state discourse on security, whereas when these deputies became a

part of the government, they bandwagoned with the state discourse, defending the very positions that they attacked when they were in opposition.

3.3.2 Educational-developmental discourse

Figure 5 - State discourse on education and development in the south-east

Education-development discourses of the state follows a similar pattern with its security discourse. While the state had referred to the level of development in the region as 'negative' twice during the 1990s, it had portrayed the situation mostly as 'in transition', followed by its portrayal of the situation in the south-east as 'positive'. Similar to the security discourse, we observe that the majority of education-development discourses were concentrated during the DYP government headed by Tansu Ciller. One interesting observation here, is that most of the 'positive' portrayals of the developmental situation in the south-east came during the tenure of Tansu Ciller, whereas other administrations refrained from painting such a positive picture.

Figure 6 - RP discourse on education and development in the south-east

For example, the second most frequent adopter of the developmentalist discourse, the Welfare Party, had referred to the situation as 'negative' even during its own administration, refraining from adopting a positive stance. Welfare Party rather used this type of discourse to exert pressure on the governing coalitions, highlighting their inability to provide services to the region's population and suggesting them to 'step down'.

Figure 7 - DYP's discourse on education and development

DYP deputies that did not hold a ministerial duty on the other hand, had generally portrayed the

situation as ‘in transition’; they generally refrained from leaning too much towards positive or negative portrayals during their party’s tenure. They did, however adopt negative discourses on this matter when they were in opposition, during early and late 1990s.

Figure 8 - SHP (CHP) discourses on education and development

SHP-CHP however, presents an interesting outlier, since it had never made a positive portrayal of the developmental situation in the south-east both during its opposition and government.

In this section we have tested whether ideology, agenda and government/opposition dynamics had any effect on the legislative discourse within the TGNA. Overall, the TGNA had portrayed the Kurdish question primarily as a doing of the ‘dark foreign powers’ – a fuzzy and under-defined set of foreign countries – that aim to defeat and partition Turkey by financing the PKK and inciting a wider Kurdish rebellion. Such a construction can be dubbed somewhat as paranoid, as the discursive balloon of ‘dark foreign powers’ could include the United States, Europe, Iran, Iran, Syria, Armenia and even Russia, all conspiring against Turkey by forming an invisible unified

front. The second discursive choice of the TGNA on the Kurdish question was that it was essentially a problem of terrorism and security. Within this context, the TGNA believed that the Kurdish problem would be solved if PKK laid down its arms and surrendered to Turkish security forces.

Perhaps one of the most important findings of this dissertation was the observation that parties in Turkey had different ideological re-configurations when they are talking on the Kurdish question. We have seen in this section, that although parties define themselves as ‘left-liberal’ or ‘right-conservative’ in policy areas that do not relate to the Kurdish question, when it comes to speaking about this internal conflict, some conservative parties followed a liberal-emancipatory discourse, whereas some leftist parties adopted a completely far-right nationalist/conservative rhetoric. Therefore, I will argue here that political parties in Turkey had different ideological positions when it came to the Kurdish question, often finding themselves in alliance with the parties that they appear completely different from. For example Social-democratic Left (SHP) discourses on the Kurdish question converged almost entirely with the Islamist-conservative Welfare Party (RP) in the sense that both of these parties argued that the state was adopting a heavy-handed stance on the problem and that the solution of it would come from democratization and preventing security force abuses in the region. We have also found that the most active MPs within the TGNA belonged to SHP-CHP and the RP, parties that come out as having adopted most discourses per their single MP. On the other hand, the Democratic Left Party (DSP) discourses converged almost entirely with Nationalist Action Party (MHP) position, which defined the Kurdish question as a security and terrorism problem. Both of these parties advocated a militarist solution of the problem by piling more troops and weapons to the south-east, with occasional

cross-border raids to destroy PKK camps in northern Iraq. Out of all the parties mentioned here, Social-democratic People's Party (SHP) comes out as the only party that had animated a clear and accurate political leftist-liberal stance on the Kurdish question; in that sense this party comes out as the only party, which acts exactly as its name would suggest. Therefore, SHP was the only party that was operating from a clear ideological position, whereas it is not possible to say the same thing for other parties in the TGNA.

In the second sub-section, we observed that agenda (as defined by a legislator's constituency being under the emergency rule) also had an impact on legislative discourse. From this perspective, MPs from Diyarbakır, Mardin, Siirt, Batman, Şırnak, Van, Hakkari, Bingöl, Muş, Tunceli, Bitlis and Elazığ had mostly defined the Kurdish question within the parameters of excessive security force violence, human rights violations and lack of development in the region. On the other hand, MPs from non-emergency region districts have portrayed the Kurdish question as one of 'terrorism' and 'security', whereas both ER and non-ER MPs were equally critical of the 'dark foreign powers' for agitating the discontent in the Kurdish areas. In many ways, in a continuum of Kurdish discourse within the TGNA, on which the state discourse established one end, the SHP and RP deputies from the emergency regions established the other.

Finally, we saw that discourses on the Kurdish question change depending on whether a legislator belongs to the governing party or the opposition. In that respect, legislators who have ministerial duties bandwagon with the rigid state discourse, even though they might have criticized the state in the past. In many ways, once they assume a ministerial position, discourses and positions of the legislators become liquid, taking the shape of the state discourse. Therefore,

we can argue that it hasn't been the parties or governments that shaped the state discourse on the Kurdish question, but the opposite: governing parties channeled the long-standing continuity within the state discourse. Such continuity can be observed specifically with regard to the 'security' and 'education-development' discourses, where state ministers have adopted an overwhelmingly positive tone regarding the situation in the south-east, despite the fact such portrayal deviated greatly from reality, and also the rhetoric adopted by the opposition. In this context, we can clearly observe that especially the True Path Party (DYP) had taken the form of the state, as a party, specifically on the security aspect of the Kurdish question. On the other hand the SHP-CHP and RP were more solid in their original stance on the Kurdish question, which changed very little once these parties assumed the government. The Motherland Party (ANAP) on the other hand comes out as the 'chronic opposition' of the 1990s, whose sole agenda within the context of the Kurdish question was to weaken the DYP, break the coalition and assume government once again. In that sense, ANAP's discourses appear to have crystallized around "what DYP isn't" as its main function within the TGNA appears to oppose DYP (and more specifically governments headed by Tansu Çiller).

Therefore, our hypotheses on the Kurdish question are partly validated: Social-Democratic Left Party conforms to our hypothesis "if a legislator belongs to the political-left, s/he defines it along the lines of emancipation", whereas DYP and MHP validate "if a legislator belongs to the political-right s/he defines it as a terror and security problem". However ANAP, DSP and RP can be provided as cases against these hypothesis as ANAP, being a center-right party, had frequently criticized security force violence, DSP, being a center-left party, had defined the Kurdish question as a security problem, and RP, being a right-wing party, had highlighted human rights and

democratization aspects of the question more than other parties. Our second hypothesis clears the fuzziness in the first hypothesis however. Agenda, as defined by representing emergency-rule districts, plays a very important role in the TGNA. We saw that emergency region deputies made more emphasis on the excessive force aspect of the Kurdish question, whereas non-ER deputies have emphasized the terrorism and security aspect of it. Finally, our third hypothesis appears to be partly valid. Generally, the TGNA has been the clearest and best example of to the theoretical dichotomy of the consciousness of the State and that of the non-State we discussed in the theoretical chapter. We can clearly observe the state discourse in Turkey shaping along Hobbes-Machiavelli-Weber, and an opposition discourse concentrating around the pole established by Locke-Rousseau-Kant. When a particular party is a part of the opposition, its legislators' discourses shape along the latter consciousness, whereas when they come to power, they adopt a stance based on the former. Only exception to this tendency was the Social-democratic People's Party (SHP) and the Welfare Party (RP), that consistently adopted a generally emancipatory discourse on the Kurdish question.

4. Comparative analysis of the European Parliament, US Congress and Turkish Grand National Assembly

A comparative analysis of legislative discourses on an intra-state conflict enables us to see the difference in priorities within each setting with regard to the conflict in question, as well as that legislature's culture and tradition with regard to intra-state conflict in general. With regard to the Kurdish question in Turkey, we clearly see how such priorities shape along major discourse contexts presented in a radar-graph:

Figure 9 - Discursive priorities in the European Parliament, US Congress and Turkish Grand National Assembly

The human rights dimension of the conflict comes out as the primary context of choice within the US Congress and the European Parliament; according to both of these legislatures, Kurdish question in Turkey was essentially a human rights problem, which would be solved by providing special status and rights to Turkey's Kurdish population. However these two legislatures part paths when it comes to their second most frequent discursive context; for the US Congress, the Kurdish problem had an 'excessive force' secondary dimension, whereas for the European Parliament it was a question of democratization and quality of democracy in Turkey. Predictably, TGNA had a much different agenda and perception of the issue. For the TGNA, the Kurdish problem was primarily a security and terrorism problem, which could only be solved by the military and the security forces, through increasing the military presence in the emergency regions and by increasing pressure on the PKK by cross-border raids and airstrikes. Also, although not

presented in the radar-graph above (since this discourse type is not valid for the US Congress or the EP) the Kurdish problem according to the TGNA, was primarily caused by foreign countries, agitated and financed on purpose in order to partition and destroy Turkey. However, rather counter-intuitively, TGNA also comes out as the most frequent critic of the security force and village guard abuses in the south-east. We observe that the European Parliament was quite reluctant to put the blame on Turkish security forces directly, instead working their criticism around security institutions, without directly criticizing them. In that sense, the US Congress was more confrontational with such institutions, mostly because of the fact that an overwhelming majority of the materiel used by these institutions were US-origin, whose export depended upon Congressional consent; this also explains the second discursive context of choice in the USC, the ‘excessive force’ dimension. European Parliament’s second choice of discursive context (democracy-democratization) on the other hand, depends much on Turkey’s EU membership process, which is heavily influenced by the European Union accession (Copenhagen) criteria, which calls for the improvement of democratic institutions and practices in a candidate country. It must also be noted that the European Parliament emerges as more sensitive towards Turkey’s right to defend its citizens against the PKK and hence, highlighting the security aspect of the conflict more than it had criticized Turkish security forces. The US Congress on the other hand had also highlighted the security aspect of the conflict, but it had criticized Turkish security forces and village guards more frequently than the European Parliament.

As I have mentioned before, ideology and party-affiliation were important factors behind how a legislator ‘talks about’ the Kurdish question in Turkey, in the European Parliament and Turkish Grand National Assembly; we also saw that ideology and party-affiliation plays very little

role within the US Congress. In this subsection, I will present a tri-legislatorial comparative analysis of how ideology shaped legislators' discourse on the Kurdish question.

First, I will look at how liberal parties performed in all three legislatures. Here, it must be highlighted in advance that Democrats in the US Congress cannot really be dubbed as 'left-wing' but they are comparatively more liberal than the Republican Party. Here is a graph showing which discursive context these liberal parties referred to in percentage to their respective aggregate discursive output.

	HR	Dem	ExF	SF/VG	Sec
PSE	34.46%	33.72%	19.18%	2.32%	9.30%
GUE-NGL	33.33%	30.70%	26.31%	3.50%	6.14%
Greens	21.12%	35.21%	26.76%	8.45%	8.45%
SHP-CHP	18.65%	16.41%	32.83%	18.65%	13.43%
Senate-D	31.15%	21.85%	18.57%	8.74%	19.67%
House-D	37.95%	20.51%	31.79%	6.15%	3.59%

Figure 10 - Cross-legislative analysis of the liberal parties' discursive priorities

Perhaps the most important convergence of the liberal party discourses within all three legislatures was the non-reference to the security aspect of the Kurdish question. Indeed, with the exception of the Senate Democrats, the security and terrorism aspect of the Kurdish question was not highlighted by the liberal parties. It is quite interesting to see that the Group Union for Europe – Nordic Green Left discourses on the Kurdish question have converged almost completely with the Democrats of the US House of Representatives in terms of human rights and excessive force dimensions, whereas the Nordic Left also converged with the Green group and the European Socialist group in the EP in terms of the democratization aspect of the problem. Turkish Social-democrats on the other hand converged with the Democrats in the US House of Representatives, and to a lesser extent European Green Group and the Nordic Left in terms of criticising excessive force practices of the Turkish state. Also with regard to the human rights aspect of the problem, there is great convergence between the European Socialists, the Green group, Nordic Left and Democrats in the US House and the Senate. It is also interesting to see that, the Senate Democrats come out as the most frequent adopter of the security discourse, followed by the Turkish social-democrats, whereas Democrats in the House have referred the least to this discursive context.

With regard to conservative/right-wing parties, the trend changes greatly. We observe that ideology plays a much lesser role in explaining right-wing discourses on the Kurdish question; rather we understand that ideology is an important factor with regard to explaining left-wing/liberal discourses. (I have also added Turkish state discourse in order to compare other conservative discourses against the state)

	HR	Dem	ExF	SF-VG	Sec
EPP-ED	37.28%	23.72%	11.86%	6.78%	20.34%
Council-Commission	35.85%	22.64%	5.66%	1.89%	33.96%
House-R	32.52%	17.79%	31.90%	7.98%	9.82%
ANAP	14.29%	14.29%	11.43%	50.48%	9.52%
RP	15.09%	14.15%	16.03%	20.75%	33.96%
DYP	19.51%	14.63%	0	12.19%	53.66%
TR State	16.88%	18.18%	0	0	64.94%

Figure 11 - Cross-legislative analysis of the conservative discourses

Perhaps the most important finding with regard to the performance of conservative parties is that they have very little convergence and each highlight a different aspect of the Kurdish question. While predictably the Turkish state had more reference to the security aspect of the question than any other conservative outlets in the TGNA, EP and USC, the True Path Party (DYP) follows as the most security-oriented political party within the political-conservative

continuum. It is also worth highlighting that another center-right party Motherland Party (ANAP) comes out as one of the least security-oriented parties, having criticized security force/village guard violence more than other conservative parties. On the other hand the European People's Party-European Democrat group, and the European Council and Commission representatives establish the human rights and democratization discourses of the conservative consciousness, whereas House Republicans come out as the most vocal critic of Turkey's excessive force practices. Welfare Party (RP) is perhaps the most 'balanced' of the conservative parties; although it has a security priority, it had referred to human rights, democracy and excessive force aspects of the Kurdish question equally. On the other hand House Republicans do not at all come out as having adopted a conservative discourse; rather their emphasis on human rights, democratization and excessive force push them closer to the European Nordic Left.

Therefore, while we can observe a particular discursive trend within the liberal politics with regard to the Kurdish question, we cannot observe a similar trend within conservative politics. Most notably in the TGNA, right-wing parties' discourse shaped less along ideology and more along whether that party is a part of the government or the opposition. In the European Parliament conservatives had more references to the security aspect of the problem, yet they did equally mention human rights and democratization aspects of it. In many ways, we can argue that political ideology becomes a more important variable with regard to left-wing/liberal legislative discourse on conflict, whereas it doesn't play a clear role with right-wing/conservative discourse. This is why, especially with regard to the right-wing parties, agenda becomes a more important factor behind their members' discourse on the Kurdish question.

Here, I will end the quantitative-comparative discussion. In the next chapter, I will provide a conclusion to this work, connect empirical findings to theory and explain where this study fits within the larger literatures on the Kurdish question, discourses on conflict and political science.

CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

Connecting findings with theory

1. Concluding summary

We had started this thesis with the inquiry: **‘what leads to different interpretations and discursive constructions of the Kurdish question?’** and discussed why legislative discourse is the best way to approach this question from a researcher’s perspective. We then specified our question and asked: **‘to what extent does a legislator’s ideology and agenda affect the way in which s-he defines and talks about the Kurdish question in Turkey?’**. In the theory chapter, we have also explained how discursive ‘habitat’s, constructed through speech acts and deliberations have affected power relations in the three legislative settings with regard to the Kurdish question.

One of the first findings of this thesis is that the ever-present poles of consciousness in the history of politics (the State and the non-State) have also been the central elements in Turkey’s Kurdish question. One can easily observe a clear-cut entrenchment through these legislative deliberations on the Kurdish question, one side representing the sense of the State, defined in the literature along the writings of Hobbes-Machiavelli and Weber, while the other side represented the consciousness of liberties and emancipation defined along the ideas of Rousseau-Kant and Locke. We observe that each of these poles of consciousnesses have established hegemonies in different discursive areas within the legislatures discussed, forcing their rivals into a state of non-decision through control of the floor agenda. How exactly these consciousness poles have

manifested in a particular legislative setting? The aim of the content chapters of this work (chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7) was to answer this question and provide both a qualitative and quantitative-comparative discussion of how the poles of state and non-state consciousnesses have manifested in legislative debates.

This work was the first extended academic study on the discursive construction of the Kurdish question within legislative settings and also the first one that compared how Turkish, European and American legislatures have discursively constructed the Kurdish question in open deliberations. The rationale for this comparative approach was to contribute to the literature on political conflict by testing whether (and how) the legislature of the country that hosts a particular intra-state conflict ‘talks about’ that conflict differently from the legislatures of the countries that observe it from the outside. Indeed, we have inferred that the nature of a particular language influences the habitual thought of its speakers: that different language patterns yield different patterns of thought and belief. Such thought and belief, then establishes power relations within a particular legislature and the political scene at large, creating a hegemonic discourse through which the official policy is channelled through, and a counter-hegemonic discourse, which attempts to bring an alternative interpretation and way of solving the problem. We also saw how legislatures are central to the study of discursive construction of a particular conflict, where every possible permutation of the views with regard to it are pitted against each other in a political Darwinist setting.

A realist might ask: ‘Can discourse affect policy?’ in other words ‘Can speech influence action?’ adding that mere speech has no power to affect concrete policies, especially within the

domain of ‘hard politics’ such as security and domestic armed conflict. This work’s response to such inquiry was to link discourse theory to operational-methodological theories of agenda-setting, policy advertising and non-decision and answering such inquiry by pointing to the norm-establishing power of discourse through the control of the legislative floor. Although a single utterance has very little (if any) chance to influence the larger policy process, the power of such elaboration is not its effect on policy formulation, but its role as a lens through which an outside observer can look into the map of beliefs and perceptions of the decision-makers. In this context, every utterance reflects a blueprint of ‘how things are’ for a particular utterer and such utterance becomes extremely important in a country’s legislature, as it is a forum where these competing realities are pitted against each other, where the winner establishes the hegemonic discourse, becoming the mutually acceptable ‘reality’, ultimately forming the main national narrative on a particular subject. Such national narratives eventually become the primary justification of any policy towards the policy in question; in our case, the Kurdish problem. Power relations within our context has been the interaction between what I have elaborated in length through the theory chapter; the consciousness of the State and of the non-State. Taking different forms such as parties, legislators and-or state officials, these two polarities of politics have also been central to any debate on the Kurdish question and enables us to understand why particular legislators and parties talk about the Kurdish question in a particular way. This is why our central concern with regard to this thesis was whether such entrenchment takes shape according to ideology or agenda; in other words do legislators assume a ‘state-ish’ stance along Hobbes-Machiavelli-Weber’s ideas, or an emancipatory stance along Rousseau-Kant-Locke’s lines based on their ideological affiliation or cost-benefit calculations that dictate their agenda.

With regard to the European Parliament in Chapter 4, we see that the consciousness of the state was mostly reflected through the European Council and Commission members, and to a lesser extent, right wing groups such as the EPP-ED. Such consciousness had manifested itself within the legislative debates in the form of more references to the security aspect of the Kurdish question, more emphasis on the continuity of the state and its extensions and generally less reference to the abuses conducted by the security officials. The competing consciousness of the non-state on the other hand was manifested in the European Parliament through the Greek MEPs, leftist groups such as the PSE, GUE-NGL and one particular Claudia Roth of the German Green Party. This trench had emphasized the human rights, democratization and primacy of the will of the people and did not make many references to the terrorism aspect of the conflict, as well as refraining from elaborating much on security, or PKK violence on non-armed symbolic extensions of the state such as school teachers, hospitals and-or mosques.

Kurdish issue was frequently brought to attention together with Turkey's other major foreign policy issue; the Cyprus – Aegean problem with Greece and the genocide allegations - Karabagh problem with Armenia. Rarely, other human rights concerns were also attached to the criticisms such as the persecution of the *Alevi*s and Chaldean Christians. Pointing to Turkish behavior towards these problems were generally brought up in a 'laundry list' way and followed a Aristotelian logic such as *'If Turkey massacred Armenians, it will massacre Kurds too; they also do not respect human rights in Cyprus or persecute Alawites or Chaldean Christians in their own country'*. Such a reasoning generally overlooked security challenges Turkey faced, such as the PKK and dismissed, trivialized public and government worries over lack of security as 'blind nationalism'. However, the Council and Commission were more aware of the severity of the

security challenges and could see human rights abuses and extra-judicial acts within the context of insurgency. That said, it would also be an over-generalization if criticisms of the MEPs were monolithic, 'anti-Turkish rhetoric'. In most examples, the MEP discourses of criticism pointed directly at the shortcomings of Turkey along its EU membership. In other words, MEP criticisms towards Turkey could also be interpreted as suggestions that would help Turkey along its EU membership adventure; the source of such criticism was not hostility towards Turkey, or anti-Turkish-ness, as much as it was advice and counsel. Although it is also true that certain MEP criticisms stemmed from strategic reasons (such as Greek members of the Nordic Left, whose overwhelmingly critical discourses showed very little variance), other MEP criticisms would have provided guidance to Turkish democracy had the security condition been less problematic.

The difference in discourses between the Parliament and the Council – Commission stem from the age-old tension between the elected representatives and the executive bureaucracy; the Roman Senate and the Consul. Although an apparent reason for this difference is the *raison d'être* of the parliaments and bureaucracies – where parliaments emphasize liberties, freedom of speech and individualism and the bureaucracies emphasize state security, manageability and *realpolitik* – another, less explicit reason for this difference is the essence of politics: the struggle *against* power in order to *assume* power. The difference between the European Parliament and Council – Commission doesn't arise from the fact that the Parliament was more sensitive towards ethnicity, but it comes down to the fact that the Parliament had been in a constant push for more say over European external affairs. Therefore, by adopting a different discourse than the bureaucratic branches, the European Parliament attempted to gain a foothold on arguably the most important item in on EU's external relations – Turkey – and arguably the most critical issue in Turkey – the

Kurdish question.

With regard to discourse theory, one can strongly argue that the civic-contractualist discourse had established a hegemony in the European Parliament, enabling legislators of this view to frequently taunt the opposition, forcing them into a state of ‘non-speech’ as an extension of Bacrach and Baratz’s theory of ‘non-decision’. This emancipatory hegemonic discourse was of course the surface manifestation of deeper underlying semantic structures within legislators’ psyches and can be presented as the general overarching sense of the European Parliament on the Kurdish question through the 1990s. Counter-hegemonic discourses of the Commission and Council members notwithstanding, one can clearly observe how the emancipatory consciousness of the left-wing (and to a certain extent, Greek) legislators within the parliament had spilled-over to other legislators, transforming individual semantic structures into the wider institutional discourse.

A similar tendency can be observed within the US Congress where the consciousness of the state was generally channeled through those House Republicans that were not a member to the Armenian or the Greek caucuses. These extremely small number of legislators who have associated with the consciousness of the state³⁹⁴ had highlighted the necessity of the Turkish state to use force if necessary and if the security of the state was in danger, de-emphasizing collateral damage induced by the attacks (especially in which internationally prohibited cluster and phosphor

³⁹⁴ These legislators (as well as their counterparts in the EP) were oddly referred as *Türk dostu* (friend of Turks) by the Turkish state in what might be presented as another case of syntactic differentiation of events and phenomena (i.e. ‘terrorist’ versus ‘freedom fighter’ analogy) where the state discourse in Turkey have identified those who speak through the consciousness of the state as ‘friends’, whereas defining those who share the consciousness of emancipation as *Türk düşmanı* (enemy of Turks). I have included a quote in the beginning of Chapter 4 by Claudia Roth of the German Green Party, questioning whether ‘friends of Turks’ are only those who have agreed and supported whatever policy the Turkish state has undertaken. A similar tendency can be observed with regard to the Israeli state in general and this can be a topic of future research.

bombs were used) and identity aspect of the conflict. The competing consciousness of emancipation on the other hand was concentrated around the legislators who were members of the Hellenic and Armenian caucuses, with less relevance to party affiliation. Both the Democratic and Republican members of the Hellenic and-or Armenian caucuses have pursued a discursive agenda similar to the Greek Nordic-Green Left legislators of the European Parliament, almost never mentioning the terrorism dimension of the conflict, instead emphasizing the security misconducts of the Turkish security forces, in addition to the democracy, human rights and excessive force-oppression dimensions of the problem. The US Congress is also the best example to the agenda-setting and non-decision theories, as the channels that conveyed the sense of the non-state overwhelmingly controlled the agenda on the Kurdish question; this dominance was so acute, that the hegemony of the consciousness of emancipation had overloaded Congressional debates and agenda far more dominantly than it had in the European Parliament. The agenda control power of the legislators of the Hellenic and Armenian caucuses have been so overwhelming, that it is safe to argue that the consciousness of the state was extremely rarely channeled into the Congressional debates. The US Congress was also a good case study for discourse analysis, especially with regard to how individual speech-acts and agendas create the wider institutional discourse; through the 1990s, the Kurdish question was brought into congressional debates via a handful of Congress members and the entire Congressional discourse on the Kurdish question was defined along the speeches of these handful legislators. Here, the case of the US Congress also offers a reply to the theoretical question: ‘can speech affect policy?’ by being a case in which a small number of utterances have effectively created the wider institutional perception and discourse on the Kurdish question.

In Chapter 6, I offered a qualitative analysis of the discursive construction of the Kurdish question within the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA). Although we can observe a dominant state discourse through TGNA deliberations, agenda control and discursive hegemony of the state consciousness was not as overwhelming in the parliament as the consciousness of emancipation was in the European Parliament and the US Congress. While the state discourse was frequently mentioned in the parliament, it was still unable to establish a complete hegemony over the consciousness of emancipation and at certain times, was forced into ‘non-speech’. In the TGNA, the consciousness of the state was channeled through the government officials (ministers), the governing party members and more specifically the True Path Party (DYP), Nationalist Action Party (MHP), Democratic Left Party (DSP) and legislators who do not come from emergency regions. On the other hand, the consciousness of emancipation was channeled by the Motherland Party (ANAP), Social-democratic People’s Party (SHP; later CHP) and deputies representing the emergency regions.

Consciousness of the State: Hobbes-Machiavelli-Weber	Consciousness of emancipation: Locke-Rousseau-Kant
European Council and Commission members	Greek MEPs in the European Parliament and Claudia Roth of Germany
Right-wing groups in the European Parliament (most notably EPP-ED)	Leftist groups in the European Parliament (PSE, GUE-NGL, Greens)
US Congressmen that are not members of the Hellenic or Armenian Caucuses and the members of the US executive branch	Members of the Hellenic and Armenian Caucuses in the US Congress.
DYP, MHP, DSP and the Turkish state officials in the TGNA	ANAP, SHP and CHP deputies in the TGNA (also to a lesser extent RP)
TGNA deputies that do not represent emergency regions	TGNA deputies that represent emergency regions

Table 21 - Consciousness of the State and the non-State in three legislatures

Perhaps one of the most important findings of this dissertation with regard to the TGNA was the observation that *‘parties and legislators in Turkey assume and emulate the consciousness of the state when they are in government, and assume the consciousness of the non-state when they*

are in opposition, regardless of their ideological line as declared in their party manifestos'. This gives us an understanding of party behavior and legislative discourse in countries that suffer from domestic conflict, where party ideology has much less influence over legislative agenda and discourse; instead the primary determinant of these countries' discourse on their domestic conflict is the question of whether the 'utterer' is a part of the state establishment (including the government) or whether the utterer is a part of the opposition. Ideology and party-related agenda notwithstanding, affiliation with the state apparatus or the opposition, is the primary factor affecting a legislator's discourse on the Kurdish question in Turkey. The same is also true for the legislators of foreign countries observing the conflict from outside (in our case, the European Parliament and the US Congress) – albeit, in their cases ideology and agenda play an equally greater role in determining agenda control and legislative discourse. In other words, especially with regard to the TGNA, the consciousness of the state has a transcendental nature and its domain has its own ideology and agenda separate from the political sphere in Turkey. In many ways through the perspective of discourse theory, I will argue here that the politics in Turkey (especially with regard to the Kurdish question) appears to be divided into separate habitats of 'the State' and 'the political'. As such, we can observe a clear discursive (as well as practical) separation between the affairs of the state and the affairs of democratic politics in Turkey, the way the affairs of the state are separated from religious affairs under Turkish secularism. Indeed, this is one aspect of Turkish narratives on the Kurdish question, which is most difficult to explain to an outsider, especially coming from Western political systems where government equals the state and the state is regarded merely as a tool, programmed to undertake policies as directed by the elected government. The difficulty in understanding the separation of state affairs from political affairs through 1990s' Turkey, has been the main reason why the legislatures of Europe and the United

States have been unable to process what is going on in Turkey with regard to the Kurdish question, getting frequently confused by different messages sent by the Turkish state officials and members of the government. The best example to this conflictuality was the deliberations in the TGNA through 1994 with regard to village burning incidents, where the state officials have repeatedly declared that the PKK was responsible for them, whereas the opposition parties as well as many members of the government had claimed that the burnings were carried out by the Turkish security forces in an attempt to undertake a 'scorched earth' policy that would create an 'empty zone', rendering the PKK unable to hide or resupply through the villages. Such duality in perception and discourse (speech) reflects the ever-present tension in the state-society relations and the political domain, reflected through mutual expectations, priorities and goals of the power holders and power challengers.

In terms of an overall comparison between three legislatures analyzed through this dissertation, we can definitely see a pattern between discourse within the legislature of the country suffering from domestic conflict and legislatures of the countries observing the problem from the outside. By studying the legislative discourse through an extended period of time (ideally, a decade) institutional discourse and general consciousness of the national narratives become easier to observe. There is a clear difference in such institutional consciousnesses between the European Parliament, US Congress and the Turkish Grand National Assembly. While European and American legislatures have identified the Kurdish question primarily as a human rights problem, for the TGNA, it was mainly a security issue. Additionally for the US Congress, the Kurdish question was also fuelled by excessive force and oppression exerted by Turkish security forces, whereas for the EP this issue was secondarily a democratization problem. For the TGNA, the

Kurdish question was secondarily a ‘foreign instigation’ and it was the help and support of the ‘foreign dark powers’ that enabled the PKK to launch attacks within Turkey. In many ways, most Turkish legislators believed that the PKK violence and the larger Kurdish problem would be ameliorated if foreign powers stopped aiding the PKK.

2. The significance of this study

This study is one of the first of its kind it bringing two seemingly incompatible methodologies, discourse analysis and statistical analysis together into a fruitful collaboration and certainly the first study of its kind in projecting this methodological amalgam into the field of legislative discourse and domestic conflict analysis. Secondly, this study introduces two new concepts; ‘consciousness of the State’ and ‘consciousness of the non-State’ in order to explain the discursive preferences and differences between state and opposition discourses. I believe this differentiation can offer a better way of studying domestic conflict and discourses on conflict for the future studies.

Empirically, this work answers the essential and surprisingly under-answered question: **“What is the Kurdish question?”**. Such an existential question of course does not relate to the essence and being of the issue at hand; rather the ‘what’ of the question begs a discursive answer (i.e. a human rights problem or security problem) that brings several discursive habitats into the picture. These discursive habitats constitute the ‘what is’-ness of the Kurdish question and not only provide us with an exhaustive list of argumentative meta-categories, they also offer us concrete policy options which would lead to the peaceful solution of the Kurdish question. Furthermore, this study is the first of its kind in providing a comparative analysis of how Turkey,

United States and Europe construct the Kurdish question and whether (and how) the country, which suffers from a domestic conflict construct its domestic conflict differently than outside observers.

In short, this study not only provides us with new and untouched avenues of research for the study of the Kurdish question, it also offers a model for future studies on domestic conflict, as well as a working example of qualitative-quantitative methodologies in cooperation.

3. Epilogue

The first three quotes I have presented at the beginning of Chapter 2 on history (two by R.A.F. wing commanders fighting the Kurdish insurgency in 1920-23 in Iraq, and one by Henry Kissinger following the C.I.A.-backed Kurdish uprising in 1971 against Iran) shows that nationality, time and space notwithstanding, some ethnic groups in history interact with the consciousness of the state in very predictably similar ways, regardless of the nationality or the ideology of the state. From this perspective, the essence of the Kurdish question – be it in Turkey, or in Iraq, Iran or Syria – has very little to do with the ‘Turkishness’, ‘Iraqi-ness’ or ‘Iranian-ness’ of the state or the type of political system these states are a part of. Having been interacting with the state consciousness in more or less the same way for centuries, the essence of the Kurdish question appears not ethnic, religious, ideological, economic or any other dependent variable, but the very chemistry that seems to emerge when Kurdish people interact with the state consciousness – not unlike how Caesium explodes on contact with water, regardless of the water

being clean or dirty water, or whether its orange juice or rain drop. Indeed, many observers³⁹⁵ have expressed their belief that (while the state consciousness is not monolithic and can be expressed in very different ways) certain ethnic groups interact with authority differently, resulting in either all-out rebellions or a law-based order. On the other hand, how different cultures handle elements such as authority, state, conflict and co-existence is the subject of serious anthropological inquiry.

However, while both the anthropologists and sociologists have studied the effects of authority on cultures and ethnic groups, they have had a tendency to regard those groups as dependent variables, as if a monolithic force of authority was imposed upon them. This relationship is a two-way interaction. While authority shapes people trying to mould and shape them according to whatever ideology and agenda it represents, people shape the authority through more peaceful methods such as elections, democratic participation or petitions or more violent methods such as rebellion, armed violence or terrorism. These more violent measures provide a challenge to the authority in question: does the projection of the consciousness of the state belong to a nationally acceptable and beneficial version of the state, or does the state require evolution? The intensity of the violence, one might argue, corresponds to the anachronism of the ideological background of the state through which the projection comes from. Therefore, intra-state violence reflects the extent to which the projection of the state moves closer to a particular ideology or belief at the expense of the people. Jean Baudrillard had claimed in response to global terrorism following September 11 attacks that “terrorism is society’s condemnation of itself” and “[t]he West’s mission is to make the world’s wealth of cultures interchangeable, and to subordinate them within the global order. Our culture, which is bereft of values, revenges itself upon the values of

³⁹⁵ For a theoretical discussion on this, see: Huo, Yuen J. and Tom R. Tyler (2000) *How Different Ethnic Groups React to Legal Authority* (California: Public Policy Institute of California)

other cultures”³⁹⁶. In this respect, cultural monolithization and subordination policy in Turkey and the subsequent escalation of separatist conflict in its south-eastern cities can also be provided as an example to Baudrillard’s suggestion on a micro-level.

In every country, society and system that suffers from internal conflict, such a pattern of monolithization and subordination can be observed. In almost all such instances the ever-present duality in politics – the consciousnesses of the state and emancipation – will establish their entrenchments materialized through parties, groups and associations and regardless of the existence of an actual material confrontation, the real battle will take place in words, through speech and among discourses. Words will establish discourses, discourses will establish norms, norms will dictate the agenda and out of agenda, actions and policies arise. If one is searching for an answer to where a particular state does its mistakes on its internal conflict and why a particular domestic conflict spirals into so much violence, that it cannot be controlled, the best place to look at would be the difference in long-term discourses (not speech) of that state versus that of the opposition and-or emancipation in that country. A state that intentionally overlooks the discourses of emancipation and an emancipation that intentionally overlooks the discourses of the state will remain as the contributors to the violence and conflict, and will remain baffled and confused, unable to ‘do something’ to make things better, eventually coming again and again to the simplicity provided by Confucius many centuries ago:

*“If language is not correct,
then what is said is not what is meant;
if what is said is not what is meant,
then what must be done remains undone.”*

³⁹⁶ Baudrillard, J. ‘The despair of having everything’ in *Le Monde Diplomatique*, November 2002.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Alexander, Yonah, Edgar Brenner and Serhat Tütüncüoğlu (2008) *Turkey: Terrorism, Civil Rights and the European Union*. (Routledge)
- Austen-Smith, David and John Duggan (eds.) *Social Choice and Strategic Decisions* (Springer)
- Austin, John L. 'Performative Utterances' in Robert Stainton (1999) *Perspectives in the Philosophy of Language: A Concise Anthology* (Broadview press)
- Austin, John L. (1975) *How to do Things With Words* (Harvard University Press)
- Bach, Kent (1979) *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts* (MIT Press)
- Barkey, Henri J. and Graham E. Fuller (1998) *Turkey's Kurdish question*. (Rowman and Litterfeld)
- Barkey, Henri J. and Graham E. Fuller (1998) *Turkey's Kurdish question*. (Rowmand and Litterfeld)
- Bartelson, Jens (2001) *The Critique of the State* (Cambridge University Press)
- Bayley, Paul (2004) *Cross-cultural perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse* (John Benjamins Publishing)
- Beschloss, Michael (2003) *Our documents: 100 milestone documents from the National Archives*. (National Archives and Records Administration, United States)
- Bird, Christiane (2004) *A Thousand Sighs, a Thousand Revolts: Journeys in Kurdistan*. (Ballantine)
- Bloch, Francis and Stephane Rottier (2000) *Agenda Control in Coalition Formation* (Fondazione Eni Enroco Mattei)
- Boulding, Karl (1969) 'National Images and International Systems' in James Rosenau (ed.) *International Politics and Foreign Policy* (The Free Press)
- Breakwell, Glynis M, Sean Hammond and Chris Fife-Schaw (1995) *Research Methods in Psychology*. (Sage)
- Brinton, Laurel and Elizabeth Coss Traugott (2005) *Lexicalization and Language Chance* (Cambridge University Press)

- Burton, Frank and Pat Carlen (1979) *On Discourse Analysis, Government Publications, Ideology and the State* (Taylor & Francis)
- Çağaptay, Soner (2006) *Islam, Secularism and Nationalism in Modern Turkey: Who is a Turk?.* (London: Routledge)
- Carrette, Jeremy R. (ed.,) (1999) *Religion and Culture by Michel Foucault* (Manchester University Press)
- Chilton, Paul Anthony and Christina Schaffner (2005) *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice* (Routledge)
- Cleveland, William (2000) *A history of the modern Middle East* (Westview Press)
- Conolly, John, Roel Vismans, Christopher Butler and Richard Gatward (1997) *Discourse and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar* (De Gruyter)
- Coulombis, Theodore (1983) *The United States, Greece and Turkey: the troubled triangle* (Praeger)
- Cox, Gary and Matthew McCubbins (2007) *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House* (Cambridge University Press)
- Cushman, Thomas and Stjepan Gabriel Mestrovic (1996) *This time we knew: Western Responses to genocide in Bosnia* (NYU Press)
- Cutting, Joan (2002) *Pragmatics and Discourse* (Routledge)
- David W. Odell-Scott (2004) *Democracy and religion: free exercise and diverse visions* (Kent University Press)
- Dijk, Theun (1997) *Discourse as Social Interaction: A multidisciplinary introduction* (SAGE)
- Dobkin, Majorie Housepian (1972) *Smyrna 1922: The destruction of a city.* (Faber)
- Dural, Tamaşa F. (1995) *Aleviler ve Gazi olayları [Alevi and the Gazi incidents]*. (Istanbul: Ant)
- Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (eds) (2006) *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn.* (Sharpe)
- Escobar, Arturo (1995) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton University Press)

- Escobar, Arturo (1995) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton University Press)
- Faroqhi, Suraiya. 'Crisis and Change: 1590-1699' in Halil İnalcık (ed.) (1997) *An economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge University Press)
- Foucault, Michel (2002 - reprint) *Archaeology of knowledge* (Routledge)
- Frey, James H. and Sabine M. Oishi (1995): *How to Conduct Interviews by Telephone and in Person*. (Sage)
- Gibbon, Dafydd and Helmut Richter (1984) *Intonation, Accent and Rhythm: Studies in Discourse Phonology* (De Gruyter)
- Giles, David (2003) *Media Psychology* (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates)
- Goldstein, Judith and Robert Keohane (1993) *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change* (Cornell University)
- Gunter, Michael 'United States Foreign Policy Towards the Kurds'. in Lokman I. Meho (ed.) *The Kurdish question in U.S. foreign policy* (Greenwood Publishing)
- Hanioglu, Şükrü (1995) *Young Turks in Opposition*. (Oxford University Press)
- Harrison, Glennon J. (1994) *Europe and the United States: Competition and Cooperation in the 1990s*. (M.E. Sharpe)
- Heidegger, Martin (1996 – reprint) *Being and Time* (SUNY Press)
- Hobbes, Thomas (1976 – reprint –) *Leviathan* (Forgotten Books)
- Hollis, Martin and Steve Smith (1991) *Explaining and Understanding International Relations* (Clarendon Press)
- Holsti, Ole (1997) *Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press)
- Holsti, Ole R. (1969) 'The Belief System and National Images: a Case Study' in S. G. Walker (ed) *Role Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis* (Duke University Press)
- Houston, Christopher (2001) *Islam, Kurds and the Turkish nation state*. (Berg Publishers)
- Howard, Douglas Arthur (2001) *The history of Turkey*. (Greenwood Publishing)
- Howard, Roger (2004) *Iran in Crisis? Nuclear ambitions and the American response*. (Zed books)
- Human Rights Watch. *Helsinki Report of October 1994* (Human Rights Watch),

- Huntington, Samuel P. (2004) *Who are we? The challenges to America's national identity* (Simon and Schuster)
- Husserl, Edmund (2001 – reprint) *Logical Investigations* (Routledge)
- Jessop, Bob (2008) *State Power: A Strategic-Relational Approach* (Polity Press)
- Jung, D. 'The Sevres Syndrome: Turkish Foreign Policy and its Historical Legacy', in Bjorn Moller (ed.) (2001) *Oil and Water: Cooperative Security in the Persian Gulf* (I.B. Tauris)
- Kaid, Lawrence L. (1981) 'Political Advertising' in Derek Nimmo and Kyle R. Sanders (eds.) *Handbook of political communication* (Sage)
- Keyman, Fuat and Ahmet İçduygu (2005) *Citizenship in a global world: European questions and Turkish experience* (Routledge)
- Kili, Suna (1969) *Kemalism* (Robert College Press)
- Kirisci, Kemal and Gareth M. Winrow. (1997) *The Kurdish Question and Turkey: An Example of Trans-state Ethnic conflict*. (Routledge)
- Kramer, Heinz (2000) *A Changing Turkey: the Challenge to the EU and United States*. (Brookings Institution Press)
- Kunalalp, Sinan (1999) *Son dönem Osmanlı erkan ve ricali, 1839-1922 [High officials and dignitaries in late-Ottoman era]*. (Isis)
- Kurz, Anat and Ariel Merari (1985) *ASALA: Irrational terror or political tool?* (Jerusalem: JCSS Press).
- Larsen, Henrik (1997) *Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis: France, Britain and Europe* (Routledge)
- Lindsay, James 'The Shifting Pendulum of Power: Executive-Legislative Relations on American Foreign Policy' in Wittkopf, Eugene and James M. McCormick (eds.) (2007) *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy: Insight and Evidence* (Rowman and Litterfeld)
- Locke, John (1980 – reprint) *Second Treatise of Government* (Hackett Publishing)
- Lybyer, Albert H. (1913) *The government of the Ottoman Empire in the time of Suleiman the Magnificent*. (Harvard University Press)
- Machiavelli, Niccolo (1883 – reprint) *Discourses on the First Decade of Titus Livius* (K. Paul, Trench & Co.)

- Machiavelli, Niccolo (1964 - reprint) *The Prince* (St. Martin's Press)
- Marcus, Aliza (2007) *Blood and Belief: the PKK and the Kurdish fight for independence* (New York: NYU Press)
- Mark Clarke and Barry White (eds) *Understanding Foreign Policy – The Foreign Policy Systems Approach* (Edward Elgar)
- Martin, Lenore G. and Dimitris Keridis (eds.) (2004) *The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy*. (Boston: MIT Press)
- McDowall, David (2004) *A modern history of the Kurds* (London: I.B. Tauris)
- Miller, Gale and Robert Dingwall (1997) *Context and method in qualitative research*. (London: Sage)
- Morgan, David (1999) *The European Parliament, Mass Media and Search for Power and Influence* (Ashgate)
- Norris, Christopher (1982) *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice* (Routledge)
- Öcalan, Abdullah (1995) PKK 5. Kongresine Sunulan Politik Rapor [Political Report Submitted to the PKK's 5th Convention] (Berlin: Güneş Ülke Yayıncılık)
- Peters, Guy (1998) 'The Structure of Government: Issues of Concepts and Theory' in Collin Campbell and Guy Peters (eds.) *Organizing Governance: Government Organizations* (University of Pittsburg Press)
- Ramsaur, Ernest E. (1970) *The Young Turks: Prelude to the revolution of 1908* (Abe Books)
- Rein, Martin and Donald A. Schon (1995) *Frame Reflection: Towards the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies* (Basic Books)
- Robins, Philip (2003) *Suits and Uniforms: Turkish foreign policy since the Cold War*. (Hurst)
- Rubin, Barry and Metin Heper (2002) *Political Parties in Turkey*. (Routledge)
- Sapir, Edward and David G. Mandelbaum (1985 – reprint) *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture, and Personality* (University of California Press)
- Saussure, Ferdinand de (1959) *Course in General Linguistics* (Philosophical Library)
- Seuren, Pieter (1985) *Discourse Semantics* (Blackwell)

- Shatzmiller, Maya (2005) *Nationalism and minority identities in Islamic societies*. (McGill-Queen's University Press)
- Smith, Karen (1998) *The Making of EU Foreign Policy: The Case of Eastern Europe* (Macmillan)
- Sprout, Harold and Margaret Sprout (1969) 'Environmental Factors in the Study of International Politics' in James Rosenau (ed.) *International Politics and Foreign Policy – A reader in Research and Theory* (The Free Press)
- Steiner, Jurg (2004) *Deliberative Politics in Action: Analyzing Parliamentary Discourse* (Cambridge University Press)
- Sylvan, Donald and Steve Chan (1984) *Foreign policy decision making: perception, cognition and artificial intelligence* (Praeger Publishing)
- Talbot, Mary (2007) *Media Discourse: Representation and Interaction* (Edinburgh University Press)
- Tiefer, Charles (1989) *Congressional Practice and Procedure: A Reference, Research and Legislative Guide* (New York: Greenwood Press)
- Van der Valk, Ineke (2002) *Difference, deviance, threat? Mainstream and right-extremist political discourse on ethnic issues in the Netherlands and France*. (Antwerp: Het Spinhuis)
- Vertzberger, Yaacov (1990) *The world in their minds: information processing, cognition and perception in foreign policy decision making* (Stanford University Press)
- Weber, Max (2004 – reprint) *The Vocation Lectures: Science As a Vocation, Politics As A Vocation* (Hacknet Publishing)
- Weissberg, Robert (2002) *Polling, Policy and Public Opinion: The Case Against Heeding the "Voice of the People"* (Palgrave)
- Welat Zeydanlıoğlu and John T. Parry (eds.) *Rights, Citizenship and Torture: Perspectives on Evil, Law and the State*. (Inter-Disciplinary Press)
- Whorf, Benjamin and John B. Carroll (1956) *Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf* (MIT Press)
- Yeğen, Mesut (2009) *Devlet Söyleminde Kürt Sorunu [Kurdish problem in State discourse]* (İletişim)

Articles and news sources

- Alvesson, Mats. 'Varieties of discourse: On the study of Organizations through discourse analysis'. *Human Relations*. Vol. 53, no. 9. Winter, 2000. pp. 1125-1149
- Anderson, Kenneth (1993) *The Anfal Campaign in Iraqi Kurdistan*. (Human Rights Watch)
- Arıkan, Harun. (2002) 'A Lost Opportunity? A critique of the EU's Human Rights Policy against Turkey'. *Mediterranean Politics*, vol. 7. p. 28
- Austen-Smith, David (1987) 'Interest groups, campaign contributions, and probabilistic voting' in *Public Choice*, vol. 54 pp. 123-40
- Bachrach, Peter and Morton S. Baratz (1962) 'Two Faces of Power' in *The American Political Science Review*. vol. 56, issue 4. pp. 947
- Banks, Jefferey S. and Frank Gasmi (1987) 'Endogenous Agenda Formation in Three-Person Committees' in *Social Choice and Welfare*. Vol. 4 pp. 133-52
- Baudrillard, J. 'The despair of having everything' in *Le Monde Diplomatique*, November 2002.
- Berkan, İsmet. 'Kürt Sorunu ve Terör Sorunu' [Kurdish Problem and Terror Problem]', *Radikal newspaper*. November 6, 2007.
- Blanchard, Eric 'Beyond Geertz: Discourse Analysis as a Qualitative Method'. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. February 4, 2002.
- Boyne, Sean. 'Arguments in favour of Turkey's continuing support for Operation Northern watch'. *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*. Volume II - Number 4. December 1997-February 1998.
- Erdem, Sari. "Iraqi Kurds Say Turkey Torched Their Town" *Reuters*, March 30, 1995.
- Ferejohn, John A., Morris Fiona and Richard McKelvey (1987) 'Sophisticated Voting and Agenda Independence in the Distributive Politics Setting' in *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 31, no. 1
- Forsythe, David. (2000) *The United States and human rights: looking inward and outward*. (University of Nebraska Press)

- Graham, Linda. 'Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault'. Paper presented at Australian Association for Research in Education. November 27, 2005
- Marquis, Susan Lynn. (1997) *Unconventional Warfare: Rebuilding U.S. special operations forces* (Brookings Institution Press)
- McKelvey, Richard (1976) 'Intransitivities in Multidimensional Voting Models and some Implications for Agenda Control' in *Journal of Economic Theory*, vol. 12 issue 3, December 1976 (Cornell University)
- Morrison, D. "Turkish War Concern for America," *National Journal*, April 15, 1995
- Munck, Gerardo and Jay Verkulien. 'Conceptualizing and Measuring democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices'. *Comparative Political Studies*. Vol. 35 Issue: 1. February 2002. pp. 5-34
- Paxton, Pamela 'Women's Suffrage in the measurement of democracy: Problems of Operationalization' *Studies in Comparative International Development*. Vol. 35, Issue: 3. Fall, 2000 pp. 92-111
- Perlmutter, Amos. 'On Target...Or Off Course in Kurdistan Clash?' *Washington Times*. April 4, 1995
- Pomfret, John. "Turkey's Hunt for the Kurds: the Making of a Quagmire?" *Washington Times*. April 2, 1995
- Robins, Philip 'Back from the Brink: Turkey's Ambivalent Approaches to the Hard Drugs issue'. *The Middle East Journal*. Vol. 62, no. 4. Autumn 2008
- Tatlıdil, Füsun, İlkay Dellal and Gülşen Keskin. 'A case study on the risk of rural poverty in semi-arid region of Turkey'. *Tarım Bilimleri Dergisi*. Vol. 15(1) issue 1. January 2009
- Ünver, H. Akın. 'Turkey's deep-state and the Ergenekon conundrum'. *Middle East Institute Policy Brief Series*, No. 23, April 2009

Online Sources

- N.A. 'Türkiye'deki Kürtlerin Sayısı' *Milliyet* (June 6, 2008) [The Number of the Kurds in Turkey]
<<http://www.milliyet.com.tr/default.aspx?aType=SonDakika&ArticleID=873452>>
- N.A. 'Başer: Türk-Kürt sorunu yoktur' *CNN-Türk* (June 9, 2007) [Baser: There is no Turk-Kurd problem] retrieved February 16, 2009 from
<<http://www.cnnturk.com/2007/turkiye/06/09/baser.turk.kurt.sorunu.yoktur/359260.0/index.html>>
- *Republican People's Party (CHP)* (October 28, 2008) 'CHP Genel Sekreter Yardımcısı Algan Hacaloğlu Van TV'de "Kürt sorunu bir demokrasi ve kalkınma sorunudur. Devletin etnisitesi, devletin ırkı yoktur" dedi' [CHP Deputy Chairman Algan Hacaloglu, during an interview with Van TV, stated "The Kurdish problem is one of democracy and development. The state has no ethnicity, no race"] retrieved February 16, 2009 from
<http://www.chp.org.tr/index.php?module=news&page=readmore&news_id=5583&sid=67c5bcd92c6e6a61f6862cde5812166c>
- N.A. 'Türkiye'de Kürt sorunu yok, terör sorunu var' *Haber Aktuel* [There is no Kurdish problem, but terror problem in Turkey] retrieved February 16, 2009 from
<http://www.haberaktuel.com/news_detail.php?id=2911&uniq_id=1234984820>
- The European Parliament website information on the composition of the legislature (accessed February 19, 2009):
<http://europa.eu/institutions/inst/parliament/index_en.htm>
- *The Constitution of the Republic of Turkey*, An English version is available online at the Directorate General of Press and Information, Office of the Prime Minister (accessed on February 19, 2009):
<<http://www.byegm.gov.tr/mevzuat/anayasa/anayasa-ing.htm>>

- N.A. 'Parliament wants more muscle in EU foreign policy'. *Euractiv.com*. September 26, 2007. Available online (accessed April 18, 2009):
<<http://www.euractiv.com/en/energy/parliament-wants-muscle-eu-foreign-energy-policy/article-167119>>
- N.A. 'A more effective EU foreign policy in prospect, but more parliamentary scrutiny needed'. *European Parliament Press Release*. May 7, 2008. Available online (accessed April 18, 2009):
<<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?language=EN&type=IM-PRESS&reference=20080505IPR28139>>
- Yackley, Joseph. 'Turkey, the EU and Democracy: How Public Opinion Divides Ankara and Brussels'. *International Relations and Security Network, Zurich*. August, 2008. Available online (accessed April 17, 2009):
<<http://se2.isn.ch/serviceengine/FileContent?serviceID=10&fileid=2AE20601-3179-1191-011A-1B9EA76FEF86&lng=en>>
- Dorsey, James M. 'Talking Turkey: Tansu Ciller Ready to Face European Union and Turkish Voters'. *Washington Report on Middle Eastern Affairs*. December 1995. Available online (accessed April 18, 2009): <<http://www.washington-report.org/backissues/1295/9512037.html>>
- Düzel, Neşe. 'Leyla Zana 'Hata Yaptık' Diyor [Leyla Zana says 'We made a mistake']'. *Radikal newspaper online edition*. January 1, 2007. Available online (accessed April 17, 2009):
<<http://www.radikal.com.tr/Default.aspx?aType=RadikalHaberDetay&ArticleID=801843&Date=19.04.2009&CategoryID=97>>
- Şafak, Erdal. 'İnönü'nün ardından [After Inonu]'. *Sabah newspaper online edition*. November 1, 2007. Available online (accessed April 17, 2009):
<<http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2007/11/01/haber,13722E347CD7469395540236E6423744.html>>
- Pope, Hugh. 'US abandoned us, say Kurds'. *The Independent*. September 4, 1996. Available online (accessed May 3, 2009):
<<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/us-abandoned-us-say-kurds-1361688.html>>

- Rosett, Claudia. 'Kurd on the Street; A visit with an Iraqi ally against terror'. *Wall Street Journal*. September 4, 2002. Available online (accessed May 3, 2009):
<<http://www.opinionjournal.com/columnists/cRosett/?id=110002214>>
- N.A. 'Kurds Supporters at American Congress are Increasing' *Patriotic Union of Kurdistan Media*,
<http://pukmedia.com/english/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=5933&Itemid=52>
- Greenhouse, S. 'US Support for Turks' Anti-Kurd Campaign Dims' *New York Times*, March 29, 1995. Available online (accessed May 3, 2009):
<<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=990CE1DD163DF93AA15750C0A963958260>>
- Arms Export Control Act (AECA), U.S. Department of the State website (accessed May 6, 2009): <http://www.pmddtc.state.gov/regulations_laws/aeca.html>
- Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Available online through USAID website (accessed May 6, 2009): <<http://www.usaid.gov/policy/ads/faa.pdf>>
- US military sales to Turkey, see the Federation of American Scientists page on Turkish arms acquisitions (accessed May 4, 2009):
<<http://www.fas.org/asmp/profiles/turkey.htm>>
- Turkish Constitution in English, Office of the Prime Minister, Directorate-General of Press and Information (accessed May 6, 2009):
<<http://www.byegm.gov.tr/mevzuat/anayasa/anayasa-ing.htm>>
- Law on Emergency Governorates, Turkish Ministry of Justice:
<<http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/652.html>>
- Akyol, Mustafa, 'Kürtler Azınlık Olmayı Lozan Döneminde Reddettiller' [Kurds have refused to be 'minority' during the Lausanne period] *Referans*, October 6, 2004. The original article can be reached at Akyol's personal website (accessed May 7, 2009):
<www.mustafaakyol.org/archives/2004/10/kurtler_azinlik_olmayi_reddettiller.php>
- N.A. 'Kart-Kurt'tan Eyalete' [From Kart-Kurt to State], *Sabah*, February 28, 2007. Available online (accessed May 7, 2009)
<www.sabah.com.tr/2007/02/28/gnd120.html>

- Institut Kurde de Paris web-page on the 'Kurdish Diaspora', (accessed May 29, 2009) <<http://www.institutkurde.org/en/kurdorama>>
- NA. 'Pro-PKK activist's brother dies in US plane crash'. *Today's Zaman*. September 5, 2007. Available online (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://www.todayszaman.com/tz-web/detaylar.do?load=detay&link=121283>>
- Akinci, Ugur. 'Grassroots of Anti-Turkism in America'. Turkish Daily News, March 10, 1996. Available through Hellenic Resources Network (accessed May 20, 2009) <<http://www.hri.org/news/turkey/trkn/1996/96-03-10.trkn.html>>
- Gugilotta, G., 'Campaign Primer's First Lesson: Cash Flows from Contacts', *Washington Post*, May 18, 1997. Available online (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/special/campfin/stories/cf051897.htm>>
- Durkin, T. 'The Great Toricelli – Man of Mystery', *The New York Observer*, June 6, 1999. Available online (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://www.observer.com/node/41573>>
- Embassy of Cyprus (Washington, DC) Newsletter. 'US Congress marks invasion anniversary'. *Hellenic Resources Network*. August 5, 1996. Available online (accessed May 20, 2009): <<http://www.hellenic.org/news/cyprus/cyemb/96-08-05.cyemb.html>>

Legislative Debates (Chronologically sorted)

European Parliament

- Extraordinary meeting of the European Council (Situation of the Kurds). D0647/B3-0560/91. Sitting of April 18, 1991.
- Humanitarian Aid to Kurds in Iraq. D1085/B30081/92. Sitting of March 12, 1992.
- Kurds in Turkey. D1144 B3-0553/92. Sitting of April 9, 1992.
- Resolution on Human Rights in Turkey. D2175/B3-0195, 0282 and 0285/93. February 11, 1993
- On the scope for peace negotiations in Kurdistan. D1695 – B3-0575/93. Sitting of April 19, 1993.
- Elections in Turkey. D2173/B3-0160/94. Sitting of February 11, 1994.

- Turkey. D2258. Sitting of March 10, 1994.
- Persecution of Kurdish parliamentarians. D2296. Sitting of April 18, 1994.
- Debate on the conviction of the Kurdish deputies. D0231. Sitting of December 15, 1994.
- Turkey. D0231. Sitting of 15 December 1994.
- Customs Union between EU and Turkey. D0311 – B4-0180/95. Sitting of February 14, 1995.
- Customs Union between EU and Turkey. D0311. Sitting of February 15, 1995
- Sakharov Prize to Leyla Zana, Turkey. D0786. Sitting of December 11, 1995.
- EC-Turkey relations – Human rights in Turkey. D0802. December 13, 1995.
- Sakharov Prize 1995 to Leyla Zana, Turkey. D0848. Sitting of January 17, 1996.
- Turkey. D 0852. Sitting of January 18, 1996.
- Political Situation in Turkey. D1255/B4-0985/96. Sitting of September 18, 1996.
- Turkey and northern Iraq. D 1655. Sitting of July 16, 1997
- Customs union with Turkey. D1193. Sitting of July 16, 1997.
- EU-Turkey relations. D 2283. Sitting of December 2, 1998
- Detention of Abdullah Ocalan and Kurdish question. D2401. Sitting of February 24, 1999.

US Congress

- Man's Inhumanity to Man. E2624: Vol. 135 No.99. July 21, 1989.
- Kurds, Turks and Cypriots: A New World Order for Whom? S2991: Vol. 137 No.39. March 7, 1991.
- Iraqi Treatment of the Kurds. S2991: Vol. 137 No.39. March 7, 1991.
- Turkey: Economic Assistance. S4110. Vol. 137 No. 53. April 11, 1991.
- Elections in Turkey. S16655: Vol. 137 No. 167. November 13, 1991.
- Turkey: human rights violations against the Kurds. E875: Vol. 138 No. 46. March 30, 1992.
- A Human Rights Tragedy: Turkey's Treatment of the Kurds. E875: Vol. 138 No. 46. March 30, 1992.
- Turkey: human rights violations. E2906: Vol. 138 No. 139. October 2, 1992.

- Turkey: economic assistance relative to the resolution of the Cyprus problem and compliance with international law E69: Vol. 139 No. 1. January 5, 1993.
- United States policy towards Turkey. E171: Vol. 140 No. 13. February 10, 1994.
- Turkish Democracy? Free Mehdi Zana. S5848: Vol. 140 No. 61. May 17, 1994.
- Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1995. Vol. 140 No. 106. May 25, 1994.
- Congressional Hearing. S7588: Vol.140 No. 81. June 23, 1994.
- Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. S15254: Vol.140 No.148. June 29, 1994
- Turkish Human Rights Compliance Act. S4199: Vol. 141 No. 51. March 20, 1995.
- Delegation Details Human Rights Conditions in Turkey. E705-E706. Vol. 141. March 28, 1995.
- Turkey's invasion of Iraq. S4741. March 28, 1995.
- Turkey must cease its relentless attacks against the Kurdish people. E745. March 30, 1995.
- Eightieth Anniversary of Armenian Genocide. H4494: Vol. 141 No. 71. May 2, 1995
- American Overseas Interests Act of 1995. H5389-H5455. May 23, 1995.
- Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act 1996. H6483: Vol. 141 No. 107 Page 78, Line 7. June 28, 1995
- Turkey's Parliament Takes Important Step Forward. E1521: Vol. 141 No. 123. July 27, 1995.
- Human rights abuses and United States-origin military equipment in Turkey. E1721-E1722. September 7, 1995.
- Foreign Relations Committee Staff Report on Turkey. S13655: Vol. 141 No. 144. September 15, 1995.
- Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 1996. S14031: Vol. 141 No. 148. September 21, 1995.
- Forsaking a Valued Bulwark To Extremism. E1972: Vol: 141 No. 161. October 18, 1995.

- Free Leyla Zana, Kurdistan Parliamentarian jailed in Turkey. E2305: Vol. 143 No. 158. November 10, 1997.
- Justice for Alizia Marcus. E2213: Vol. 141 No. 183. November 17, 1995.
- Oppose the Sale of Advanced Missiles to Turkey. E2340: Vol. 141 No. 197. December 12, 1995
- Anniversary of Massacre of Kurds by Iraqi Government. H2853: Vol. 142 No. 43. March 26, 1996.
- United States-origin military equipment in Turkey. E469: Vol. 142 No. 45. March 27, 1996.
- Self-determination for the Kurds. H2152: Vol. 143 No. 55. May 1, 1997.
- Plight of the Kurdish People. H10328: Vol. 143 No. 155. November 7, 1997.
- Turkey Looks Outside its Borders to Solve its Kurdish Question, when the problem clearly Rests Within. E2251-E2252. November 8, 1997.
- Free Leyla Zana. E2305: Vol.143 No. 158. November 10, 1997.
- Ankara's Decision to Sentence Leyla Zana. E2132: Vol.144 No.145. October 13, 1998.
- Clinton Administration's Double standard of foreign policy. E2289: Vol.144 No.151. October 21, 1998.
- *Needed: Justice and a political solution for the Kurdish people.* H1792: Vol.145 No.48. March 25, 1999.

Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA)

- Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 1: September 1, 1994
- Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 5: September 13, 1994
- Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 12: September 28, 1994
- Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 15: October 5, 1994.
- Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 16. October 6, 1994
- Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 17: 7 October 1994
- Term 19, Year 4, Session 18. October 11, 1994.
- Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 20: October 18, 1994

- Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 21. October 19, 1994
- Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 85: March 14, 1995
- Term 19, Year 4, Sitting 149. August 16, 1995.
- Term 19, Year 5, Sitting 8: October 13, 1995
- Term 19, Year 5, Sitting 17: 28 October 1995
- Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 4: October 8, 1996
- Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 6: 10 October 1996
- Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 11: 23 October 1996
- Term 20, Year 1, Sitting 38: April 17, 1996
- Term: 20, Year: 2, Sitting: 7. October 15, 1996
- Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 11: October 23, 1996
- Term 23, Year 2, Sitting 73: March 26, 1997
- Term 20, Year 2, Sitting 136. August 15, 1997
- Term 20, Year 3, Sitting 2: October 2, 1997
- Term 20, Year 3, Sitting 96: June 2, 1998
- Term 20, Year 3, Sitting 125: 21 July 1998
- Term 20, Year 4, Sitting 23: 24 November 1998
- Term 21, Year 1, Sitting 58: August 26, 1999

Appendix I – The European Parliament Discourse on the Kurdish question in Turkey

A) Sorted According to Country Affiliation.....	2
B) Sorted According to Party-Group Affiliation.....	11
C) Various statistical graphs on the EP’s discursive performance.....	20

Key to coding:

HR: Human Rights discourse **Dem:** Democratization/Democracy discourse **ExF:** Criticism for excessive use of force / violence by Turkey **PKK-t:** Condemnation of the PKK as a terrorist organization **Trmil:** Criticism of the Turkish military for its stance on the Kurdish question **TI:** Territorial integrity discourse **iEUc:** inter-EU criticism

Support / opposition dynamics: 1: Very negative, 2: negative, 3: neutral – in transition, 4) positive, 5) very positive

Relevance dynamics: + (issue relevant) - (issue irrelevant)

Austria

18.9.1996

D1255

Konecny (PSE – Aut)
(HR1,
Dem1, Dem1, Dem2
ExFV)

- continuing torture, murder, close down newspapers, raze Turkish villages
- Kurdish opposition blocked

2.12.1998

D2283

Swoboda (PSE – Aut)
(PKK-t, , PKK-t)
HR3

- we reject terrorism
- Kurdish people must uphold their cultural rights
- EU should help Turkey combat terrorism

24.2.1999

D2401

Swoboda (PSE – Aut)
(HR2)

- we call on TR to give Kurds rights

Kronberger (NI – Aut)
(HR3)

- HR and cultural rights is the way to solve the Kurdish problem

Program of the Finnish presidency

Swoboda (PSE – Aut)
(HR2)

- Turkey must respect HR, democracy, particularly in Kurdish issue

6.10.1999

State of relations between Turkey and the EU

(HR4)
Swoboda (PSE – Aut)

- positive developments in HR

14.12.1999

Swoboda (PSE – Aut)
(HR2, Dem2)

- Turkey must abolish death penalty
- it doesn't recognize Kurdish problem

Belgium

9.4.1992

Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC – Belg)

ExF, ExF, ExF

Dem2, Dem3,
HR3, HR2,
PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t

- murders directed against the Kurdish population in SE TR
- censorship against Kurdish publications
- political pluralism, human rights needed in SE TR
- request for the state of emergency lifted
- campaign against terrorism
- terrorism, terrorist acts of the PKK
- TR government has no reason to target women and children
- arms embargo on TR

Anne Andre-Leonard (LDR – Bel)
(HR3, HR2)

- Kurdish problem encourages TR gov to democratize
- Human rights must be respected

10.3.1994

DE19940310-02

Vandemeulebroucke (ARC – Bel)
(iEUc, iEUc)

- What will the Council do about this?
- Commissioner should take concrete action

10.3.1994

DE19940310-02

Dillen (DR - Belg)

(HR2, HR3
PKK-t, PKK-t
ExF, ExF)

- Kurds should be entitled to their language, beliefs, identity, self-determination
- condemn terrorism by the TR state and PKK
- Kurds right to self-determination
- Kurdish terrorism
- terrorist style responses of the TAF

15.12.1994

D0231

Andre-Leonard (ELDR – Bel)
(HR2, HR2
Dem3)

- violation of HR
- Kurdish problem should be solved in peaceful democratic nonseparatist way
- TR should democratize, recognize Kurdish identity

14.2.1995

D3011

Vanhecke (NI – Bel)
(iEUc)

- Will the EP and EU do nothing about the Kurds?

13.12.1995

D0802

De Clereq (ELDR – Bel)
(Dem3)

- we have to ensure Turkey proceeds along the democratic path

18.1.1996

D0852

Vanhecke (NI – Bel)
(HR2, Dem2)

- Zana in prison
- territorial integrity of TR must be ensured
- no restriction to Kurdish self-determination

24.2.1999

D2401

Aelvoet (Greens – Bel)
(Dem2, Dem3)

- HADEP having great difficulties
- Democratic Turkey is answer to the Kurdish problem

1.12.1999

Morillon report debate

Maes (Greens – Bel)
(Dem2, Dem3,
HR3)

- Kurdish right to self-determination is unresolved
- we'd like to see Turkey improve on democratization and HR

16.12.1999

Voting for the Helsinki Summit text

Maes (Greens – Bel)
(HR2)

- freedom of speech and HR neglected

Denmark

17.11.1992

PE 3 AP DE-1992

Ulla Margrethe Sandbaek (ARC – Den)
(HR1,
Dem1, Dem1)

- torture, murder, repression

24.2.1999

D2401

Bonde (I-EDN – Den)
(HR1, HR1, HR1, Dem1)

- political prisoners in Turkey being tortured
- jailing of young people
- Serious torture
- oppression of Kurds

Finland

Debate on report A5-0054/99

Seppanen (GUE-NGL – Fin)

(Dem2)

- problem of democracy in Turkey is the Kurdish problem

France

9.4.1992

Dury (S - Fr)

ExF, ExF,
HR1, HR2,
Dem1, Dem1, Dem3, Dem3, Dem3
PKK-t, PKK-t,

- massacre
- acts of violence, murders, CONDEMN
- PKK terrorist organization CONDEMN
- Kurds must be given rights
- murders committed in SE TR
- appreciate difficulties encountered by the TR Gov, will to democratize
- violence of TAF and terrorists of the PKK
- respect integrity of TR state
- open the way to democratization
- democratization and liberalization

Bernard Antony (DR – Fr)
(ExF, PKK-t, PKK-t)

- bloody fighting
- CIA armed the Kurds then abandoned them
- PKK is a Stalinist terror movement

10.2.1994
DE19940210-02

Elmalan (CG – Fr)
(Dem1, Dem1, Dem2
ExF, ExF, ExF,
PKK-t,
HR2,)

- policy of repression in Kurdistan
- shelling destroying Kurdish villages
- banning Kurdish parties
- condemn terrorist activity of Kurdish groups
- TAF's bloody reign of terror
- repression should stop
- negotiations with Kurds
- linguistic rights
- self-determination

10.3.1994
DE19940310-02

Simeoni (ARC – Fr)
(Dem2, Dem1
HR1,)

- military has the power
- assault on human rights
- regime of terror

15.12.1994
D0231

Fouque (ARE – Fr)
(Dem1, Dem1
HR1, HR1)

- iniquitous verdict by TR court
- total disregard against human rights
- Fail Kanan killed by TR
- Kurdish MPs under bad prison conditions

15.12.1994
D0231

Pailler (GUE – Fr)
(HR2, Dem2)

- Help Turks Kurds resolve this democratically
- TR violates human rights and democracy

14.2.1995
D3011

Blot (NI – Fr)
(HR2)

- Turkey doesn't respect fundamental freedoms

14.2.1995
D3011

Beres (PSE – Fr)
(Dem3,
HR3, HR1, HR2, HR1)

- Turkey should be anchored amongst parliamentary democracies, with HR
- Amnesty INT'L says Turkey is "out of control"
- recognition of cultural identity, respect to the frontiers
- deplore deterioration of HR

13.12.1995
D0802

Carrere D'Encause (UPE – Fr)
(Dem2, PKK-t)

- democratic progress is far from complete
- PKK bent on destroying public order

Lalumiere (ARE – Fr)
(PKK-t, Dem3, HR2)

- TR is facing terrorism from the PKK
- it organizes democratic elections but its not very representative
- we don't approve TR HR

Piquet (GUE – NGL – Fr)
(HR4)

- small progress on HR but not fundamental

Sainjon (ARE – Fr)
(Dem1)
we are breaking down a form of dictatorship

18.9.1996
D1255

Piquet (GUE-NGL – Fr)
(Dem3, HR1)

- we want a democratic solution to the Kurdish problem
- deplore deaths of Kurdish prisoners

Dupuis (ARE – Fr)
(ExF, PKK-t)

- TAF or PKK did not denounce violence

24.2.1999
D2401

Pasty (UPE – Fr)
(PKK-t, PKK-t)

- PKK terrorism
- condemn all forms of terrorism

6.10.1999

State of relations between Turkey and the EU

Roure (PSE – Fr)
(Dem2)

- denial of Kurdish problem

2.12.1999

Morillion report debate

Boudjenah (GUE-NGL-Fr)
(HR2, HR2, HR3, HR2, HR2, HR2)

- Ocalan condemned to death
- Leyla Zana in prison
- no significant progress made on HR
- Turkey should recognize rights of Kurds
- abolish death penalty
- release Zana

Caudron (PSE – Fr)
(HR3)

- we should guide Turkey towards better HR

Cauquil (GUE-NGL-Fr)
(ExF, HR2)

- oppression of Kurdish people,
- no recognition of basic freedoms

Krivine (GUE-NGL-Fr)
(ExF, HR2, iEUc)

- condemn repression of TR
- refuse to allow self-determination to Kurds
- criticizes EU governments on not allowing Kurds to vote

18.11.1999

Krivine (GUE-NGL – Fr)
(Dem1)

- Ankara dictatorship

Germany
9.4.1992

Lenz (PPE – Ger):
HR4, HR2
PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t
ExF

- we have thanked TR several times for help to Kurds.
- Attacks on terrorist forces in another country.
- Deaths among the civilian population
- military operations against civilians
- TR gov has the right to take action against terrorists

- demonstrations in EU countries weren't peaceful

Claudia Roth (Greens – Ger)
(ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF,
HR1, HR2,
Dem3, Dem1, Dem1
PKK-t, PKK-t,

- TR forces: trail of blood
- destroy rights of Kurdish people
- children among victims
- appalled by Turkey's reign of terror
- war against the Kurdish people
- Turks and Kurds should coexist in peace
- bloodbath
- condemn terrorism
- bloodbath in Kurdish towns
- condemn PKK's methods
- Turkish oppression
- TR gov to respect human rights
- war against the Kurds

Gerd Ludwig Lemmer (PPE – Ger)
(HR4, HR4, Dem4, PKK-t)

- Kurdish language is permitted
- Kurdish culture promoted
- Kurdish MPs in the parliament
- PKK deliberately trying to prevent reform
- Turkey's importance in the region

17.11.1992
PE 3 AP DE-1992

Claudia Roth (Greens – Ger)
(HR1, iEUc, Dem1)

- blatant violation of human rights
- criticize situation in the Greek jails
- declaration of war against the Kurds

10.2.1994
DE19940210-02

Haller von Hallertein (PPE – Ger)
(Dem4, Dem3, ExF, PKK-t)

- Turkey democratic state
- Kurdish issue major obstacle to democracy, yet can be resolved through democratic means
- PKK and TAF violence

Roth (Greens – Germ)
(ExF, Dem3, ExF)

- dirty war in Kurdistan
- Kurdish war will determine Turkish democratization
- Nevroz bloodshed

10.3.1994
DE19940310-02

Roth (Greens – Ger)
(Dem1,
TRmil,

ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF
HR1, HR2
PKK-t,)

- the TR parl has carried putsch on itself
- Chief of staff mutters under his breath...
- death squads that murder scores of people
- military personnel who set fire villages
- policemen who torture people to death
- PKK guerillas will not stand by this
- Two murderous parties
- turning country into a bloodbath

Lenz (PPE – Ger)
()

- TR gov should observe human rights

15.12.1994
D0231

Kreissl-Dörfler (Greens – Ger)
(Dem2, HR1, Dem3)

- Turkey breached parliamentary democracy
- human rights reports are critical
- Kurdish problem should be resolved democratically

Skellariou (PSE – Ger)
(PKK-t)

- parliament condemns PKK and TR terrorism

Schulz (PES – Ger)
(iEUc)

- We sacrifice HR to economic interests, especially the Council.

14.2.1995
D3011

Roth (Greens – Ger)
(Dem2, Dem2, Dem3, Dem2,
TRmil,
HR2, HR4
HR1,
ExF,
iEUc, iEUc,

- no democratization and recognition of Kurds
- Turkey moved more towards military solution
- reversal of democratization

Sakellariou (PSE – Ger)
()

- Turkish democrats working for democracy and a constitutional state
- TR must honor its commitments in HR, democratization
- HR violations
- burning villages, expulsion of Kurds
- Commissioner emphasized 12.5 billion ECU over HR

Brok (PPE – Ger)
()

- Turkey's standards of HR are relatively higher than our other partners in the region

Rothe (PSE – DE)
()

- flagrant violation of HR
- we must not put economics before HE

14.3.1995
D0380

Roth (Greens – Ger)
(iEUc,
Dem2, Dem2,
HR2, HR2,
TRmil)

- Council and Commission provocation by disregarding EP view
- anti-terror law
- what improvement in HR and democratization?
- Release of Kurdish MPs?
- TR trying to settle Kurdish question by military means

13.12.1995
D0802

Schwaiger (PPE – Ger)
()

- Turkey says its moving along democratization
- Schulz (PSE – Ger)
(HR2, HR2, HR2,
Dem3, Dem4, Dem3, Dem2, Dem3
Dem3, Dem2, Dem2
ExF, ExF
iEUc

Leyla Zana is in prison

Roth (Greens, Ger)
()

- democratization and political solution to the Kurdish problem
- anti-terror law was only cosmetic
- destroyed 3000 villages, driven out 3 million people, claimed thousands of lives
- current administration is not genuine democratization

Hoff (PSE – Ger)
()

- Kurdish oppression cannot continue
- Kurdish rights must be fulfilled

Gomolka (PPE – Ger)
()

- Turkey is light-years away from totalitarianism
- we should appreciate the process of democratization

Sakellariou (PSE – Ger)
()

- express anxiety about the human rights, democracy in TR

Langen (PPE – Ger)
()

- Critique for Roth for double standard on HR of Cuba

Lenz (PPE – Ger)

<p>()</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kurdish question will be solved by peace and democracy 	<p>(HR3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Death to Ocalan wouldn't be the best way to solve Kurdish question 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arms embargo genocide
<p>18.1.1996 D0852</p> <p>Telkamper (Greens – Ger) (HR1, HR2 iEUc, iEUc PKK-t, , PKK-t ExF ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> torture by the TR police arrest of Kurdish politician Melik Firat <p>von Habsburg (PPE – Ger) ()</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> critique of EP for applying double standard on Turkey PKK cooperates with Zhirinovsky critique of Daskalaki for photo <p>Sakellariou (PSE – Ger) ()</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> condemn bloody suppression of prison riots condemn terrorism by PKK <p>Schulz (PSE – Ger) ()</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> military excesses 	<p>6.10.1999 State of relations between Turkey and the EU</p> <p>Uca (GUE-NGL-Ger) (Dem3, HR3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kurdish question must be settled politically Kurdish identity must be recognized <p>1.12.1999 Morillion report debate</p> <p>Ceyhun (ALE – Ger) (HR2,) HR2, HR2, HR2, HR2 Dem3 Dem2,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> death penalty must be abolished we must contribute to democratization in TR <p>Brie (GUE-NGL – Ger) ()</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turkey must cooperate with HR, rights of Kurds, abolition of death penalty, democratization TR officials disregard HR <p>14.12.1999</p> <p>Langen (PPE – Ger) (HR2, HR2) HR3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> death penalty upheld for Ocalan Zana is in prison <p>Poettering (PPE-Ger) (ExF,)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> we hope TR mil will moderate towards Kurds hope TR gives Kurds a real identity <p>16.12.1999 Voting for the Helsinki Summit text</p> <p>Nassauer (PPE-Ger) (TRmil)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> influence of the military not amended <p>Greece 9.4.1992</p> <p>Alavanos (CG – Gr) (ExF, ExF, iEUc, ExF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> security forces attack unarmed demonstrators causing bloodbath Parliament has not reacted properly military assistance is used against unarmed demonstrators <p>Vassilis Ephremidis (CG – Gr) (ExF, ExF, ExF, Dem1, ExF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> murdered Kurdish demonstrators scores of dead and wounded Turkey's role in the war doesn't justify violence violate int'l law in most barbarous way Kurds aren't doing anything other than what we did to Nazis. 	<p>Alavanos (CG – Gr) (iEUc)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> European Political Cooperation is responsible, they aren't listening to the debate. <p>17.11.1992 PE 3 AP DE-1992</p> <p>Dessylas (CG – Gr) (HR2, iEUc)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turkey turns its back on the democratic rights of the Kurds patriots in the PKK Only Belgium and Germany that oppress Turkish immigrants to support this resolution <p>Ephremidis (CG- Gr) (Dem1, ExF, HR1, HR1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> violate international law in barbarous way genocide against Kurds systemic torture brutal destruction of independence, autonomy, rights of people, national sovereignty <p>10.2.1994 DE19940210-02</p> <p>Ephremidis (CG – Gr) (ExF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> systematical genocide against Kurds <p>10.3.1994 DE19940310-02</p> <p>Alavanos (CG – Gr) (HR1, HR2, HR2, HR2, Dem1, Dem2, Dem2, Dem2, iEUc, iEUc, iEUc (TRmil, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> violation of human rights and democracy ...they had the misfortune to be born as Kurds ...tell the Commissioner to put on his headphones arrest of Kurdish MPs <p>Pagropoulos (PSE – Gr)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> illegal arrest military over-arrogant TR violates human rights and democratic principles genocide against Kurds they are killing hundreds everyday <p>Ephremidis (CG -Gr)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> savage crimes against Kurds
<p>18.9.1996 D1255</p> <p>Roth (Greens – Ger) (iEUc, ExF, Dem1, Dem2 HR2, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> criticizes EP for hypocrisy no trace of democratization political prisoners dead from hunger strike state of emergency not lifted <p>Schulz (PSE – Ger) ()</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [in the Kurdish regions] there is torture if Turkey was a real democracy... <p>16.7.1997 D1655</p> <p>Roth (Greens – Ger) (Dem2, TRmil)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Democracy means finding a solution to the Kurdish problem military is antidemocratic <p>24.2.1999 D2401</p> <p>Langen (PPE – Ger) (PKK-t, PKK-t, Dem2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> condemn PKK terrorism PKK acts of terrorism find political solution to Kurdish problem <p>Program of the Finnish presidency</p> <p>Ceyhun (Greens – Ger)</p>		

- Commission and Council are responsible for the arrest

Nianias (RDE – Gr)

- persecution of noted citizens
- terrorism of TR state
- persecution of journalists, minorities
- Commissioners come here and disregard us

Alavanos (CG – Fr)

- condemnation of Turkish terrorists

15.12.1994 D0231

Daskalaki (RDE – Gr)
(ExF, ExF, ExF
HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1,
Dem1, Dem1, Dem2, Dem1
iEUc

- new genocide taking place in TR
- violation of HR and int'l Law
- punishment for expressing views
- 50 villages burnt to the ground
- 2 DEP lawyers killed

Dimitrakopoulos (PPE – Gr)
(,)

- act against democracy and flagrant violation of HR
- Turkey is far from democracy and HR

Theonas (GUE – Gr)
()

- arrogant violation of personal freedoms
- criminal policy of the Turkish government

Ephremidis (GUE – Gr)
()

- Commission requires EP's consent, not opinion (silenced by the President)

14.2.1995 D3011

Ephremidis (GUE-NGL – Gr)
(iEUc, HR1)

- Council and Commission suffering amnesia
- flagrant HR abuses

Daskalaki (RDE – Gr)
(HR2, HR1)

- Nothing has changed on TR HR
- continuing suppression of Kurdish HR

Lambrias (PPE – Gr)
(HR3)

- Cooperation between EU and TR depends on HR

Kranidiotis (PSE – Gr)
(HR2, Dem2, Dem1, HR1)

- HR violations, lack of democracy
- arrests, condemnations, torture

14.3.1995 D0380

Lambrias (PPE – Gr)
(Dem1)

- continuing persecution of the Kurds

Alavanos (GUE-NGL – Gr)
(HR2)

- Kurdish MPs in prison

Roubatis (PSE – Gr)
(ExF, ExF, HR2, ExF)

- genocide of the Kurds
- increased police activity
- improve HR
- stop genocide against Kurds

13.12.1995 D0802

Daskalaki (UPE – Gr)

iEUc, iEUc, iEUc
Dem1, Dem1, Dem1, Dem1, Dem2, Dem2,
HR3, HR1, HR3, HR2, HR1
ExF

- U-turn by the EP on HR
- TR antidemocratic
- EP blatant hypocrisy
- meager HR progress

Alavanos (GUE-NGL – Gr)
()

- imprisoned parliamentarians
- imprisoned journalists, authors
- torture
- we want Turkey to be a home for democracy

Kranidiotis (PSE – Gr)
()

- TR constitution autocratic provisions
- Kurdish delegates in prison
- anti-terror law a.8 not repealed
- HR violated
- policy of violence against Kurdish struggle

Lambrias (PPE – Gr)
()

- deplore HR violations in TR
- undemocratic for EU to influence TR elections

18.1.1996 D0852

Daskalaki (UPE – Gr)
(ExF, ExF, HR1, iEUc)

- condemns bloodshed on Thursday 4 January
- worried about reign of violence and terrorism
- manifest violations of human rights
- EP schizophrenic

18.9.1996 D1255

Lambrias (PPE – Gr)
(HR1, HR1, HR2)

- shameless violation of HR
- adopting murder as a method
- Zana is in prison

Ephremidis (GUE – NGL – Gr)
(iEUc)

- Council is guilty of disgraceful hypocrisy

Kranidiotis (PSE – Gr)
(ExF, Dem1)

- Turkey aggressive and autarchic policy towards Kurds

16.7.1997 D1655

Lambrias (PPE – Gr)
(ExF, HR1, Dem1, HR1, ExF)

- carnage and bloodshed
- execute, imprison, torture
- excessive violence

2.12.1998 D2283

Ephremidis (GUE-NGL – Gr)
(HR1, Dem1, Dem1)

- torture, disappearances, murder (cut off by the President)

Roubatis (PSE – Gr)
(Dem1, Dem1, ExF)

- torture, disappearances
- genocide must never be used as a tool

24.2.1999 D2401

Ephremidis (GUE-NGL – Gr)
(Dem1)

- military rule of torturers (cut by the President)

Lambrias (PPE – Gr)
(PKK-t, Dem1)

- PKK terrorist organization
- Kurds persecuted Turkey for 60 years

Program of the Finnish presidency

Alavanos (GUE-NGL – Gr)
(HR2)

- TR should take steps to give Kurds cultural rights

6.10.1999 Turkey

Korakas (GUE-NGL – Gr)
(ExF)

- TR policy of oppression of Kurds

Korakas (GUE-NGL – Gr)
(ExF, Dem2, HR2)

- bombings carried out by TR of Kurds in Iraq
- TR refuse to acknowledge democratization and HR

1.12.1999

Morillion report debate
 Korakas (GUE-NGL – Gr)
 (Dem2, Dem2)

- deterioration of democratization
- criminal code needs democratization

Alavanos (GUE – NGL – Gr)
 (iEUc)

- criticizes parliament for double standard against Kurds and Chechens

14.12.1999

Alyssandrakis (GUE-NGL – Gr)
 (HR2, ExF)

- TR violation of HR
- genocide against Kurd

Italy
9.4.1992

Gawronski (LDR – It):
 (PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t
 ExF,
 HR1, HR1, HR2, HR3
 Dem3, Dem3

- terrorist activities of the PKK,
- Trgov has right to respond,
- excessive violence,
- breaches of human rights (we condemn).
- Trgov attempting to strengthen democracy.
- TR was our ally during the war.
- Kurds victims of systematic human rights violations.
- PKK terrorists.

Luciano Vecchi (GUE – It)
 (TRmil, ,)

- predominance of TR mil in politics
- human rights must not be subordinate to nat. sec.
- Every citizen must have right to individual identity
- TR should proceed with democratization

15.12.1994
D0231

Caligaris (FE – It)
 (HR1, HR4, HR4, HR3, HR3) Dem1, Dem3,

- unacceptable in terms of human rights and democracy
- Turkey was an ally of the west for 50 years against USSR
- TR on path to democracy
- TR bastion of secular Islam
- helped us save Kurds in Iraq
- we should speed up Turkey's march to Europe
- Balkan countries have more serious HR abuses than TR

Dell'Alba (ARE – It)
 ()

- Turkey should abide by HR
- If no HR, no EU

13.12.1995
D0802

Cellai (NI – It)
 (HR3)

- we are asking for HR, political solution

18.9.1996
D1255

Dupuis (ARE – It)
 (ExF, PKK-t)

- TAF or PKK did not denounce violence

16.7.1997
D1655

Caccavale (GUE – It)
 (TRmil, HR1)

- military violate human rights in Kurdistan

2.12.1998
D2283

Bianco (PPE – It)
 (ExF,)

- TR violent attitudes

24.2.1999
D2401

Dell'Alba (ARE-It)
 (iEUc)

- Criticism of Italy for not holding on to Ocalan

Cellai (NI – It)
 (PKK-t)

- PKK terrorism

Graziani (PPE – It)
 (Dem2, HR1)

- Turkey should grant autonomy to the Kurds
- every HR in the book is being flouted

6.10.1999
State of relations between Turkey and the EU

Turchi (UEN – It)
 (TRmil,
 Dem1, Dem2, Dem2
 HR1) (HR2, HR2,)
 (HR2)
 ()

- Armed struggle must be condemned for democracy and minority rights

Speroni (NI – It)

- death penalty still in force
- HR not respected
- antidemocratic legislation

Fava (PSE – It)

- TR continues to deny existence of a Kurdish minority

Tajani (PPE – It)

- Abolition of death penalty and respect for HR

1.12.1999

Morillion report debate
 Speroni (TDI – It)
 (Dem1, HR1, iEUc)

- Turkey as a whole is undemocratic no respect for HR
- Criticizes Alema government for handing Ocalan

Morgatini (GUE-NGL – It)
 (HR1)

- everyday HR are violated
- PKK's ceasefire is positive

Ireland

11.9.1991
 (HR2)
 Proinsias De Rossa: “less than satisfactory performance HR”

9.4.1992

Patrick Lane (RDE - Ire)
 (ExF)

atrocities carried out against ethnic minority

10.3.1994
DE19940310-02

Maher (LDR - Ire)
 (Pkk-T, HR2, Pkk-T)

- TR gov fight against terrorism of PKK
- arrests benefit PKK terrorists

14.12.1999

Cox (ELDR - Ire)
 (HR3, Dem3, HR2, HR2)

- TR must make progress towards HR, democratization, abolition of death penalty, respect for minorities

Netherlands
9.4.1992

Mathilde Van den Brink (S – Neth)
 (ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF
 Dem2, Dem2, Dem3,
 TRmil)

- violent police presence
- restore freedom of press, allow language, education
- halt bombing in n.Iraq
- acts of violence by TR forces of law

Jan Willem Bertens (LDR – Neth)
 ()

- Turkish army overreacted
- innocent victims among civilians
- Kurdish issue key to democratization
- army's uncontrolled, brutal and unacceptable actions

10.2.1994
DE19940210-02

Bertens (LDR – Neth)
 (PKK-t, ExF, Dem3, HR2)

- condemn PKK terrorism
- condemn TR violence against civilians
- Kurdish problem can be resolved democratically
 - ethnic cultural rights

10.3.1994

DE19940310-02

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)
(Dem3, Dem2)

- Kurdish problem democratic means
- arrest is not democratic

15.12.1994

D0231

Siema (ELDR – Neth)
(HR2, HR3)

- punishes for free speech
- Kurds must have cultural identity

14.2.1995

D3011

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)
(HR2, iEUc)

- realpolitik cannot be used as an excuse to HR

14.3.1995

D0380

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)
(HR2)

- human right violations, treatment of the Kurds

13.12.1995

D0802

Dr Vries (ELDR – Neth)
(Dem4, Dem1, Dem2, Dem3
HR4, HR2, HR1, HR1, HR2, HR3

- EP persuaded TR to relax its anti-terror law and release political prisoners
- HR in Turkey remains unsatisfactory
- torture even of children is commonplace
- arrests against people of opinion is still exercised
- state security prisons deny rights

van der Waal (EDN – Neth)

()

- there are no signs that Turkey is seeking a peaceful solution to the Kurdish problem
- discrimination against minorities

Oomen-Ruijten (PPE – Neth)

()

- Kurdish question tied to democratization
- improve HR

18.1.1996

D0852

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)
(Dem3, HR3, ExF, ExF)

- TR claims to be a democratic country
- Turkey should enable minorities to develop rather than terrorism
- bloodbath in Istanbul prison

D'Ancona (PSE – Neth)
(HR1, HR1)

- four political prisoners were killed in Istanbul
- Metin Goktepe tortured to death

18.9.1996

D1255

Van der Waal (EDN – Neth)
(Dem3, Dem1, Dem1
HR3, HR1, HR2

ExF ExF,

- there was democratic and HR improvements in TR, but currently they are reversed

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)

()

- Constantly more aggressive policy towards Kurds is adopted

Dankert (PSE – Neth)

()

- Turkish government burns villages
- systematic torture, disappearances, extra-judicial killings
- no signs of improvement in any HR

16.7.1997

D1655

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)
(PKK-t, ExF, TRmil)

- I reject the terrorism of the PKK, Turkish response is not justified
- we hope military withdraws from politics

2.12.1998

D2283

Van Bladel (GUE – Neth)
(PKK-t)

- Ocalan: terrorist leader

24.2.1999

D2401

Oostlander (PPE – Neth)
(PKK-t, PKK-t

ExF,

Dem3, Dem2, Dem3, Dem3

- PKK terrorism
- brutal repression by TR mil
- self-determination possible through democracy

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)

()

- PKK terrorist organization
- Kurdish existence not recognized
- we must promote democratization of Turkey
- Democratic parties like HADEP must be given rights

6.10.1999

State of relations between Turkey and the EU

Belder (EDD – Neth)
(ExF, Dem2)

- Turkey's hard line approach against Kurdish questions

Van den Bos (ELDR – Neth)
(TRmil, HR2)

- supreme authority must fall on government, not military
- TR infringes HR

Spain

13.12.1995

D0802

Carnero Gonzalez (GUE-NGL- Sp)
(Dem1, Dem1, Dem1, Dem1, Dem2
HR1, HR1, HR1, HR2, HR2, HR2
TRmil

- Turkey is a country with substantial problems with democracy and HR
- opinions cannot be expressed in Turkey
- state security overrides citizens' rights
- torture, arbitrary imprisonment, disappearances
- Leyla Zana is still in prison
- TR should enter into negotiations with Kurds

Puerta (GUE-NGL – Sp)

()

- pseudo-democratic structures
- under military tutelage
- identity of minorities not recognized
- HR violated

6.10.1999

Turkey

Gorostiaga-Atxalandabaso (NI - Sp)
(HR2)

- Turkey is denying recognition of Kurds

Carnero Gonzales (PSE – Sp)
(HR2)

- push for democratic values is not being fulfilled

Sweden

18.1.1996

D0852

Sjöstedt (GUE-NGL – Swe)
(HR2, HR2, HR2

ExF, ExF,

TRmil, ,

PKK-t, iEUc)

- series of HR violations
- HR violations
- outrages against Kurdish minority
- barbaric methods by TR mil
- MPs detained in prisons
- we condemn all forms of separatism and terrorism
- criticism of Swedish government for deporting Kurdish families

18.9.1996

D1255

Theorin (PSE – Swe)
(HR1, Dem1, ExF, ExF, Dem2, Dem2, Dem2)

- torture is still practiced
- people disappearances
- brutality against protestors
- villages are burned down
- HADEP was not allowed to conduct election campaign
- article 8 of the anti-terror law still practiced
- writers prosecuted

6.10.1999

Turkey

Schmidt (ELDR – Swe)
(HR2, PKK-t)

- Turkey deny Kurds political cultural rights, language
- PKK should renounce terrorism

1.12.1999

Morillion report debate

Schori (PSE – Swe)
(HR1, HR2)

- torture, breaches of HR

14.12.1999

Schori (PSE – Swe)
(HR2)

- Turkey must give full rights to Kurds

Portugal

9.4.1992

Joao Cravinho (S – Port)
(PKK-t, ExF)

- condemn PKK terrorism
- brutal repression by TAF

1.12.1999

Morillion report debate

Queiro (UEN – Port)
(HR2, HR3)

- we are concerned by the death sentence of Ocalan
- preservation of HR

16.12.1999

Voting for the Helsinki Summit text

Figueiredo (GUE-NGL – Port)
(Dem3)

- TR must find a political solution to the Kurdish question

UK

10.2.1994

DE19940210-02

Arthur Stanley Newens (PSE – UK)
(Dem3, Dem2)

HR2, HR3, HR3

ExF, ExF,
PKK-t.)

- democracy in Turkey is being undermined by

the Kurdish question

- human rights abuses (HEP, DEP banned, representatives attacked, journalists killed)
- Nevros bloodbath
- TR Gov and PKK should cease violence
- Kurdish rights must be fully recognized x 2

10.3.1994

DE19940310-02

Newens (PSE – UK)

(HR2, PKK-t, ExF, Dem1, Dem3, HR3)

- TR doesn't recognize rights of the Kurdish people
- campaign of terror by PKK
- TR authorities used ruthless violence
- condemn the arrest of MPs
- Kurds democratically, full rights

15.12.1994

D0231

Moorhouse (PPE – UK)

(HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR2, HR3)

Dem2, Dem1, Dem2,
ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF,
TrMil, PKK-t,

- onslaught of HR
- TR resort to state terrorism
- many people imprisoned

Newens (PSE – UK)

()

- genuine parliamentary democracy is not allowed in TR
- undemocratic and intolerant character of Turkey
- intolerance
- ruthless campaign against Kurdish rights
- newspapers, journalists
- cruel military campaign harassed, terrorized
- destroy villages
- condemn act of terrorism by PKK, scale of terrorism by the TR cannot be justified
- Kurdish rights should fully recognized

14.2.1995

D3011

Green (PSE – UK)

(HR2, Dem2)

- violations of human rights
- Turkey doing nothing on reforms

Moorhouse (PPE – UK)

(HR2)

- Turkey doesn't respect its obligations towards HR

14.3.1995

D0380

Green (PSE – UK)

(HR2, Dem2)

- HR abuses in TR
- Turkey had no gestures towards Kurdish MPs

13.12.1995

D0802

Green (PSE – UK)

(Dem2, iEUC, Dem1, Dem4, Dem4, HR4, ExF, HR3)

- Turkey doesn't adhere to the norms and values of democratic life
- Neither Council nor commission asked for reform from Turkey in exchange for customs union
- no freedom of speech in TR
- there was positive constitution change
- participatory democracy has been enhanced
- most political prisoners have been released
- dreadful war
- Kurds should exercise their language culture and traditions

18.1.1996

D0852

Green (PSE – UK)

(ExF, HR1, Dem1, HR1, HR1, ExF)

- TR actions have been vicious, gross and deadly
- beatings, torture, killings
- abuse in the Kurdish lands
- barbaric and medieval behavior

18.9.1996

D1255

Moorhouse (PPE – UK)

(Dem2, Dem2, Dem2, HR1)

- Yasar Kemal was imprisoned
- anti-terror law still implemented
- extra-judicial killings still take place
- HR situation critical

2.12.1998

D2283

Titely (PSE – UK)

(Dem3)

- to solve Kurdish question we should strengthen democracy

24.2.1999

D2401

Green (PSE – UK)

(ExF, PKK-t, PKK-t, Dem1, HR1, HR3, Dem2)

- destruction of villages in SE TR strengthened terrorism
- we condemn terrorism
- extra-judicial murders and torture in prisons
- Kurds must enjoy their language rights
- HADEP is being harassed

6.10.1999

State of relations between Turkey and the EU

Duff (ELDR - UK)

(Dem2)

- nobody should ignore problems over Kurds

Ludford (ELDR - UK)

(Dem2, HR2, ExF, ExF, PKK-t, ExF)

- Turkey unable to democratize, HR or Kurdish rights
- Turkey repressing Kurdish people
- Millions have been evicted from homes
- PKK committed some atrocities but TR mil outweighed them

14.12.1999

Ludford (ELDR - UK)
(HR4, HR2, HR2)

	• welcome signs death sentence may be lifted		• TR must recognize cultural rights of Kurds
	• TR denies identity to its citizens		

Socialist Group / European Socialists

11.9.1991

(HR2)
Proinsias De Rossa: "less than satisfactory performance HR"

9.4.1992

Dury (S - Fr)
(ExF, ExF, Dem1, PKK-t, HR2, Dem1, Dem3, ExF, PKK-t, TI, Dem3, Dem3)

- massacre
- acts of violence, murders, CONDEMN
- PKK terrorist organization CONDEMN
- Kurds must be given rights
- murders committed in SE TR
- appreciate difficulties encountered by the TR Gov, will to democratize
- violence of TAF and terrorists of the PKK
- respect integrity of TR state
- open the way to democratization
- democratization and liberalization

Luciano Vecchi (GUE - It)
(TRmil, HR3, HR3, Dem3)

- predominance of TR mil in politics
- human rights must not be subordinate to nat. sec.
- Every citizen must have right to individual identity
- TR should proceed with democratization

Joao Cravinho (S - It)
(PKK-t, ExF)

- condemn PKK terrorism
- brutal repression by TAF

Mathilde Van den Brink (S - Neth)
(ExF, Dem2, HR2, Dem2, TRmil, ExF)

- violent police presence
- restore freedom of press, allow language, education
- halt bombing in n.Iraq
- acts of violence by TR forces of law

10.2.1994
DE19940210-02

Arthur Stanley Newens (PSE - UK)
(Dem3, HR2, Dem2, Dem2, ExF, ExF, PKK-t, HR2)

- democracy in Turkey is being undermined by the Kurdish question
- human rights abuses (HEP, DEP banned, representatives attacked, journalists killed)
- Nevros bloodbath
- TR Gov and PKK should cease violence
- Kurdish rights must be fully recognized x 2

10.3.1994
DE19940310-02

Pagropoulos (PSE - Gr)
(Dem2, TRmil, HR2, Dem2, ExF, ExF)

- illegal arrest
- military over-arrogant
- TR violates human rights and democratic principles
- genocide against Kurds
- they are killing hundreds everyday

Newens (PSE - UK)
(HR2, PKK-t, ExF, Dem2, Dem3)

- TR doesn't recognize rights of the Kurdish people
- campaign of terror by PKK
- TR authorities used ruthless violence
- condemn the arrest of MPs
- Kurds democratically, full rights

15.12.1994
D0231

Fouque (ARE - Fr)
(Dem1, HR1, HR1, HR2)

- iniquitous verdict by TR court
- total disregard against human rights
- Fail Kanan killed by TR
- Kurdish MPs under bad prison conditions

Skellariou (PSE - Ger)
(PKK-t, ExF)

- parliament condemns PKK and TR terrorism

Newens (PSE - UK)
(Dem2, Dem1, Dem1, ExF, Dem2, ExF, TRmil, ExF, PKK-t, ExF, HR3)

- genuine parliamentary democracy is not allowed in TR
- undemocratic and intolerant character of Turkey
- intolerance
- ruthless campaign against Kurdish rights
- newspapers, journalists
- cruel military campaign harassed, terrorized
- destroy villages
- condemn act of terrorism by PKK, scale of terrorism by the TR cannot be justified
- Kurdish rights should fully recognized

Schulz (PSE - Ger)
(iEUc)

- We sacrifice HR to economic interests, especially the Council.

14.2.1995
D3011

Green (PSE - UK)
(HR2, Dem2)

- violations of human rights
- Turkey doing nothing on reforms

Sakellariou (PSE - Ger)

(Dem4, HR3, Dem3, HR2, ExF, iEUc)

- Turkish democrats working for democracy and a constitutional state
- TR must honor its commitments in HR, democratization
- HR violations
- burning villages, expulsion of Kurds
- Commissioner emphasized 12.5 billion ECU over HR

Kranidiotis (PSE - Gr)
(HR2, Dem2, HR2, HR1)

- HR violations, lack of democracy
- arrests, condemnations, torture

Beres (PSE - Fr)
(HR3, Dem3, HR1, HR3, TI, HR1)

- Turkey should be anchored amongst parliamentary democracies, with HR
- Amnesty INT'L says Turkey is "out of control"
- recognition of cultural identity, respect to the frontiers
- deplore deterioration of HR

Rothe (PSE - DE)
(HR1, iEUc)

- flagrant violation of HR
- we must not put economics before HE

Green (PSE - UK)
(HR2, Dem2)

- HR abuses in TR
- Turkey had no gestures towards Kurdish MPs

14.3.1995
D0380

Roubatis (PSE - Gr)
(ExF, ExF, HR3, ExF)

- genocide of the Kurds
- increased police activity
- improve HR
- stop genocide against Kurds

13.12.1995
D0802

Carnero Gonzalez (PSE - Sp)
(Dem1, HR1, HR2, HR2, HR2, Dem2, HR2, HR2)

- Turkey is a country with substantial problems with democracy and HR
- opinions cannot be expressed in Turkey
- state security overrides citizens' rights
- torture, arbitrary imprisonment, disappearances
- Leyla Zana is still in prison
- TR should enter into negotiations with Kurds

Schulz (PSE - Ger)
(HR2)

- Leyla Zana is in prison

Green (PSE - UK)
(Dem2, iEUc, HR2, Dem4, Dem4, Dem4, ExF,

PKK-t, HR3)

- Turkey doesn't adhere to the norms and values of democratic life
- Neither Council nor commission asked for reform from Turkey in exchange for customs union
- no freedom of speech in TR
- there was positive constitution change
- participatory democracy has been enhanced
- most political prisoners have been released
- dreadful war
- Kurds should exercise their language culture and traditions

Lalumiére (ARE – Fr)

(PKK-t, Dem3, HR2)

- TR is facing terrorism from the PKK
- it organizes democratic elections but its not very representative
- we don't approve TR HR

Hoff (PSE – Ger)

(ExF, HR3)

- Kurdish oppression cannot continue
- Kurdish rights must be fulfilled

Sakellariou (PSE – Ger)

(HR1, Dem1)

- express anxiety about the human rights, democracy in TR

Kranidiotis (PSE – Gr)

(Dem2, Dem2, Dem2, HR2, ExF)

- TR constitution autocratic provisions
- Kurdish delegates in prison
- anti-terror law a.8 not repealed
- HR violated
- policy of violence against Kurdish struggle

18.1.1996

D0852

Green (PSE – UK)

(ExF, HR1, HR1, Dem1, ExF, ExF)

- TR actions have been vicious, gross and deadly
- beatings, torture, killings
- abuse in the Kurdish lands
- barbaric and medieval behavior

Sakellariou (PSE – Ger)

(ExF, PKK-t)

- condemn bloody suppression of prison riots
- condemn terrorism by PKK

D'Ancona (PSE – Neth)

(HR1, HR1)

- four political prisoners were killed in Istanbul
- Metin Goktepe tortured to death

Schulz (PSE – Ger)

(Trmil, ExF)

military excesses

18.9.1996

D1255

Kranidiotis (PSE – Gr)

(ExF, Dem2)

- Turkey aggressive and autarchic policy towards Kurds

Konecny (PSE – Aut)

(HR1, Dem1, Dem2, ExF, Dem2)

- continuing torture, murder, close down newspapers, raze Turkish villages
- Kurdish opposition blocked

Theorin (PSE – Swe)

(HR1, Dem1, Dem1, ExF, Dem2, Dem2, HR2)

- torture is still practiced
- people disappearances
- brutality against protestors
- villages are burned down
- HADEP was not allowed to conduct election campaign
- article 8 of the anti-terror law still practiced
- writers prosecuted

Schulz (PSE – Ger)

(HR1, Dem2)

- [in the Kurdish regions] there is torture
- if Turkey was a real democracy...

Dankert (PSE – Neth)

(ExF, HR1, Dem1, Dem1, HR2)

- Turkish government burns villages
- systematic torture, disappearances, extra-judicial killings
- no signs of improvement in any HR

2.12.1998

D2283

Swoboda (PSE – Aut)

(PKK-t, HR3, PKK-t)

- we reject terrorism
- Kurdish people must uphold their cultural rights
- EU should help Turkey combat terrorism

Titley (PSE – UK)

(Dem3)

- to solve Kurdish question we should strengthen democracy

Roubatis (PSE – Gr)

(HR1, Dem2, ExF)

- torture, disappearances
- genocide must never be used as a tool

24.2.1999

D2401

Green (PSE – UK)

(ExF, PKK-t, PKK-t, Dem1, HR1, HR3, Dem1)

- destruction of villages in SE TR strengthened terrorism
- we condemn terrorism
- extra-judicial murders and torture in prisons
- Kurds must enjoy their language rights
- HADEP is being harassed

Swoboda (PSE – Aut)

(HR2)

- we call on TR to give Kurds rights

21.7.1999

Program of the Finnish presidency

Swoboda (PSE – Aut)

(HR2, Dem2)

- Turkey must respect HR, democracy, particularly in Kurdish issue

6.10.1999

State of relations between Turkey and the EU

Swoboda (PSE – Aut)

(HR4)

- positive developments in HR

Carnero Gonzales (PSE – Sp)

(Dem2)

- push for democratic values is not being fulfilled

Fava (PSE – It)

(Dem2)

- TR continues to deny existence of a Kurdish minority

Roure (PSE – Fr)

(Dem2)

- denial of Kurdish problem

2.12.1999

Morillion report debate

Caudron (PSE – Fr)

(HR3)

- we should guide Turkey towards better HR

1.12.1999

Morillion report debate

Schori (PSE – Swe)

(HR1, HR2)

- torture, breaches of HR

14.12.1999

Schori (PSE – Swe)

(HR2)

- Turkey must give full rights to Kurds

14.12.1999

Swoboda (PSE – Aut)

(HR2, Dem2)

- Turkey must abolish death penalty
- it doesn't recognize Kurdish problem

Christian Democrats – European Democrats

9.4.1992

Gawronski (LDR – It):

(PKK-t, PKK-t, ExF, HR1, Dem4, HR1, PKK-t)

- terrorist activities of the PKK,
- Trgov has right to respond,
- excessive violence,
- breaches of human rights (we condemn).
- Trgov attempting to strengthen democracy.
- TR was our ally during the war.

- Kurds victims of systematic human rights violations.
- PKK terrorists.

Marlene Lenz (PPE – Ger):
(HR4, PKK-t, ExF, TRmil, PKK-t, PKK-t)

- we have thanked TR several times for help to Kurds.
- Attacks on terrorist forces in another country.
- Deaths among the civilian population
- military operations against civilians
- TR gov has the right to take action against terrorists
- demonstrations in EU countries weren't peaceful

Gerd Ludwig Lemmer (PPE – Ger)
(HR4, HR4, Dem4, PKK-t)

- Kurdish language is permitted
- Kurdish culture promoted
- Kurdish MPs in the parliament
- PKK deliberately trying to prevent reform
- Turkey's importance in the region

10.3.1994

DE19940310-02

Lenz (PPE – Ger)
(HR3)

- TR gov should observe human rights

15.12.1994

D0231

Dimitrakopoulos (PPE – Gr)
(Dem2, HR1, HR1, Dem1)

- act against democracy and flagrant violation of HR
- Turkey is far from democracy and HR

14.2.1995

D3011

Lambrias (PPE – Gr)
(HR3)

- Cooperation between EU and TR depends on HR

Brok (PPE – Ger)
(HR4)

- Turkey's standards of HR are relatively higher than our other partners in the region

14.3.1995

D0380

Lambrias (PPE – Gr)
(HR2)

- continuing persecution of the Kurds

13.12.1995

D0802

Schwaiger (PPE – Ger)
(Dem3)

- Turkey says its moving along democratization

Gomolka (PPE – Ger)
(Dem4, Dem4)

- Turkey is light-years away from totalitarianism
- we should appreciate the process of

democratization

Langen (PPE – Ger)
(iEUc)

- Critique for Roth for double standard on HR of Cuba

Oomen-Ruijten (PPE – Neth)
(Dem3, HR2)

- Kurdish question tied to democratization
- improve HR

Lambrias (PPE – Gr)
(HR1, iEUc)

- deplore HR violations in TR
- undemocratic for EU to influence TR elections

Lenz (PPE – Ger)
(Dem3)

- Kurdish question will be solved by peace and democracy

18.1.1996

D0852

von Habsburg (PPE – Ger)
(iEUc, PKK-t, iEUc)

- critique of EP for applying double standard on Turkey
- PKK cooperates with Zhirinovsky
- critique of Daskalaki for photo

18.9.1996

D1255

Lambrias (PPE – Gr)
(HR1, Dem1, HR2)

- shameless violation of HR
- adopting murder as a method
- Zana is in prison

16.7.1997

D1655

Lambrias (PPE – Gr)
(ExF, HR1, HR1, ExF)

- carnage and bloodshed
- execute, imprison, torture
- excessive violence

2.12.1998

D2283

Bianco (PPE – It)
(ExF)

- TR violent attitudes

24.2.1999

D2401

Oostlander (PPE – Neth)
(PKK-t, TRmil, ExF, Dem3)

- PKK terrorism
- brutal repression by TR mil
- self-determination possible through democracy

Graziani (PPE – It)
(Dem3, HR1)

- Turkey should grant autonomy to the Kurds
- every HR in the book is being flouted

Langen (PPE – Ger)
(PKK-t, PKK-t, Dem3)

- condemn PKK terrorism
- PKK acts of terrorism
- find political solution to Kurdish problem

Lambrias (PPE – Gr)
(PKK-t, ExF)

- PKK terrorist organization
- Kurds persecuted Turkey for 60 years

6.10.1999

State of relations between Turkey and the EU

Tajani (PPE – It)
(HR2, HR3)

- Abolition of death penalty and respect for HR

14.12.1999

Langen (PPE – Ger)
(HR2, HR2)

- death penalty upheld for Ocalan
- Zana is in prison

14.12.1999

Poettering (PPE-Ger)
(TRmil, Dem3)

- we hope TR mil will moderate towards Kurds
- hope TR gives Kurds a real identity

16.12.1999

Voting for the Helsinki Summit text

Nassauer (PPE-Ger)
(TRmil)

- influence of the military not amended

European United – Nordic Left

9.4.1992

Alavanos (CG – Gr)
(ExF, ExF, iEUc, ExF)

- security forces attack unarmed demonstrators
- causing bloodbath
- Parliament has not reacted properly
- military assistance is used against unarmed demonstrators

Vassilis Ephremidis (CG – Gr)
(ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF)

- murdered Kurdish demonstrators
- scores of dead and wounded
- Turkey's role in the war doesn't justify violence
- violate int'l law in most barbarous way
- Kurds aren't doing anything other than what we did to Nazis.
- Arms embargo
- genocide

Alavanos (CG – Gr)
(iEUc)

- European Political Cooperation is responsible, they aren't listening to the debate.

17.11.1992

PE 3 AP DE-1992

Dessylas (CG – Gr)
(Dem2, iEUc)

- Turkey turns its back on the democratic rights of the Kurds
- patriots in the PKK
- Only Belgium and Germany that oppress Turkish immigrants to support this resolution

Ephremidis (CG- Gr)
(ExF, ExF, HR1, Dem1, HR1, Dem1)

- violate international law in barbarous way
- genocide against Kurds
- systemic torture
- brutal destruction of independence, autonomy, rights of people, national sovereignty

10.2.1994
DE19940210-02

Elmalan (CG – Fr)
(ExF, ExF, Dem1, PKK-t, ExF, ExF, HR3, Dem3)

- policy of repression in Kurdistan
- shelling destroying Kurdish villages
- banning Kurdish parties
- condemn terrorist activity of Kurdish groups
- TAF's bloody reign of terror
- repression should stop
- negotiations with Kurds
- linguistic rights
- self-determination

10.2.1994
DE19940210-02

Ephremidis (CG – Gr)
(ExF,)

- systematical genocide against Kurds

10.3.1994
DE19940310-02

Alavanos (CG – Gr)
(HR2, Dem2, iEUc, HR2)

- violation of human rights and democracy
- ...they had the misfortune to be born as Kurds
- ...tell the Commissioner to put on his headphones
- arrest of Kurdish MPs

Ephremidis (CG -Gr)
(ExF, iEUc)

- savage crimes against Kurds
- Commission and Council are responsible for the arrest

15.12.1994
D0231

Pailler (GUE – Fr)
(Dem3, HR2, Dem2)

- Help Turks Kurds resolve this democratically
- TR violates human rights and democracy

Theonas (GUE – Gr)
(HR1, ExF)

- arrogant violation of personal freedoms
- criminal policy of the Turkish government

Daskalaki (RDE – Gr)
(ExF, HR2, HR2, Dem2, ExF, Dem1)

- new genocide taking place in TR
- violation of HR and int'l Law
- punishment for expressing views
- 50 villages burnt to the ground
- 2 DEP lawyers killed

Ephremidis (GUE – Gr)
(iEUc)

- Commission requires EP's consent, not opinion (silenced by the President)

14.2.1995
D3011

Ephremidis (GUE-NGL – Gr)
(iEUc, HR1)

- Council and Commission suffering amnesia
- flagrant HR abuses

Daskalaki (RDE – Gr)
(HR2, HR2)

- Nothing has changed on TR HR
- continuing suppression of Kurdish HR

14.3.1995
D0380

Alavanos (GUE-NGL – Gr)
(Dem2)

- Kurdish MPs in prison

13.12.1995
D0802

Carrere D'Encause (UPE – Fr)
(Dem2, PKK-t)

- democratic progress is far from complete
- PKK bent on destroying public order

Puerta (GUE-NGL – Sp)
(Dem2, Trmil, Dem2, HR2)

- pseudo-democratic structures
- under military tutelage
- identity of minorities not recognized
- HR violated

Daskalaki (UPE – Gr)
(iEUc, Dem2, iEUc, HR3)

- U-turn by the EP on HR
- TR antidemocratic
- EP blatant hypocrisy
- meager HR progress

Piquet (GUE – NGL – Fr)
(HR4)

- small progress on HR but not fundamental

Alavanos (GUE-NGL – Gr)
(Dem2, Dem2, HR1, HR3)

- imprisoned parliamentarians
- imprisoned journalists, authors
- torture
- we want Turkey to be a home for democracy

18.1.1996

D0852

Daskalaki (UPE – Gr)
(ExF, ExF, PKK-t, HR1, iEUc)

- condemns bloodshed on Thursday 4 January
- worried about reign of violence and terrorism
- manifest violations of human rights
- EP schizophrenic

18.1.1996
D0852

Sjöstedt (GUE-NGL – Swe)
(HR2, HR2, ExF, ExF, Trmil, Dem2, TI, PKK-t, iEUc)

- series of HR violations
- HR violations
- outrages against Kurdish minority
- barbaric methods by TR mil
- MPs detained in prisons
- we condemn all forms of separatism and terrorism
- criticism of Swedish government for deporting Kurdish families

18.9.1996
D1255

Piquet (GUE-NGL – Fr)
(Dem3, HR1)

- we want a democratic solution to the Kurdish problem
- deplore deaths of Kurdish prisoners

18.9.1996
D1255

Ephremidis (GUE – NGL – Gr)
(iEUc)

- Council is guilty of disgraceful hypocrisy

16.7.1997
D1655

Caccavale (GUE – It)
(TRmil, HR2)

- military violate human rights in Kurdistan

2.12.1998
D2283

Van Bladel (GUE – Neth)
(PKK-t)

- Ocalan: terrorist leader

2.12.1998
D2283

Ephremidis (GUE-NGL – Gr)
(HR1, Dem1, Dem1)

- torture, disappearances, murder (cut off by the President)

24.2.1999
D2401

Ephremidis (GUE-NGL – Gr)
(Dem1, Trmil)

- military rule of torturers (cut by the President)

24.2.1999
D2401

Pasty (UPE – Fr)
(PKK-t, PKK-t)

- PKK terrorism
- condemn all forms of terrorism

6.10.1999
Turkey
 Korakas (GUE-NGL – Gr)
 (ExF)

- TR policy of oppression of Kurds

6.10.1999
State of relations between Turkey and the EU
 Korakas (GUE-NGL – Gr)
 (ExF, Dem2, HR2)

- bombings carried out by TR of Kurds in Iraq
- TR refuse to acknowledge democratization and HR

1.12.1999
Morillion report debate
 Brie (GUE-NGL – Ger)
 (HR3, HR3 Dem3, HR2)

- Turkey must cooperate with HR, rights of Kurds, abolition of death penalty, democratization
- TR officials disregard HR

Korakas (GUE-NGL – Gr)
 (Dem2, Dem2)

- deterioration of democratization
- criminal code needs democratization

Alavanos (GUE – NGL – Gr)
 (iEUc)

- criticizes parliament for double standard against Kurds and Chechens

Morgatini (GUE-NGL – It)
 (HR2)

- everyday HR are violated
- PKK's ceasefire is positive

2.12.1999
Morillion report debate

Boudjenah (GUE-NGL-Fr)
 (HR2, HR2, HR3, Dem3, HR3, HR3)

- Ocalan condemned to death
- Leyla Zana in prison
- no significant progress made on HR
- Turkey should recognize rights of Kurds
- abolish death penalty
- release Zana

2.12.1999
Morillion report debate
 Cauquil (GUE-NGL-Fr)
 (ExF, HR2)

- oppression of Kurdish people,
- no recognition of basic freedoms

14.12.1999

Alyssandrakis (GUE-NGL – Gr)
 (HR2, ExF)

- TR violation of HR
- genocide against Kurd

2.12.1999
Morillion report debate
 Krivine (GUE-NGL-Fr)
 (ExF, Dem2, iEUc)

- condemn repression of TR
- refuse to allow self-determination to Kurds
- criticizes EU governments on not allowing Kurds to vote

18.11.1999
 Krivine (GUE-NGL – Fr)
 (Dem1)

- Ankara dictatorship

Debate on report A5-0054/99
 Seppanen (GUE-NGL – Fin)
 (Dem3)

- problem of democracy in Turkey is the Kurdish problem

Program of the Finnish presidency
 Alavanos (GUE-NGL – Gr)
 (Dem3)

- TR should take steps to give Kurds cultural rights

6.10.1999
State of relations between Turkey and the EU
 Uca (GUE-NGL-Ger)
 (Dem3, Dem3)

- Kurdish question must be settled politically
- Kurdish identity must be recognized

16.12.1999
Voting for the Helsinki Summit text
 Figueiredo (GUE-NGL – Port)
 (Dem3)

- TR must find a political solution to the Kurdish question

European Democratic Alliance
9.4.1992
 Patrick Lane (RDE - Ire)
 (ExF)
 atrocities carried out against ethnic minority

10.3.1994
DE19940310-02
 Nianias (RDE – Gr)
 (HR2, ExF, Dem2, iEUc)

- persecution of noted citizens
- terrorism of TR state
- persecution of journalists, minorities
- Commissioners come here and disregard us

European Radical Alliance (ALDE)
9.4.1992
 Jaak Vandemeulebroucke (ARC – Belg)
 (ExF, Dem2, HR3, Dem3, Dem2, PKK-t, PKK-t, ExF)

- murders directed against the Kurdish population in SE TR

- censorship against Kurdish publications
- political pluralism, human rights needed in SE TR
- request for the state of emergency lifted
- campaign against terrorism
- terrorism, terrorist acts of the PKK
- TR government has no reason to target women and children
- arms embargo on TR

10.3.1994
DE19940310-02
 Vandemeulebroucke (ARC – Neth)
 (iEUc, iEUc)

- What will the Council do about this?
- Commissioner should take concrete action

Simeoni (ARC – Fr)
 (Trmil, HR1 Dem1)

- military has the power
- assault on human rights
- regime of terror

13.12.1995
D0802
 Sainjon (ARE – Fr)
 (Dem1)
 we are breaking down a form of dictatorship

18.9.1996
D1255
 Dupuis (ARE – It)
 (ExF, PKK-t)

- TAF or PKK did not denounce violence

Greens
9.4.1992
 Claudia Roth (Greens – Ger)
 (ExF, HR1, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, PKK-t, ExF, PKK-t, ExF, HR2, ExF)

- TR forces: trail of blood
- destroy rights of Kurdish people
- children among victims
- appalled by Turkey's reign of terror
- war against the Kurdish people
- Turks and Kurds should coexist in peace
- bloodbath
- condemn terrorism
- bloodbath in Kurdish towns
- condemn PKK's methods
- Turkish oppression
- TR gov to respect human rights
- war against the Kurds

17.11.1992
PE 3 AP DE-1992
 Claudia Roth (Greens – Ger)
 (HR1, iEUc, ExF)

- blatant violation of human rights
- criticize situation in the Greek jails
- declaration of war against the Kurds

10.2.1994
DE19940210-02

Roth (Greens – Ger)
(ExF, Dem3, ExF)

- dirty war in Kurdistan
- Kurdish war will determine Turkish democratization
- Nevroz bloodshed

10.3.1994
DE19940310-02

Roth (Greens – Ger)
(Dem1, Trmil, ExF, ExF, Trmil, HR1, PKK-t, ExF, ExF)

- the TR parl has carried putsch on itself
- Chief of staff mutters under his breath...
- death squads that murder scores of people
- military personnel who set fire villages
- policemen who torture people to death
- PKK guerillas will not stand by this
- Two murderous parties
- turning country into a bloodbath

15.12.1994
D0231

Kreissl-Dörfler (Greens – Ger)
(Dem2, HR1, Dem3)

- Turkey breached parliamentary democracy
- human rights reports are critical
- Kurdish problem should be resolved democratically

14.2.1995
D3011

Roth (Greens – Ger)
(Dem1, Trmil, Dem2)

- no democratization and recognition of Kurds
- Turkey moved more towards military solution
- reversal of democratization

14.3.1995
D0380

Roth (Greens – Ger)
(iEUc, Dem2, HR2, HR2, Trmil)

- Council and Commission provocation by disregarding EP view
- anti-terror law
- what improvement in HR and democratization?
- Release of Kurdish MPs?
TR trying to settle Kurdish question by military means

13.12.1995
D0802

Roth (Greens, Ger)
(Dem3, Dem2, ExF, Dem2)

- democratization and political solution to the Kurdish problem
- anti-terror law was only cosmetic
- destroyed 3000 villages, driven out 3 million people, claimed thousands of lives
- current administration is not genuine democratization

18.1.1996
D0852

Telkamper (Greens – Ger)
(HR1, Dem2)

- torture by the TR police
- arrest of Kurdish politician Melik Firat

18.9.1996
D1255

Roth (Greens – Ger)
(iEUc, Dem1, HR1, Dem1)

- criticizes EP for hypocrisy
- no trace of democratization
- political prisoners dead from hunger strike
- state of emergency not lifted

16.7.1997
D1655

Roth (Greens – Ger)
(Dem3, Dem2, Trmil)

- Democracy means finding a solution to the Kurdish problem
- military is antidemocratic

24.2.1999
D2401

Aelvoet (Greens – Belg)
(Dem2, Dem3)

- HADEP having great difficulties
- Democratic Turkey is answer to the Kurdish problem

Program of the Finnish presidency

Ceyhun (Greens – Ger)
(HR3)

- Death to Ocalan wouldn't be the best way to solve Kurdish question

1.12.1999
Morillion report debate

Ceyhun
(HR2, Dem3)

- death penalty must be abolished
- we must contribute to democratization in TR

Maes (Greens – Bel)
(Dem2, Dem3, HR3)

- Kurdish right to self-determination is unresolved
- we'd like to see Turkey improve on democratization and HR

16.12.1999
Voting for the Helsinki Summit text

Maes (Greens – Bel)
(HR2)

- freedom of speech and HR neglected

Independent/Non-attached
9.4.1992

Bernard Antony (DR – Fr)
(ExF, PKK-t, PKK-t)

- bloody fighting
- CIA armed the Kurds then abandoned them
- PKK is a Stalinist terror movement

10.3.1994
DE19940310-02

Dillen (DR – Belgium)
(HR3, Dem3, PKK-t, ExF, HR3, PKK-t, ExF)

- Kurds should be entitled to their language, beliefs, identity, self-determination
- condemn terrorism by the TR state and PKK
- Kurds right to self-determination
- Kurdish terrorism
- terrorist style responses of the TAF

15.12.1994
D0231

Dell'Alba (ARE – It)
(HR2, HR3)

- Turkey should abide by HR
- If no HR, no EU

14.2.1995
D3011

Vanhecke (NI – Bel)
(iEUc)

- Will the EP and EU do nothing about the Kurds?

Blot (NI – Fr)
(HR2)

- Turkey doesn't respect fundamental freedoms

13.12.1995
D0802

van der Waal (EDN – Neth)
(Dem2, HR2)

- there are no signs that Turkey is seeking a peaceful solution to the Kurdish problem
- discrimination against minorities

Cellai (NI – It)
(HR3)

- we are asking for HR, political solution

18.1.1996
D0852

Vanhecke (NI – Bel)
(HR2, TI, Dem3)

- Zana in prison
- territorial integrity of TR must be ensured
- no restriction to Kurdish self-determination

18.9.1996
D1255

Van der Waal (EDN – Neth)
(Den3, HR3)

- there was democratic and HR improvements in TR, but currently they are reversed

24.2.1999
D2401

Dell'Alba (ARE-It)
(iEUc)

- Criticism of Italy for not holding on to Ocalan

Bonde (I-EDN – Den)
(HR1, HR1, HR1, ExF)

- political prisoners in Turkey being tortured
- jailing of young people

- Serious torture
- oppression of Kurds

Cellai (NI – It)
(PKK-t)

- PKK terrorism

Kronberger (NI – Aut)
(HR3)

- HR and cultural rights is the way to solve the Kurdish problem

6.10.1999

Turkey

Gorostiaga-Atxalandabaso (NI - Sp)
(Dem2)

- Turkey is denying recognition of Kurds

Turchi (UEN – It)
(ExF, HR2, Dem2)

- Armed struggle must be condemned for democracy and minority rights

Speroni (NI – It)
(HR2, HR2, Dem2)

- death penalty still in force
- HR not respected
- antidemocratic legislation

1.12.1999

Morillion report debate

Speroni (TDI – It)
(Dem1, HR1, iEUc)

- Turkey as a whole is undemocratic no respect for HR
- Criticizes Alema government for handing Ocalan

Liberal, Democrat, Reform party (ALDE) 9.4.1992

Andre-Leonard (LDR – Bel)
(Dem3, HR3)

- Kurdish problem encourages TR gov to democratize
- Human rights must be respected

Jan Willem Bertens (LDR – Neth)
(Trmil, ExF, ExF, Dem3, Trmil, ExF)

- Turkish army overreacted
- innocent victims among civilians
- Kurdish issue key to democratization
- army's uncontrolled, brutal and unacceptable actions

10.2.1994

DE19940210-02

Bertens (LDR – Neth)
(PKK-t, ExF, Dem3, HR3)

- condemn PKK terrorism

- condemn TR violence against civilians
- Kurdish problem can be resolved democratically
 - ethnic cultural rights

10.3.1994

DE19940310-02

Bertens (LDR – Neth)
(Dem3, Dem2)

- Kurdish problem democratic means
- arrest is not democratic

Maher (LDR - Ire)
(PKK-t, PKK-t, HR2)

- TR gov fight against terrorism of PKK
- arrests benefit PKK terrorists

15.12.1994

D0231

Moorhouse (PPE – UK)
(HR1, ExF, HR1)

- onslaught of HR
- TR resort to state terrorism
- many people imprisoned

Siema (ELDR – Neth)
(HR1, HR2)

- punishes for free speech
- Kurds must have cultural identity

Andre-Leonard (ELDR – Bel)
(HR2, Dem3, TI, Dem3)

- violation of HR
- Kurdish problem should be solved in peaceful democratic nonseparatist way
- TR should democratize, recognize Kurdish identity

14.2.1995

D3011

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)
(HR2)

- realpolitik cannot be used as an excuse to HR

Moorhouse (PPE – UK)
(HR2)

- Turkey doesn't respect its obligations towards HR

14.3.1995

D0380

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)
(HR2, HR2)

- human right violations, treatment of the Kurds

13.12.1995

D0802

Dr Vries (ELDR – Neth)
(Dem3, HR3, HR2, HR1, HR1, HR1)

- EP persuaded TR to relax its anti-terror law and release political prisoners
- HR in Turkey remains unsatisfactory
- torture even of children is commonplace
- arrests against people of opinion is still exercised

- state security prisons deny rights

De Clereq (ELDR – Bel)
(Dem3)

- we have to ensure Turkey proceeds along the democratic path

18.1.1996

D0852

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)
(Dem3, Dem2, ExF)

- TR claims to be a democratic country
- Turkey should enable minorities to develop rather than terrorism
- bloodbath in Istanbul prison

18.9.1996

D1255

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)
(ExF)

- Constantly more aggressive policy towards Kurds is adopted

18.9.1996

D1255

Moorhouse (PPE – UK)
(Dem2, Dem2, Dem2, HR1)

- Yasar Kemal was imprisoned
- anti-terror law still implemented
- extra-judicial killings still take place
- HR situation critical

16.7.1997

D1655

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)
(PKK-t, ExF, TRmil)

- I reject the terrorism of the PKK, Turkish response is not justified
- we hope military withdraws from politics

24.2.1999

D2401

Bertens (ELDR – Neth)
(PKK-t, Dem2, Dem3, Dem2)

- PKK terrorist organization
- Kurdish existence not recognized
- we must promote democratization of Turkey
- Democratic parties like HADEP must be given rights

6.10.1999

Turkey

Schmidt (ELDR – Swe)
(HR2, PKK-t)

- Turkey deny Kurds political cultural rights, language
- PKK should renounce terrorism

Duff (ELDR - UK)
(Dem2)

- nobody should ignore problems over Kurds

Ludford (ELDR - UK)
(Dem2, HR2, ExF, ExF, PKK-t, Trmil, ExF)

- Turkey unable to democratize, HR or Kurdish rights
- Turkey repressing Kurdish people

- Millions have been evicted from homes
- PKK committed some atrocities but TR mil outweighed them

Van den Bos (ELDR – Neth)
(Trmil, HR2)

- supreme authority must fall on government, not military
- TR infringes HR

14.12.1999

Ludford (ELDR - UK)
(HR4, Dem2, HR2)

- welcome signs death sentence may be lifted
- TR denies identity to its citizens
- TR must recognize cultural rights of Kurds

14.12.1999

Cox (ELDR - Ire)
(HR3, Dem3, HR2, Dem2)

- TR must make progress towards HR, democratization, abolition of death penalty, respect for minorities

Europe of Democracies and Diversities (I-D)

17.11.1992

PE 3 AP DE-1992

Ulla Margrethe Sandbak (ARC – Den)
(HR1, Dem1, ExF)

- torture, murder, repression

6.10.1999

State of relations between Turkey and the EU

Belder (EDD – Neth)
(ExF)

- Turkey's hard line approach against Kurdish questions

Council

14.2.1995

D3011

Lamassoure (Council)
(PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t, Dem2, ExF, HR2)

- Turkey has to cope with separatist ambitions
- actual terrorism x 3
- TR bans newspapers, jails members, destroys villages, express opinion

18.9.1996

D1255

Mitchell (Council)
(Dem2, PKK-t, Dem3, PKK-t, Dem3, HR2)

- welcome anti-terror law amended
- Council recognizes terror in the SE
- democratic government can best stand

terrorism

- we are encouraged by the plans on lifting the state of emergency
- urge TR to improve Kurdish minority rights

Mitchell (Council)
(HR2)

- urging approach freedom of expression

16.7.1997

D1655

Wohlfart (Council)
(Dem3, ExF, Dem2)

- Kurdish problem can be resolved politically
- Turkey must show restraint towards civilians

- Turkish politicians deny Kurdish problem

24.2.1999

D2401

Volmer (Council)
(PKK-t, PKK-t, TI, Dem3, Dem3, HR3)

- PKK discredited through terrorism and violence
- PKK random acts of violence
- Hope Turkey will differentiate between separatism and autonomy
- Kurdish problem must be solved on the basis of democracy and HR

Program of the Finnish presidency

Halonen (Council)
(HR3)

- we hope Ocalan's death sentence won't be exercised

6.10.1999

State of relations between Turkey and the EU

Sasi (Council)
(HR3)

- we hope Turkey will refrain from carrying death penalty against Ocalan

1.12.1999

Preparation for Helsinki

Halonen (Council)
(HR2)

- worried that death sentence was approved

Commission

9.4.1992

Matutes (Commission – Sp)
(PKK-t, ExF, HR1, PKK-t)

- condemn all forms of violence and terrorism
- grateful to TR for cooperation on relief operations
- condemn acts of repression
- regret at numerous deaths
- terrorism in TR come from abroad

17.11.1992
PE 3 AP DE-1992

Matutes (Commission – Sp)
(Dem4)

- Turkey is too important to ignore
- Useful in embargo on Iraq and strategy on Kuwait, Central Asia and Caucasus
- directing along a course of pluralist democracy
- Turkey important platform between Asia and Europe

10.2.1994
DE19940210-02

Van den Broek (Commission – Neth)
(PKK-t, Trmil)

- condemn PKK
- military solution cannot solve it

10.3.1994
DE19940310-02

Sir Leon Brittan (Commission)
(PKK-t, PKK-t, HR3, HR3, Dem3, PKK-t, HR3)

- Turks and Kurds live peacefully elsewhere in Turkey
- PKK terrorist campaign
- DEP said terrorist attacks against military targets were legitimate
- right way to handle terrorism is human rights
- Kurdish rights and democracy must be reinstated
- Commission condemns all forms of terrorism against Turkish citizens
- human rights must be abided by

15.12.1994

D0231

Van den Broek (Commission – Neth)
(Dem1, HR1, PKK-t, HR1)

- condemn measures taken against DEP
- worry human rights in TR
- condemn PKK
- disgraceful HR records

14.2.1995

D3011

Van den Broek (Commission)
(HR2)

- much to be done on HR

Van den Broek (Commission)
(HR3)

- we will express our views on HR situation in TR

13.12.1995
D0802

van den Broek (Commission)
(Dem4, PKK-t)

- constitutional amendments shouldn't be underestimated
- terrorism in Turkey

18.1.1996
D0852
 Sir Leon Brittan (Commission)
 (PKK-t, HR1)

- TR suffered two terrorist attacks
- deplore death of Metin Goktepe
- riots in the prisons are coordinated; they can be political

24.2.1999
D2401
 van den Broek (Commission)
 (PKK-t, HR2)

- we support Turkey in its war against terrorism
- TR should recognize Kurds cultural and minority rights

6.10.1999

State of relations between Turkey and the EU
 Verheugen (Commission)
 (HR2)

- we expect TR to abolish capital punishment

1.12.1999
Preparation for Helsinki
 Prodi (Commission)
 (HR2)

- negotiations cannot be opened until TR meets HR

EP President
17.1.1996
D0833 + D0848
 Klaus Hansch (EP President)

- rights of Kurdish people
- mistreatment of Mehdi Zana
- Methdi Zana tortured
- Leyla Zana protested against tyranny
- She was tortured herself
- DEP banned
- MPs' immunity revoked
- recognition of Kurdish identity
- TR killing Kurdish soul by banning their language
- systematic atrocities in the south-east
- horrifying depths of arrogance in TR
- mistreatment of prisoners, torture
- charges on Kurdish MPs must be reviewed
- TR should sit down with Kurds
- we call TR gov to create a climate of trust and cultural identity

Chart 1) Total number of discourses adopted by EU member countries on Turkey's Kurdish issue compared to their respective number of MEPs (January 1991 – December 1999)

Chart 2) Pie chart showing the percentage and total number discourses adopted by the European Parliament by discourse type (January 1991 – December 1999)

Chart 3) Most frequent discourses of 5 most active countries on the Kurdish issue
(January 1991 – December 1999)

Chart 4) Total number of discourses adopted by EP Groups on the Kurdish issue compared to their respective numbers of MEPs
(January 1991 – December 1999)

Chart 5) Time – series graph showing the frequency of HR discourses of 5 most active parties

Chart 6) Time – series graph showing the frequency of Dem discourses of 5 most active parties

Chart 7) Council versus Commission discourses

Appendix II – United States Congress discourse on the Kurdish question in Turkey	
A) Sorted according to Senate, House and written executive branch activity.....	26
B) Sorted according to party activity.....	36
C) Various Congressional activity graphs.....	45

Key to coding:

HR: Human Rights discourse **Dem:** Democratization/Democracy discourse **ExF:** Criticism for excessive use of force / violence by Turkey **PKK-t:** Condemnation of the PKK as a terrorist organization **Trmil:** Criticism of the Turkish military for its stance on the Kurdish question **TI:** Territorial integrity discourse **iUSc:** inter-US criticism

Support / opposition dynamics: 1: Very negative, 2: negative, 3: neutral – in transition, 4) positive, 5) very positive

Relevance dynamics: + (issue relevant) - (issue irrelevant)

US Senate

7 March 1991

(SS) Alan MacGregor Cranston (D - Cal)

- US standoffishness against Kurds has to do with US-TR relations (iUSc)
- Turkey waged its own campaign of repression against Kurds (HR1, Dem1)
- TR would be apprehensive if US gave Kurds autonomy that TR doesn't give (Dem2)
- TR Gov's well documented record of human rights abuse (HR1)

11 April 1991

(S) Dennis DeConcini (D - Az) (HR2)

- Turkish Gov refused to allow aid for Kurdish refugees

18 April 1991

(SS) Robert Byrd (D - Virginia) (HR4)

- Turkish government is bearing the brunt of efforts to help Kurdish refugees (commend)

13 November 1991

(S) Dennis DeConcini (D-Az)

- Democratic process is alive in TR (Dem4)
- Turkish democracy can serve as a model for its neighbours (Dem4)

2 March 1994

(S) Dennis deConcini (D-Az)

- increasing violence in SE TR (Trmil, PKK-t)
- basic HR have been suspended (HR2)
- Turkey's democratic institutions are stronger than ever (Dem5)
- PKK initiated violent campaign (PKK-t)
- security forces arbitrarily round up villagers and beat, intimidate

(Trmil, HR1)

- evacuation of hundreds of villages (HR1)
- destruction of entire towns (HR1)
- Turkey to protect its citizens from terrorism (PKK-t)
- has to preserve its territorial integrity (TI)
- military methods only escalated tensions (TRmil)
- one dimensional military approach (TRmil)
- threats to democratic process (Dem2)
- inability of Kurds to gain political representations or exercise other rights (Dem2, HR2)
- shadowy death squads killed 70 members of the DEP (Dem1)
- Twenty party offices bombed (Dem1)
- 300 DEP members arrested (Dem1)
- security made it difficult for Kurds to vote (Dem1)
- TR parl lifted DEP MPs' immunity (Dem1)
- such procedures are contrary to basic principles of free speech (HR1)
- abolish restrict antiterror law, remove restrictions on Kurdish broadcasting (Dem2, HR2)
- heavy-handed security presence (ExF, TRmil)

17 May 1994

(S) Dennis deConcini (D-Az)

HR2, Dem2, Dem2, HR1, HR2, Dem1, ExF, PKK-t, ExF, ExF, PKK-t, PKK-t, HR2, HR2, Dem2, HR2, HR2)

- disturbing trend by the TR gov to restrict free speech on the Kurdish issue
- Mehdi Zana was jailed for 4 years.
- Injustices visited upon Kurds
- He has already been tortured
- They face death penalty
- I'm frightened for the future of Turkish democracy
- situation in the SE has deteriorated as violence became common form of discourse
- Turkish security forces destroyed hundreds of villages, their inhabitants forced to flee

- ethnic cleansing
- condemn PKK terrorism
- terrorism is never a legitimate way
- fight against terrorism must not be waged at the expense of the rights of Turkish citizens
- Kurds must be allowed to express their cultural identity
- policies threaten democracy
- frustration over Turkey restricting free speech
- increasingly frequent practice of arrest

23 June 1994,

Dennis deConcini (D-Az)

Dem1, HR2, Dem1, HR2, HR1, Dem1, ExF, HR1, Dem1, PKK-t, HR2, Dem2, HR2, PKK-t, Dem2, HR2, ExF, HR2, HR2, HR2

- TR banned DEP and kicked 13 members out of the Parliament
- five deputies in prison without being indicted
- what kind of democracy finds its own legislators either in prison or fleeing arrest?
- CSCE should be sent to monitor deteriorating HR levels
- increasingly frequent trend to criminalize free speech
- arrest of the parliamentarians is an affront to all democratic legislatures
- heavy handed tactics of the security forces destroyed over 1000 Kurdish villages
- criminalize even moderate expressions of Kurdish discontent, TR gov stifles legitimate democratic discourse
- PKK terrorism
- not at the expense of HR
- raise questions on TR democracy
- deteriorating HR
- PKK terrorism
- allow non-violent parties
- abolish restrictions on free speech
- repeal state of emergency
- remove restrictions on Kurdish linguistics
- life constraints on radio broadcast, media
- allow schools in Kurdish

29 June 1994

(SS) Patrick Leahy (D - Vermont)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> killings of civilians by PKK gunned by PKK guerrillas ask TR gov to redress Kurdish grievances in democratic manner PKK must abandon its armed struggle PKK slaughter civilians terrorist tactics HR is not getting better in TR Kurdish villages burn HR activists are murdered or disappear campaign against free speech for the sake of HR and dem in TR, I call sides to drop arms violence and terror must cease 	(S) Alfonse D'Amato (R - NY)
(iUSc, ExF, HR2, HR2, HR1, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, PKK-t, ExF, iUSc, ExF, ExF)		(Dem1, ExF, Trmil, ExF, Dem1, HR3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US military items should not be used against noncombatants, HR violations raise concerns in HR torture is routine TR mil fired at Kurdish homes villages burned, forcibly evacuated 800 villages evacuated scorched-earth tactics, landscape of burnt villages security forces charged with using deadly force against civilians PKK guilty of atrocities no excuse for tactics that target civilian populations we can't allow our helicopters to bomb Kurdish villages. TR has to differentiate between a noncombatants and terrorists 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR continues the existence of its Kurds TR military systematically emptied over 2000 villages TR gov systematic effort in eradication of Kurdish identity is a high-tech genocide TR must take steps towards full recognition of Kurdish cultural, civil and HR
4 August 1994	30 November 1994	28 March 1995
Dennis deConcini (D-Az)	Dennis deConcini (D-Az)	(JS) John Kerry (D - Massachusetts)
(HR1, Dem2, Dem2, Trmil, Dem2, Trmil, Dem2, PKK-t, Dem1)	(HR2, Dem2, HR1, Dem1, ExF, Trmil, Dem2, HR1, HR1, HR1, Dem1, HR1, Dem1, Dem1, HR1, Dem3, PKK-t, PKK-t, HR3)	(PKK-t, Trmil, ExF, Dem2, ExF, PKK-t, ExF, Trmil, HR1, Trmil, ExF, HR2, HR2, PKK-t)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am flabbergasted on capital punishment of six Kurdish parliamentarians trial will highlight other obstructions to democracy media sources are controlled by the government and military TR press must be free trial will underscore government's unrealistic military approach political parties are criminalized PKK extremism political trial dark day for TR democracy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I was not allowed to meet imprisoned Kurdish parliamentarians unwillingness of TR to seek new approaches wide use of torture, restricting free speech sec forces destroy Kur villages no public examination occurred widespread use of torture torture routinely used in political cases forced confessions are used to prepare indictments TR court ordered confiscation of 'file of torture' prepared by HR foundation in TR voices of moderation are squelched by threats, even assassinations for years, Turkey has repressed, brutally a Kurdish identity TR denied existence of Kurds, granting liberties how it deals with these questions will determine Turkish democracy tomorrow moderate political voices must condemn terrorism TR must differentiate between terrorism and liberties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sympathize TR's fight against PKK terrorism brutality of the military are counterproductive TR's invasion undermines its commitments to democracy TR responds with punitive acts of violence more destructive than PKK terrorism TR military systematically emptied Kurdish villages extensive HR abuses, torture and assassination Military's actions wreak havoc and destruction among innocent Kurds TR must improve its HR TR recognition of cultural, civil and political rights first step and HR PKK terrorism
11 August 1994		5 September 1995
Dennis deConcini (D-Az)		(S) Claiborne Pell (D – Rh.Island)
PKK-t, PKK-t, Dem3, PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t, HR2, ExF, HR1, HR2, HR3, Dem3, ExF, PKK-t		(PKK-t, Trmil, PKK-t, PKK-t, ExF, PKK-t, HR2, ExF, Trmil, PKK-t, HR1, ExF)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anger and frustration over recent 	20 March 1995	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PKK terrorism TR militarily PKK threat to regional stability PKK promotes TR incursions into Iraq TR gov unable to distinguish btw

- aspirations of PKK and rights of Kurds
- heavy-handed, indiscriminate military campaign
- terr aspirations of the PKK
- well-chronicled TR HR abuses
- towns and villages destroyed by the TR military

15 September 1995

(S) Claiborne Pell (D – Rh.Island)

(PKK-t, ExF, Dem1, PKK-t, HR2, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1, Dem1)

- PKK poses grave threat
- TR responding heavy-handed, indiscriminate military campaign
- shuts of nonviolent, Kurdish political expressions
- PKK is a threat
- TR unwilling to discern between legitimate KR rights and PKK
- executing heavy-handed, indiscriminate attacks
- towns and villages destroyed by the TR militarily
- oppressive security-presence
- high cost in HR violations
- TR eliminated outlets for nonviolent Kurdish political expression

20 September 1995

(S) Alfonse D'Amato (R - NY)

(HR2, HR2)

- denial of basic rights to Kurds
- consistently violated international agreements

(SS) Olympia Snowe (R - Maine)

(HR1, ExF, Trmil, ExF, Trmil)

- consistent record of HR abuses
- TR army forcibly evacuated 2000 villages
- over 10,000 Kurds killed by TR gov forces

(S) Mitchell McConnell (R – Kentucky)

(Dem4, Dem4)

- TR has preserved at least basic

- principles of democracy
- TR remains secular democracy

22 September 1995

(S) Patrick Leahy (D - Vermont)

ExF, Trmil, PKK-t, PKK-t, Trmil, ExF, HR2, HR1

- TR soldiers used excessive force
- PKK used abominable tactics
- TR militarily uses destroy Kurdish villages
- attacks have been indiscriminate
- pattern of HR violations, dehumanized by TR society
- TR deny red cross access

20 December 1995

(S) Larry Pressler (R – S. Dak)

(ExF, ExF)

- TR gov waged a brutal war against the Kurdish people
- TR mil destroyed 2000 villages

27 May 1999

(S) Christopher Dodd (D - Connecticut)

(PKK-t, HR1, PKK-t, Dem4, PKK-t, PKK-t, HR2, ExF, PKK-t, Trmil, ExF, HR4, HR2, PKK-t, ExF)

- both sides guilty of human rights abuses
- Turkish Kurds took arms against democratically elected government
- PKK devolved into a terrorist organization
- thousands have killed by the PKK
- under the state of emergency, TR rationed food
- TR forced civilians out of their homes, leaving 2600 villages ghost towns
- PKK terrorism
- people who don't support PKK end up suffering at the hands of TR mil and police
- TR is democracy
- it would inappropriate to overlook TR HR problems
- PKK's abuse and TR response deserves condemnation

House of Representatives

30 March 1992

(H) William S. Broomfield (R – Michigan)

ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1

- brutal suppression of the Kurds by Turkey
- Turkish security forces have used massive force
- use of the German origin equipment against the civilian Kurdish community
- Ankara's security forces appear to operate like a bull in a china shop
- Turkish troops and police have been involved with illegal killings, torture and related HR abuses

6 May 1992

(H) Lee H. Hamilton (D - Indiana)

HR2, ExF

- Concerns over human rights practices in Turkey have not diminished
- a number of violent incidents btw TR auth and local population

2 July 1992

(H) Stephen J. Solarz (D - NY)

HR4,

- Laudable action taken by the TR gov to extend international protection for Kurds in N. Iraq (OPC)

2 October 1992

(H) Nicholas Mavroules (D – Massachusetts)

ExF, ExF, Trmil, ExF, HR1, HR2

- Turkey ethnic cleansing against Kurds
- Atrocities carried out against minorities

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turkish military action against Kurdish minority Amnesty condemned TR for its use of torture Turkey violated HR 	(Congress HR Caucus)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Atrocities perpetrated against Kurds Since 1984 11,000 people have been killed in the southeast of TR nine Kur villages burned down people rounded up and killed (rumors of) Turkish HR assoc members killed, offices closed, journalists assassinated, 40 people died in house raids TR gov has fresh blood of innocent noncombatants barbarism systematic abuses TR doesn't share our values on HR violators of HR, blatant, unabashed
3 October 1992		
(H) Lee H. Hamilton (D - Indiana) HR2, PKK-t, Trmil, ExF, PKK-t, ExF, HR1, HR3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR unconscionable HR record TR's horrendous treatment of its people, Kurds call TR to adhere to internationally recognized standards of HR Killing in prison, atrocities by Trmil, torture of a nurse Gross violations of HR 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human rights abuses in Turkey PKK, a terrorist organization TR sec. Forces used increasingly violent methods. Terrorist violence heavy handed official Turkish policy practice of torture it is in our interest that HR violations cease in TR 	20 July 1993 (H) Michael Bilirakis (R – Florida) HR1, ExF	
5 October 1992		28 March 1995
(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus)		(H) Christopher H. Smith (R – NJ) HR1, HR1, Dem1, Dem1
HR1, Dem1, HR1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HR significantly deteriorated sweeping restrictions on expression and peaceful political activity TR's democratic credentials are increasingly questioned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> appalled by heinous, shameful record of human rights abuses Turkey eschewing negotiated settlement with the Kurds and focus militarily; Turkey doesn't share our value system HR is abused by police, torture in police stations is commonplace, seven deaths in police custody, political prisoners 	10 February 1994 Hon. Lee H. Hamilton (D - Indiana) PKK-t, Trmil, PKK-t, Trmil	30 March 1995 (H) Bobby L. Rush (D – Illinois) Trmil, Dem1, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, iUSc, PKK-t, HR1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> insurgency of PKK military alone will not solve this problem condemn terrorist tactics by PKK Trmil campaign is not fully convergent with US 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> dismay and strong concerns on Turkish operation on the PKK TR officially denies Kurdish population Kurds have been subject to discriminate harassment, persecution, killing, wounding TR condemned for denying Kurds cultural rights, self-determination harassment from Turkish officials attack on their heritage, culture and existence we may be to blame too, for giving military aid TR does have the right to protect its borders from terrorism this cannot justify harassment and persecution
9 October 1992	22 March 1994 (H) Dan Burton (R – Indiana) PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t	
(H) Robert T. Matsui (D - Cal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terrorist PKK PKK has murdered thousands PKK terrorism 	
ExF, HR2, ExF, HR1, Dem1	4 August 1994 (H) Tony P. Hall (D - Ohio) HR1, Dem1, HR1, HR1, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ethnic cleansing and HR abuses in TR ethnic cleansing by Turkey against its Kurdish minorities TR Kurds subject to HR violations, torture ugly repression of Kurdish civilians 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turkey has repressed the Kurds for decades Kurdish parl arrested My wife was followed everywhere she went HR activists murdered, executed, disappeared. 	2 May 1995 (H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1, Dem1, Trmil,
5 January 1993		
(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois)		

Dem1, HR1, Dem3, HR3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • genocide going on in TR • worsening HR problem • TR democracy is being undermined • violently abusing its country • unbridled violence against the Kurdish minority • torture, unlawful detention and extrajudicial killings • genocide against Kurds • villages forcibly evacuated • excessive force against civilian noncombatants • HR violations • TR police and military: extrajudicial killings, unlawful detention, torture with impunity • torture is systematic, widespread • people disappear and their bodies are found mutilated • 77 people disappeared in custody • TR gov harass, detain and prosecute writers, journalists, parliamentarians • Yasar Kemal is under trial • TR gov policy of terror against Kurds • media face harassment • high-ranking gov official who spoke openly about torture was relieved of his post 	<p>PKK, terrorist group, founded by the KGB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PKK kills tourists • TR has a threat to its national security • PKK is intent on dividing the nation • 25% of the parliament being Kurdish doesn't sound genocide to me • free expression is getting better <p>(H) Nita Lowey (D – NY) HR1, HR1, Dem1, iUSc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR HR abuses in the last two decades • American taxpayers fund a terrifying HR abuse, extra-judicial executions, tortures, missing persons, political imprisonment <p>(H) George Gekas (R - Penn) HR1, ExF, iUSc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR engaged in brutal conduct against its population • guns we gave, that were pointed at the USSR are now pointed inwardly <p>(H) Benjamin A. Gilman (R - NY) HR1, HR2, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am deeply concerned about HR situation in TR • TR action against Kurds, journalists... • genocidal campaign against 100,000s of its people • villages razed; I saw with my own eyes • thousands of people disappeared from their homes • villages of the Kurdish people were razed and people abused <p>(H) Michael Bilirakis (R - Florida) HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR HR abuses
24 May 1995		
(H) Cynthia McKinney (D - Georgia) ExF, HR1, Trmil, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR gov depopulated villages • repeated HR violations • TR mil documented cases of killing and displacement • indiscriminate approach of bombing and depopulating villages • abuses against civilians • inhumane warfighting tactics 	
22 June 1995		
(H) George Gekas (R - Penn) HR1, HR1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR genocide against Kurdish minority • deaths of 15,000 Kurds, 2500 Kurdish villages, 3 million refugees • American tanks are used against innocent people 	
(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) ExF, ExF	<p>(H) Frank R. Wolf (R - Virginia) ExF, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • butchering of the Kurds • ripping apart and the body parts are all over <p>(H) Nancy Pelosi (D - Cal) HR1, HR1</p>	
28 June 1995		
John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) HR1, ExF, HR1, Dem2, HR1, ExF, HR1, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, Dem1, Dem1, ExF, Dem1, Dem1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amn. Int'l identified Turkey as one of the worst HR abusers • each year HR in Turkey deteriorates <p>(H) James Bunn (R – Oregon) PKK-t, PKK-t, TI, TI, Dem4, HR4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are not being told about the 	<p>(H) Steny Hoyer (D - Maryland) Trmil, Dem1, PKK-t, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not believe Mr Ciller is in control of the military • PKK are terrorists • continued undermining of HR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • millions of Turks are denied basic HR 		

<p>(H) Christopher Henry Smith (R- NJ) HR1, HR2, ExF, ExF, HR1, PKK-t, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HR abuses, oppression TR has failed to improve HR 2000 villages have been evacuated deaths squads operate unhindered hundreds of civilians have disappeared or become victims of unsolved murders TR deserves support in combating terrorism, violence made it worse 	<p>PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t, HR3, Dem3, PKK-t, HR4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PKK terrorists PKK terrorist acts trying to reconcile HR, with Democracy terrorist organizations TR committed improving HR 	<p>democracy in TR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> stable, democratic TR there is more to be done on free speech
<p>(H) Robert Menendez (D - NJ) HR1, HR1, HR1, Dem1, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> we must condemn HR abuses HR violations by Turkey within its borders and in Iraq jailing the nation's leading author represses the ethnic minorities 	<p>(H) Robert Ernest Andrews (D - NJ) HR2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR violated HR 	<p>7 September 1995</p> <p>Hon. Lee Hamilton HR2, Trmil, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> report on the allegations of HR abuses by TR militarily HR violations in TR
<p>(H) Richard A. Zimmer (R - NJ) ExF, ExF, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR continues its genocide against Kurds 2500 villages destroyed TR oppresses HR of its own citizens 	<p>(H) Albert Russel Wynn (D - Maryland) ExF, HR1, Dem1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15000 deaths, 2500 Kurdish villages destroyed or evacuated TR persecuted and imprisoned writers and journalists 	<p>20 September 1995</p> <p>(H) Alan K. Simpson (R – Wyoming) HR2, PKK-t, iUSc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HR not as we want to see PKK engaged terrorist attacks how about cutting aid to Israel and Egypt?
<p>(H) Carolyn B. Maloney (D - NY) HR1, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> terrible human rights violations abuses against Kurdish civilians 	<p>(H) Eliot L. Engel (D – NY) HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> express grave reservation on TR behavior towards Kurds 	<p>18 October 1995</p> <p>(H) Jim Bunn (R – Oregon) iUSc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> danger of basing foreign policy on ethnic head count
<p>(H) Gregory Laughlin (D – Tex) iUSc, Dem4, Dem4, Dem4, PKK-t</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turks' voices are not heard in the Congress because they did not immigrate here They hold free elections a woman heads the government quarter of the parliament is Kurdish Kurdish parliamentarians under death threats from the PKK 	<p>(H) Peter Deutsch (D - Florida) HR2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR HR violations 	<p>9 November 1995</p> <p>(H) Christopher H. Smith (R - NJ) Dem2, HR2, Dem4, HR1, Dem1, HR1, Trmil, Trmil, Dem2, Dem1, HR1, Dem1, PKK-t</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marcus' indictment raised questions on democracy restrictions on free speech in Turkey release of political prisoners is a significant positive progress TR gov routinely charge, convict and imprison people for speech crimes 4 Kurdish parl. Are jailed for speech crimes, including Leyla Zana role of the military in TR state courts role of military raise concerns over judicial independence courts imprison intellectuals, journalists and others, a major impediment to TR democracy TR maintains laws to restrict free expression, hundreds of political
<p>(H) Peter John Visclosky (D - Indiana) HR1, HR1, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> blatant refusal to abide by the international norms of conduct continues to violate rights of its citizens 3 million Kurds are rendered homeless 	<p>26 July 1995</p> <p>Christopher Smith Dem4, Dem4, Dem4, Dem4, HR2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR must respect rights of Kurds 25% of TR parl. Is Kurdish only really functioning Muslim democracy commend TR parliament for strengthening democracy after approving 16 constitutional amendments they also agreed to amend anti-terror law amendments significant for 	
<p>(H) Wayne Edward Whitfield (R – Kentucky)</p>		

<p>prisoners in jails, questions about gov's international HR commitments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR gov right to combat terrorism <p>17 November 1995</p> <p>(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) Dem1, ExF, Dem3, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • complete vindication of justice • ongoing TR military campaign of forced evac and destruction of Kur villages • her acquittal may mean TR considering reform • Turkey's prosecution of free speech violates HR <p>12 December 1995</p> <p>(H) Christopher H. Smith (R – NJ) Dem1, HR1, ExF, PKK-t, Trmil, ExF, iUSc, ExF, iUSc, HR1, iUSc, iUSc, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unstable regime which routinely commits massive HR abuses • ruthless campaign against Kurdish guerrillas • Kurdish terrorists • TR mil killed thousands, tortured and maimed countless others, destroyed almost 3000 Kurdish villages, forced 3 million people away from their homes • TR mil's widespread use of US armament against civilians • atrocities are appalling • US equipment are used to violate rights of civilians • TR uses US supplied weapons against civilians • disturbed that State Department supported this sale, although it had refused earlier this year • Turkey's ruthless suppression of Kurds <p>(H) Christopher H. Smith (R - NJ) ExF, ExF, HR1, ExF, PKK-t, HR1, Dem1, ExF, Trmil, Trmil, HR1, PKK-t, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR sec forces forcibly evacuated or destroyed more than 2650 villages • villagers subject to beatings, mass arrests and intimidation • death squads have been responsible 	<p>for extra judicial killings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PKK also killed innocents • torture remains widespread • state emergency curbed political and media activity • TR mil heavy hand stifled legitimate Kurdish voices • Kurds resentful of TR military abuses • brutality of PKK terrorism • intolerant of Kurdish rights <p>26 March 1996</p> <p>(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) ExF, Dem4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • repression of Kurds in southern TR • Mesut Yilmaz said Kurdish issue would be solved peacefully, this is good news <p>(H) Christopher H. Smith (R - NJ) ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ethnic cleansing effort against Kurds <p>5 June 1996</p> <p>(H) Elizabeth Furse (D - Oregon) Dem2, HR2, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leyla Zana imprisoned • TR yet to recognize cultural and political rights of Kurds • waging a brutal military campaign against legitimate aspirations of the Kurdish people <p>(H) Christopher H. Smith (R - NJ) Trmil, Dem2, Trmil, ExF, ExF, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR mil's campaign against Kurdish militants poses threat to TR democracy • military conducts a violent campaign that claimed 20,000 lives • TR forces destroyed more than 2500 Kurdish villages • death squads are responsible for hundreds of mystery killings <p>(H) Carolyn B. Maloney (D - NY) ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • brutal war against Kurdish minority 	<p>(H) James Bunn (R – Oregon) PKK-t</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PKK terrorism <p>(H) David Funderburk (R – N.Carol) Trmil, ExF, ExF, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • militaristic policy against Kurds that claimed 20,000 lives • TR plan to destroy Kurdish culture <p>(H) Richard Zimmer (R - NJ) HR1, Trmil, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR dismal humanitarian record • military campaign against its own people • 2000 villages destroyed <p>1 May 1997</p> <p>(H) Robert Filner (D - Cal) ExF, ExF, Trmil, ExF, Dem1, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1, ExF, iUSc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • genocide against Kurds • TR states responsible over ethnic cleanings • Turkish special komandos actually collect rewards for the severed heads of Kurdish guerillas and others • seven Kurdish members of the parliament are in prison • Turkish depredations against Kurds • 20,000 people killed, 3000 villages destroyed • rampant torture, murder, displacement and imprisonment • cluster bombs are used against Kurdish villages <p>(H) Frank Pallone (D - NJ) HR1, ExF, ExF, ExF, Dem1, Dem1, Dem1, HR1, HR2, HR2, Dem1, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kurds are subjected to a policy of forced assimilation • 3124 Kurdish villages destroyed, • brutal treatment of Kurds • Turkey's cruel, irrational anti-Kurd policies • Zana imprisoned • Ahmet Turk arrested • one-sided mockery of justice • repressed Kurdish people in Turkey • Kurdish identity must be recognized • The use of Kurdish language in
---	--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> conversations must be legalized so-called democracy Kurds have been slaughtered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15 million Kurds face oppression 3000 Kurdish villages evacuated TR doesn't allow Red Cross TR must put flesh on its skeletal democracy our Gov. sends billions of dollars to Ankara yet overlooks its HR violations all Kurdish based parties in TR are suppressed non-violent Kurdish parties must be allowed 78 journalists jailed for speech crimes HR monitors are subject to harassment Yavuz Onen and Akin Birdal, Ahmet Turk charged 3 years imprisonment 20 HRA branches closed torture remains widespread a court refused to make a police who tortured 14 people appear in court 	<p>3 August 1998</p> <p>(H) Colin Peterson (D - Minnesota) ExF, ExF</p> <p>TR must cease atrocities against Kurds</p> <p>hostilities against Kurds must cease</p> <p>13 October 1998</p> <p>(H) Elizabeth Furse (D - Oregon) Dem1, Dem1, HR1, ExF, Dem1, ExF, Trmil, ExF, ExF</p> <p>indignation over sentencing of Leyla Zana</p> <p>blatant violation of freedom of expression</p> <p>Turkey is a racist state and denies Kurds a voice in the state</p> <p>3000 villages have been destroyed</p> <p>TR army continues to pursue policies of hatred, torture and murder, and genocide of the Kurdish people</p> <p>Turkish war against Kurds</p> <p>1 October 1998</p> <p>(H) Michael J. Pappas (R - NJ) Trmil, ExF, HR1, ExF, iUSc, iUSc</p> <p>TR mil has been conducting an inhumane campaign of ethnic cleansing and oppression</p> <p>TR killed over 30,000 Kurds</p> <p>Clinton Admin's double standard on TR</p> <p>double standard on foreign policy</p> <p>11 March 1999</p> <p>(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) HR1, Dem1, HR1</p> <p>serious HR problems persist in TR</p> <p>total rejection of political solution to the Kurdish problem</p> <p>mistreatment of the Kurds</p> <p>25 March 1999</p> <p>(H) Frank Pallone (D - NJ) ExF, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, ExF, HR1,</p>
<p>7 November 1997</p> <p>(H) Peter Visclosky (D – Indiana) ExF, HR1, Dem1, HR1, HR2, HR2, Dem2, iUSc, iUSc, Trmil, HR1, HR1, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR obliterates, kills Kurds, denying their ability to speak their language, culture Turkey's cruel, irrational, anti-Kurd policies Leyla Zana in prison repressed Kurdish people Kurdish identity must be recognized use of Kurdish in language and conversation must be legalized all cultural rights must be conceded Kurdish political parties must be given full constitutional rights and general amnesty for political prisoners we have witnessed a pro-Turkish tilt in the State Department much of military hardware is used to terrorize Kurds and repress Kurds victimized by the armed forces Kurdish treatment is against basic fundamentals of HR TR adopted a policy of forced assimilation 3134 villages destroyed Kurdish situation reminds Armenian genocide brutal treatment of Kurds 	<p>10 November 1997</p> <p>(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) HR1, Dem1, iUSc, HR2, Dem1, ExF, ExF, Trmil, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> outrage at the treatment of Zana her prosecution is a crime against democracy and crime against freedom Our administration like those before it has maintained a policy of ignoring TR abuses Zana's case demonstrates freedom of expression, thought are problematic TR harassment of Kurds overflow into Iraq TR openly waged attack on Kurdish villages in n. Iraq mindless military effort to eradicate Kurds <p>11 February 1998</p> <p>(H) Wayne Gilchrest (R - Maryland) Dem1, ExF, ExF, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leyla Zana imprisoned for free speech TR attacking Kurds in n. Iraq TR persecuting Kurds it is the governments who persecute Kurds are terrorists 	<p>11 March 1999</p> <p>(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) HR1, Dem1, HR1</p> <p>serious HR problems persist in TR</p> <p>total rejection of political solution to the Kurdish problem</p> <p>mistreatment of the Kurds</p> <p>25 March 1999</p> <p>(H) Frank Pallone (D - NJ) ExF, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, ExF, HR1,</p>
<p>8 November 1997</p> <p>(H) Steny Hoyer (D - Maryland) HR1, Trmil, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1, Dem2, iUSc, HR1, Dem1, Dem2, Dem2, HR1, Dem1, HR1, HR1, Dem1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR invasion of Iraq blatant violation of HR military campaign produces countless civilian victims reports indicate TR using napalm, cluster bombs despite international conventions banning their use TR violates no-fly zone to kill Kurdish civilians and destroy villages 	<p>11 February 1998</p> <p>(H) Wayne Gilchrest (R - Maryland) Dem1, ExF, ExF, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leyla Zana imprisoned for free speech TR attacking Kurds in n. Iraq TR persecuting Kurds it is the governments who persecute Kurds are terrorists 	<p>11 March 1999</p> <p>(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) HR1, Dem1, HR1</p> <p>serious HR problems persist in TR</p> <p>total rejection of political solution to the Kurdish problem</p> <p>mistreatment of the Kurds</p> <p>25 March 1999</p> <p>(H) Frank Pallone (D - NJ) ExF, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, ExF, HR1,</p>

iUSC, iUSc, iUSc, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Kurds victims of oppression by TurkeyTurks refer to Kurds as mountain Turksprohibiting all cultural and linguistic expressionforcible assimilationjailing, torturingTR destroyed 4000 villagesTR mistreatment of Kurds deplorableembarrassing record for US to help capture Ocalanshameful collaboration with Turkeyunlawfulness of this abductionoppression of the Kurdish peopleTR's undeclared war against the KurdsTurkey at war with Kurdswe must put an end to the genocide of the Kurds	<ul style="list-style-type: none">jailing, torturing, killings Kurdish leaderundeclared war against Kurds claimed 40,000 lives <p>9 June 1999</p> <p>(H) Patrick Toomey (R - Penn) ExF, Trmil</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">40,000 Kurds dead at the hands of Turkish forces.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">PKK terrorist campaignPKK murder and extortionPKK kidnapped foreign touristsPKK terrorism internationalconcerns about TR human rights violationsextrajudicial killings, torture by the TrmilUS supports Turkey in its fight against terrorismurge leaders to find political solution, prevent HR violations in its military campaignscondemnation of PKK reflects US policyproblems won't be solved through tough security measuresPKK terrorist campaign in the West
	Executive Branch		
	29 September 1992	Thomas M. T. Niles (Subcommittee hearing) – Ambassador to EU	June 1995
	PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t, Dem4, Dem4, Dem4, HR2, TI, TI, HR2, HR3, PKK-t		State Dept. report HR1, ExF, ExF, HR1, Trmil, ExF, HR1, Dem1, Dem1, Dem1
11 May 1999	<ul style="list-style-type: none">level of terror elevatedfocus of PKK insurgency increasedcivilians have diedPKK uses terrorextortion, murder, kidnapping, assassination, targeting civilians, teachersTurkey is dealing with security threat while maintaining a functioning democratic government, free pressA party of Kurdish origin existsexpressed satisfaction that laws on thought crimes have been abolishedpolitical prisoners have been releasedtorture may have increasedTR gov is uncompromising about separatismStrongly support Turkey's terr. IntegrityConcerned by frequency of reports of extra-judicial killings and tortureUS will expand dialog on HRfight against terrorism	<ul style="list-style-type: none">torture, excessive use of force persisted in 1994police and security forces employed torturesec forces used excessive force against noncombatantsvarious agencies harass, intimidate, indict and imprison HR monitors, journalists, lawyers and professorsdisappearances and mystery murder cases continued at a high ratethousands of political prisoners	
(H) Frank Pallone (D - NJ) ExF, ExF, iUSc, HR1			7 September 1995
<ul style="list-style-type: none">TR atrocity against KurdsTR regime war against Kurdswe may be contributing to the oppression of the KurdsKurdish people victims of oppression by Turkey			State Dept. letter Trmil, HR1, HR2, HR3, HR3, Dem4, HR4, TI, PKK-t, Dem3, HR3, PKK-t, HR4, PKK-t
8 June 1999	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Tribunal for Ocalan is not fairhis legal team faces harassmentTR policy of relentless violence and political attackdirty war against a minoritydeny the existence of a Kurdish identity, language and cultureAkin Birdal entered prisonTR regime refuses to acknowledge Kurds existence, referring to them mountain Turksprohibit all expression of cultural and linguisticforcible assimilation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">abuses by the TR militarilyconcern of HR abusesHR record raises serious concerns, but they are not grossTR has a functioning, but troubled democracyfreedom of expression is limited but press can criticize governmentTGNA approved constitutional amendmentsTGS initiated a program to train soldiers on HR practicesWe support Turkey's TI and	
(H) Frank Pallone (D - NJ) Dem1, Dem1, ExF, Dem1, HR1, HR1, Dem1, Dem1, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, ExF,	15 January 1994	secretary of State Peter Tarnoff (letter) PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t, HR2, HR1, Dem1, Trmil, PKK-t, Dem2, HR1, Trmil, PKK-t, PKK-t,	

- legitimate right to fight terrorism
- in addition to carefully calibrated military operations, they have to initiate expansion of democracy and human rights, civil, cultural rights for Kurds
- PKK brutal terrorist organization
- TR making determined effort to improve its HR
- TR's legitimate struggle against terrorism
- parliamentarians weren't guilty
- we are disturbed by TR failure to provide for the displaced
- our active engagement with the Turks on human rights issues are meeting with success.
- Constitutional amendments enacted broadened political participation
- TR amended the anti-terror law, 130 people were released from prison

21 September 1995

John Salikashvili

HR4, HR4, HR4, PKK-t, HR4, HR4, Dem4, HR4

- TR military is actively engaging in efforts to improve HR awareness among its personnel
- Instituted new rules of engagement to its personnel
- TR mil went great lengths to protect lives of innocent civilians while destroying terrorist base camps
- There has been significant progress on HR front
- TR's chief of defence was engaged in enhancing Turkish democracy and human rights
- TR mil is backing progress on human rights and ready to make a concerted attempt to encourage progress

28 March 1996

State Dept reply

PKK-t, TI, Trmil, ExF, Dem Dem3, HR3, HR4, HR1, HR4, Dem4, Dem4

- PKK terrorism
- TR gov has right to defend itself
- TR mil says it is trying to discern between
- we remain concerned on how operations are conducted
- civilian deaths, village evacuations, burnings
- mystery killings down sharply
- we urge them to come up with a political solutions that include equal rights, cultural and linguistic
- we are encouraged by positive actions in incremental granting of rights such as TR high court decision that Kurdish

Democratic Party

(H) Stephen J. Solarz (D - NY)
HR4

10 February 1994

7 March 1991

(SS) Alan MacGregor Cranston (D - Cal)
iUSc, HR1, Dem1, Dem2, HR1

- US standoffishness against Kurds has to do with US-TR relations
- Turkey waged its own campaign of repression against Kurds
- TR would be apprehensive if US gave Kurds autonomy that TR doesn't give
- TR Gov's well documented record of human rights abuse

- Laudable action taken by the TR gov to extend international protection for Kurds in N. Iraq (OPC)

2 October 1992

(H) Nicholas Mavroules (D - Massachusetts)

ExF, ExF, Trmil, ExF, HR1, HR2

- Turkey ethnic cleansing against Kurds
- Atrocities carried out against minorities
- Turkish military action against Kurdish minority
- Amnesty condemned TR for its use of torture
- Turkey violated HR

11 April 1991

(S) Dennis DeConcini (D - Az)
HR2

- Turkish Gov refused to allow aid for Kurdish refugees

Hon. Lee H. Hamilton (D – Indiana)
PKK-t, Trmil, PKK-t, Trmil

- insurgency of PKK
- situation is worsening
- military alone will not solve this problem
- condemn terrorist tactics by PKK
- Trmil campaign is not fully convergent with US

2 March 1994

(S) Dennis deConcini (D-Az)
Trmil, PKK-t, HR2, Dem5, PKK-t, Trmil, HR1, HR1, HR1, PKK-t, TI, Trmil, Trmil, Dem2, Dem2, HR2, Dem1, Dem1, Dem1, Dem1, Dem1, HR1, Dem2, HR2, ExF, Trmil

- increasing violence in SE TR
- basic HR have been suspended
- Turkey's democratic institutions are stronger than ever
- PKK initiated violent campaign
- security forces arbitrarily round up villagers and beat, intimidate
- evacuation of hundreds of villages
- destruction of entire towns
- Turkey to protect its citizens from terrorism
- has to preserve its territorial integrity
- military methods only escalated tensions
- one dimensional military approach
- threats to democratic process
- inability of Kurds to gain political representations or exercise other rights
- shadowy death squads killed 70 members of the DEP
- Twenty party offices bombed
- 300 DEP members arrested
- security made it difficult for Kurds to vote
- TR parl lifted DEP MPs' immunity
- such procedures are contrary to basic principles of free speech
- abolish restrict antiterror law, remove restrictions on Kurdish broadcasting
- heavy-handed security presence

18 April 1991

(SS) Robert Byrd (D - Virginia)
HR4

- Turkish government is bearing the brunt of efforts to help Kurdish refugees (commend)

3 October 1992

(H) Lee H. Hamilton (D - Indiana)

HR2, PKK-t, Trmil, ExF, PKK-t, ExF, HR1, HR3

- Human rights abuses in Turkey
- PKK, a terrorist organization
- TR sec. Forces used increasingly violent methods.
- Terrorist violence
- heavy handed official Turkish policy
- practice of torture
- it is in our interest that HR violations cease in TR

13 November 1991

(S) Dennis DeConcini (D-Az)
Dem4, Dem4

- Democratic process is alive in TR
- Turkish democracy can serve as a model for its neighbours

6 May 1992

(H) Lee H. Hamilton (D - Indiana)

HR2, ExF

9 October 1992

(H) Robert T. Matsui (D - Cal)

ExF, HR2, ExF, HR1, Dem1

- Concerns over human rights practices in Turkey have not diminished
- a number of violent incidents btw TR auth and local population

- Ethnic cleansing and HR abuses in TR
- ethnic cleansing by Turkey against its Kurdish minorities
- TR Kurds subject to HR violations, torture
- ugly repression of Kurdish civilians

2 July 1992

17 May 1994		affront to all democratic legislatures	HR1, Dem2, Dem2, Trmil, Dem2, Trmil,
(S) Dennis deConcini (D-Az)		<ul style="list-style-type: none">heavy handed tactics of the security forces destroyed over 1000 Kurdish villages	Dem2, PKK-t, Dem1
HR2, Dem2, Dem2, HR1, HR2, Dem1, ExF, PKK-t, ExF, ExF, PKK-t, PKK-t, HR2, HR2, Dem2, HR2, HR2		<ul style="list-style-type: none">criminalize even moderate expressions of Kurdish discontent, TR gov stifles legitimate democratic discoursePKK terrorismnot at the expense of HRincreasingly intolerant policies towards Kurdsraise questions on TR democracydeteriorating HRPKK terrorismallow non-violent partiesabolish restrictions on free speechrepeal state of emergencydismantle village guardremove restrictions on Kurdish linguisticslife constraints on radio broadcast, mediaallow schools in Kurdish	<ul style="list-style-type: none">I am flabbergasted on capital punishment of six Kurdish parliamentarianstrial will highlight other obstructions to democracymedia sources are controlled by the government and militaryTR press must be freetrial will underscore government's unrealistic military approachpolitical parties are criminalizedPKK extremismpolitical trial dark day for TR democracy
<ul style="list-style-type: none">disturbing trend by the TR gov to restrict free speech on the Kurdish issueMehdi Zana was jailed for 4 years.Injustices visited upon KurdsHe has already been torturedThey face death penaltyI'm frightened for the future of Turkish democracysituation in the SE has deteriorated as violence became common form of discourseTurkish security forces destroyed hundreds of villages, their inhabitants forced to fleeethnic cleansingcondemn PKK terrorismterrorism is never a legitimate wayfight against terrorism must not be waged at the expense of the rights of Turkish citizensKurds must be allowed to express their cultural identitypolicies threaten democracyfrustration over Turkey restricting free speechincreasingly frequent practice of arrest			August 4 1994
			(H) Tony P. Hall (D – Ohio)
			HR1, Dem1, HR1, HR1, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1
			<ul style="list-style-type: none">Turkey has repressed the Kurds for decadesKurdish parl arrestedMy wife was followed everywhere she wentHR activists murdered, executed, dissapeared.Atrocities perpetrated against KurdsSince 1984 11,000 people have been killed in the southeast of TRnine Kur villages burneddownloadingpeople rounded up and killed (rumors of)Turkish HR assoc members killed, offices closed,journalists assassinated,40 people died in house raidsTR gov has fresh blood of innocent noncombatantsbarbarismsystematic abusesTR doesn't share our values on HRviolators of HR, blatant, unabashed
29 June 1994	(SS) Patrick Leahy (D - Vermont)	iUSc, ExF, HR2, HR2, HR1, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">US military items should not be used against noncombatants, HR violationsraise concerns in HRsituation got worsetorture is routineTR mil fired at Kurdish homesvillages burned, forcibly evacuated800 villages evacuatedscorched-earth tactics, landscape of burnt villagessecurity forces charged with using deadly force against civiliansPKK guilty of atrocitiesno excuse for tactics that target civilian populationswe can't allow our helicopters to bomb Kurdish villages.TR has to differentiate between a noncombatants and terrorists	
June 23 1994,			11 August 1994
Dennis deConcini (D-Az)			Dennis deConcini (D-Az)
Dem1, HR2, Dem1, HR2, HR1, Dem1, ExF, HR1, Dem1, PKK-t, HR2, Dem2, HR2, PKK-t, Dem2, HR2, ExF, HR2, HR2, HR2			PKK-t, PKK-t, Dem3, PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t, HR2, ExF, HR1, HR2, HR3, Dem3, ExF, PKK-t
<ul style="list-style-type: none">TR banned DEP and kicked 13 members out of the Parliamentfive deputies in prison without being indictedwhat kind of democracy finds its own legislators either in prison or fleeing arrest?CSCE should be sent to monitor deteriorating HR levelsincreasingly frequent trend to criminalize free speecharrest of the parliamentarians is an			
4 August 1994	Dennis deConcini (D-Az)		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anger and frustration over recent killings of civilians by PKK • gunned by PKK guerrillas • ask TR gov to redress Kurdish grievances in democratic manner • PKK must abandon its armed struggle • PKK slaughter civilians • terrorist tactics • HR is not getting better in TR • Kurdish villages burn • HR activists are murdered or dissappear • campaign against free speech • for the sake of HR and dem in TR, I call sides to drop arms • violence and terror must cease 	<p>28 March 1995</p> <p>(JS) John Kerry (D - Massachusetts)</p> <p>PKK-t, Trmil, ExF, Dem2, ExF, PKK-t, ExF, Trmil, HR1, Trmil, ExF, HR2, HR2, PKK-t</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sympathize TR's fight against PKK terrorism • brutality of the military are counterproductive • TR's invasion undermines its commitments to democracy • TR responds with punitive acts of violence more destructive than PKK terrorism • TR military systematically emptied Kurdish villages • extensive HR abuses, torture and assassination • Military's actions wreak havoc and destruction among innocent Kurds • TR must improve its HR • TR recognition of cultural, civil and political rights first step and HR • PKK terrorism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR gov depopulated villages • repeated HR violations • TR mil documented cases of killing and displacement • indiscriminate approach of bombing and depopulating villages • abuses against civilians • inhumane warfighting tactics <p>(H) Esteban Torres (D - Cal) ExF, ExF, iUSc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR genocide against Kurdish minority • deaths of 15,000 Kurds, 2500 Kurdish villages, 3 million refugees • American tanks are used against innocent people <p>(H) Nancy Pelosi (D - Cal) HR1, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amn. Int'l identified Turkey as one of the worst HR abusers • each year HR in Turkey deteriorates <p>(H) Nita Lowey (D – NY) HR1, HR1, Dem1, iUSc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR HR abuses in the last two decades • American taxpayers fund a terrifying HR abuse, extra-judicial executions, tortures, missing persons, political imprisonment <p>(H) Steny Hoyer (D - Maryland) Trmil, Dem1, PKK-t, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not believe Mr Ciller is in control of the military • PKK are terrorists • continued undermining of HR <p>(H) Robert Menendez (D - NJ) HR1, HR1, HR1, Dem1, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we must condemn HR abuses • HR violations by Turkey within its borders and in Iraq • jailing the nation's leading author • represses the ethnic minorities <p>(H) Carolyn B. Maloney (D - NY) HR1, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • terrible human rights violations • abuses against Kurdish civilians
<p>30 November 1994</p> <p>Dennis deConcini (D-Az)</p> <p>HR2, Dem2, HR1, Dem1, ExF, Trmil, Dem2, HR1, HR1, HR1, Dem1, HR1, Dem1, Dem1, HR1, Dem3, PKK-t, PKK-t, HR3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was not allowed to meet imprisoned Kurdish parliamentarians • unwillingness of TR to seek new approaches • wide use of torture, restricting free speech • sec forces destroy Kur villages • no public examination occurred • widespread use of torture • torture routinely used in political cases • forced confessions are used to prepare indictments • TR court ordered confiscation of 'file of torture' prepared by HR foundation in TR • voices of moderation are squelched by threats, even assassinations for years, Turkey has repressed, brutally a Kurdish identity • TR denied existence of Kurds, granting liberties • how it deals with these questions will determine Turkish democracy tomorrow • moderate political voices must condemn terrorism • TR must differentiate between terrorism and liberties 	<p>30 March 1995</p> <p>(H) Bobby L. Rush (D - Illinois) Trmil, Dem1, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, iUSc, PKK-t, HR1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dismay and strong concerns on Turkish operation on the PKK • TR officially denies Kurdish population • Kurds have been subject to discriminate harassment, persecution, killing, wounding • TR condemned for denying Kurds cultural rights, self-determination • harassment from Turkish officials • attack on their heritage, culture and existence • we may be to blame too, for giving military aid • TR does have the right to protect its borders from terrorism • this cannot justify harassment and persecution <p>24 May 1995</p> <p>(H) Cynthia McKinney (D - Georgia) ExF, HR1, Trmil, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF</p>	

(H) Gregory Laughlin (D – Tex) iUSC, Dem4, Dem4, Dem4, PKK-t	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PKK terrorism • TR militarily • PKK threat to regional stability • PKK promotes TR incursions into Iraq • TR gov unable to distinguish btw aspirations of PKK and rights of Kurds • heavy-handed, indiscriminate military campaign • terr aspirations of the PKK • well-chronicled TR HR abuses • towns and villages destroyed by the TR military 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • villages • attacks have been indiscriminate • pattern of HR violations, dehumanized by TR society • TR deny red cross access
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turks' voices are not heard in the Congress because they did not immigrate here • They hold free elections • a woman heads the government • quarter of the parliament is Kurdish • Kurdish parliamentarians under death threats from the PKK 		5 June 1996
(H) Peter John Visclosky (D - Indiana) HR1, HR1, ExF	7 September 1995	(H) Elizabeth Furse (D - Oregon) Dem2, HR2, ExF
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • blatant refusal to abide by the international norms of conduct • continues to violate rights of its citizens • 3 million Kurds are rendered homeless 	Hon. Lee Hamilton HR2, Trmil, HR1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leyla Zana imprisoned • TR yet to recognize cultural and political rights of Kurds • waging a brutal military campaign against legitimate aspirations of the Kurdish people
(H) Robert Ernest Andrews (D - NJ) HR2	15 September 1995	(H) Carolyn B. Maloney (D - NY) ExF
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR violated HR 	(S) Claiborne Pell (D – Rh.Island)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • brutal war against Kurdish minority
(H) Albert Russel Wynn (D - Maryland) ExF, HR1, Dem1	PKK-t, ExF, Dem1, PKK-t, HR2, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1, Dem1	1 May 1997
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15000 deaths, 2500 Kurdish villages destroyed or evacuated • TR persecuted and imprisoned writers and journalists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PKK poses grave threat • TR responding heavy-handed, indiscriminate military campaign • shuts of nonviolent, Kurdish political expressions • PKK is a threat • TR unwilling to discern between legitimate KR rights and PKK • executing heavy-handed, indiscriminate attacks • towns and villages destroyed by the TR militarily • oppressive security-presence • high cost in HR violations • TR eliminated outlets for nonviolent Kurdish political expression 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • genocide against Kurds • TR states responsible over ethnic cleanings • Turkish special komandos actually collect rewards for the severed heads of Kurdish guerillas and others • seven Kurdish members of the parliament are in prison • Turkish depredations against Kurds • 20,000 people killed, 3000 villages destroyed • rampant torture, murder, displacement and imprisonment • cluster bombs are used against Kurdish villages
(H) Eliot L. Engel (D - NY) HR1		(H) Robert Filner (D - Cal) ExF, ExF, Trmil, ExF, Dem1, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1, ExF, iUSC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • express grave reservation on TR behavior towards Kurds 		
(H) Peter Deutsch (D - Florida) HR2		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR HR violations 		(H) Frank Pallone (D - NJ) HR1, ExF, ExF, ExF, Dem1, Dem1, Dem1, HR1, HR2, HR2, Dem1, ExF
(House) David Edward Bonior HR2	22 September 1995	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR must respect rights of Kurds 	(S) Patrick Leahy (D - Vermont)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kurds are subjected to a policy of forced assimilation • 3124 Kurdish villages destroyed, • brutal treatment of Kurds • Turkey's cruel, irrational anti-Kurd policies
5 September 1995	ExF, Trmil, PKK-t, PKK-t, Trmil, ExF, HR2, HR1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zana imprisoned • Ahmet Turk arrested • one-sided mockery of justice
(S) Claiborne Pell (D – Rh.Island)		
PKK-t, Trmil, PKK-t, PKK-t, ExF, PKK-t, HR2, ExF, Trmil, PKK-t, HR1, ExF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TR soldiers used excessive force • PKK used abominable tactics • TR militarily uses destroy Kurdish 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> repressed Kurdish people in Turkey Kurdish identity must be recognized The use of Kurdish language in conversations must be legalized so-called democracy Kurds have been slaughtered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR violates no-fly zone to kill Kurdish civilians and destroy villages 15 million Kurds face oppression 3000 Kurdish villages evacuated TR doesn't allow Red Cross TR must put flesh on its skeletal democracy our Gov. sends billions of dollars to Ankara yet overlooks its HR violations all Kurdish based parties in TR are suppressed non-violent Kurdish parties must be allowed 78 journalists jailed for speech crimes HR monitors are subject to harassment Yavuz Onen and Akin Birdal, Ahmet Turk charged 3 years imprisonment 20 HRA branches closed torture remains widespread a court refused to make a police who tortured 14 people appear in court 	<p>ExF, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, ExF, HR1, iUSC, iUSC, iUSC, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kurds victims of oppression by Turkey Turks refer to Kurds as mountain Turks prohibiting all cultural and linguistic expression forcible assimilation jailling, torturing TR destroyed 4000 villages TR mistreatment of Kurds deplorable embarrassing record for US to help capture Ocalan shameful collaboration with Turkey unlawfulness of this abduction oppression of the Kurdish people TR's undeclared war against the Kurds Turkey at war with Kurds we must put an end to the genocide of the Kurds
7 November 1997		
(H) Peter Visclosky (D - Indiana) ExF, HR1, Dem1, HR1, HR2, Dem2, iUSC, iUSC, Trmil, HR1, HR1, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR obliterates, kills Kurds, denying their ability to speak their language, culture Turkey's cruel, irrational, anti-Kurd policies Leyla Zana in prison repressed Kurdish people Kurdish identity must be recognized use of Kurdish in language and conversation must be legalized all cultural rights must be conceded Kurdish political parties must be given full constitutional rights and general amnesty for political prisoners we have witnessed a pro-Turkish tilt in the State Department much of military hardware is used to terrorize Kurds and repress Kurds victimized by the armed forces Kurdish treatment is against basic fundamentals of HR TR adopted a policy of forced assimilation 3134 villages destroyed Kurdish situation reminds Armenian genocide brutal treatment of Kurds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR must cease atrocities against Kurds hostilities against Kurds must cease 	<p>11 May 1999</p>
	3 August 1998	(H) Frank Pallone (D - NJ) ExF, ExF, iUSC, HR1
	(H) Colin Peterson (D - Minnesota) ExF, ExF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR atrocity against Kurds TR regime war against Kurds we may be contributing to the oppression of the Kurds Kurdish people victims of oppression by Turkey
	13 October 1998	
	(H) Elizabeth Furse (D - Oregon) Dem1, Dem1, HR1, ExF, Dem1, ExF, Trmil, ExF, ExF	27 May 1999
		(S) Christopher Dodd (D - Connecticut) PKK-t, HR1, PKK-t, Dem4, PKK-t, PKK-t, HR2, ExF, PKK-t, Trmil, ExF, TR4, HR2, PKK-t, ExF
8 November 1997		
(H) Steny Hoyer (D - Maryland) HR1, Trmil, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1, Dem2, iUSC, HR1, Dem1, Dem2, Dem2, HR1, Dem1, HR1, HR1, Dem1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> indignation over sentencing of Leyla Zana blatant violation of freedom of expression Turkey is a racist state and denies Kurds a voice in the state 3000 villages have been destroyed TR army continues to pursue policies of hatred, torture and murder, and genocide of the Kurdish people Turkish war against Kurds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> both sides guilty of human rights abuses Turkish Kurds took arms against democratically elected government PKK devolved into a terrorist organization thousands have killed by the PKK under the state of emergency, TR rationed food TR forced civilians out of their homes, leaving 2600 villages ghost towns PKK terrorism
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR invasion of Iraq blatant violation of HR military campaign produces countless civilian victims reports indicate TR using napalm, cluster bombs despite international conventions banning their use 	25 March 1999	
	(H) Frank Pallone (D - NJ)	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> people who don't support PKK end up suffering at the hands of TR mil and police 	5 October 1992	(S) Alfonse D'Amato (R – NY)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR is democracy it would inappropriate to overlook TR HR problems PKK's abuse and TR response deserves condemnation 	(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) HR1, Dem1, HR1	Dem1, ExF, Trmil, ExF, Dem1, HR3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR continues the existence of its Kurds TR military systematically emptied over 2000 villages TR gov systematic effort in eradication of Kurdish identity is a high-tech genocide TR must take steps towards full recognition of Kurdish cultural, civil and HR
8 June 1999			
(H) Frank Pallone (D - NJ) Dem1, Dem1, ExF, Dem1, HR1, HR1, Dem1, Dem1, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, ExF,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> appalled by heinous, shameful record of human rights abuses Turkey eschewing negotiated settlement with the Kurds and focus militarily; Turkey doesn't share our value system HR is abused by police, torture in police stations is commonplace, seven deaths in police custody, political prisoners 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tribunal for Ocalan is not fair his legal team faces harassment TR policy of relentless violence and political attack 	5 January 1993	(H) Christopher H. Smith (R - NJ) HR1, HR1, Dem1, Dem1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> dirty war against a minority deny the existence of a Kurdish identity, language and culture Akin Birdal entered prison hardline regime refuses to give in TR regime refuses to acknowledge Kurds existence, referring to them mountain Turks prohibit all expression of cultural and linguistic forcible assimilation jailing, torturing, killings Kurdish leader undeclared war against Kurds claimed 40,000 lives 	(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) HR1, HR1, HR2, HR1, ExF, Trmil, HR1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HR significantly deteriorated sweeping restrictions on expression and peaceful political activity TR's democratic credentials are increasingly questioned 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR unconscionable HR record TR's horrendous treatment of its people, Kurds call TR to adhere to internationally recognized standards of HR Killing in prison, atrocities by Trmil, torture of a nurse Gross violations of HR 	2 May 1995	
	20 July 1993	(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1, Dem1, Trmil, Dem1, HR1, Dem3, HR3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> another genocide is taking place by Turkish troops burning and tearing down Kurdish towns genocide systematic torture, execution, disappearances we do not have a free and democratic Turkey TR gov can only do things that Turkish military permits it to do stop human rights abuses against Kurds values we look to are democracy, human rights, rule of law
Republican Party			
30 March 1992	(H) Michael Bilirakis (R - Florida) HR1, ExF		
(H) William S. Broomfield (R – Michigan)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turkish government has persecuted Kurds Trmil ethnic cleansing 		
ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1	22 March 1994		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> brutal suppression of the Kurds by Turkey Turkish security forces have used massive force use of the German origin equipment against the civilian Kurdish community Ankara's security forces appear to operate like a bull in a china shop Turkish troops and police have been involved with illegal killings, torture and related HR abuses 	(H) Dan Burton (R - Indiana) PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terrorist PKK PKK has murdered thousands important to distinguish between Kurds oppressed under Saddam and those living in TR PKK terrorism 	22 June 1995	
	20 March 1995	(H) George Gekas (R – Penn) HR1, HR1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR human rights violations total replete severe human rights violations

John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus)	KGB	• TR oppresses HR of its own citizens
• we are aiding a country that is committing genocide x 2	• PKK kills tourists	(H) Wayne Edward Whitfield (R - Kentucky)
28 June 1995	• TR has a threat to its national security	PKK-t, PKK-t, PKK-t, HR3, Dem3, PKK-t, HR4
John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus)	• PKK is intent on dividing the nation	• PKK terrorists
HR1, ExF, HR1, Dem2, HR1, ExF, HR1, (H) George Gekas (R - Penn)	• 25% of the parliament being Kurdish doesn't sound genocide to me	• PKK terrorist acts
ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1, HR1, HR1, HR1, ExF, iUSc	• free expression is getting better	• trying to reconcile HR, with Democracy
HR1, Dem1, Dem1, ExF, Dem1, Dem1	• TR engaged in brutal conduct against its population	• terrorist organizations
• millions of Turks are denied basic HR	• guns we gave, that were pointed at the USSR are now pointed inwardly	• TR committed improving HR
• genocide going on in TR	(H) Benjamin A. Gilman (R - NY)	(H) Joe Wilson (R – S.Carolina)
• worsening HR problem	HR1, HR2, ExF, ExF, ExF, ExF, HR1	Dem4, Dem4
• TR democracy is being undermined	• I am deeply concerned about HR situation in TR	• 25% of TR parl. Is Kurdish
• violently abusing its country	• TR action against Kurds, journalists...	• only really functioning Muslim democracy
• unbridled violence against the Kurdish minority	• genocidal campaign against 100,000s of its people	26 July 1995
• torture, unlawful detention and extrajudicial killings	• villages razed; I saw with my own eyes	Christopher Smith
• genocide against Kurds	• thousands of people disappeared from their homes	Dem4, Dem4, Dem4, Dem4, HR2
• villages forcibly evacuated	• villages of the Kurdish people were razed and people abused	• commend TR parliament for strengthening democracy after approving 16 constitutional amendments
• excessive force against civilian noncombatants	(H) Michael Bilirakis (R - Florida)	• they also agreed to amend anti-terror law
• HR violations	HR1	• amendments significant for democracy in TR
• TR police and military: extrajudicial killings, unlawful detention, torture with impunity	• TR HR abuses	• stable, democratic TR
• torture is systematic, widespread	(H) Christopher Henry Smith (R- NJ)	• there is more to be done on free speech
• people disappear and their bodies are found mutilated	HR1, HR2, ExF, ExF, HR1, PKK-t, ExF	20 September 1995
• 77 people disappeared in custody	• HR abuses, oppression	(S) Alfonse D'Amato (R - NY)
• TR gov harass, detain and prosecute writers, journalists, parliamentarians	• TR has failed to improve HR	HR2, HR2
• Yasar Kemal is under trial	• 2000 villages have been evacuated	• denial of basic rights to Kurds
• TR gov policy of terror against Kurds	• deaths squads operate unhindered	• consistently violated international agreements
• media face harassment	• hundreds of civilians have disappeared or become victims of unsolved murders	(SS) Olympia Snowe (R - Maine)
• high-ranking gov official who spoke openly about torture was relieved of his post	• TR deserves support in combating terrorism, violence made it worse	HR1, ExF, Trmil, ExF, Trmil
(H) Frank R. Wolf (R - Virginia)	(H) Richard A. Zimmer (R - NJ)	• consistent record of HR abuses
ExF, ExF	ExF, ExF, HR1	• TR army forcibly evacuated 2000 villages
• butchering of the Kurds	• TR continues its genocide against Kurds	• over 10,000 Kurds killed by TR gov forces
• ripping apart and the body parts are all over	• 2500 villages destroyed	
(H) James Bunn (R - Oregon)		
PKK-t, PKK-t, TI, TI, Dem4, HR4		
• we are not being told about the PKK, terrorist group, founded by the		

(H) Alan K. Simpson (R - Wyoming) HR2, PKK-t, iUSc	(Congress HR Caucus) Dem1, ExF, Dem3, HR1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> villagers subject to beatings, mass arrests and intimidation death squads have been responsible for extra judicial killings PKK also killed innocents torture remains widespread state emergency curbed political and media activity TR mil heavy hand stifled legitimate Kurdish voices Kurds resentful of TR military abuses brutality of PKK terrorism intolerant of Kurdish rights
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HR not as we want to see PKK engaged terrorist attacks how about cutting aid to Israel and Egypt? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> complete vindication of justice ongoing TR military campaign of forced evac and destruction of Kur villages her acquittal may mean TR considering reform Turkey's prosecution of free speech violates HR 	
(S) Mitchell McConnell (R - Kentucky) Dem4, Dem4		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR has preserved at least basic principles of democracy TR remains secular democracy 	12 December 1995	
18 October 1995	(H) Christopher H. Smith (R - NJ) Dem1, HR1, ExF, PKK-t, Trmil, ExF, iUSc, ExF, iUSc, HR1, iUSc, iUSc, ExF	26 March 1996
(H) Jim Bunn (R - Oregon) iUSc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unstable regime which routinely commits massive HR abuses ruthless campaign against Kurdish guerrillas Kurdish terrorists TR mil killed thousands, tortured and maimed countless others, destroyed almost 3000 Kurdish villages, forced 3 million people away from their homes TR mil's widespread use of US armament against civilians atrocities are appalling US equipment are used to violate rights of civilians TR uses US supplied weapons against civilians disturbed that State Department supported this sale, although it had refused earlier this year Turkey's ruthless suppression of Kurds 	(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois) (Congress HR Caucus) ExF, Dem4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR strategic importance danger of basing foreign policy on ethnic head count 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> repression of Kurds in southern TR Mesut Yilmaz said Kurdish issue would be solved peacefully, this is good news
9 November 1995		
(H) Christopher H. Smith (R - NJ) Dem2, HR2, Dem4, HR1, Dem1, HR1, Trmil, Trmil, Dem2, Dem1, HR1, Dem1, PKK-t	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marcus' indictment raised questions on democracy restrictions on free speech in Turkey release of political prisoners is a significant positive progress TR gov routinely charge, convict and imprison people for speech crimes 4 Kurdish parl. Are jailed for speech crimes, including Leyla Zana role of the military in TR state courts role of military raise concerns over judicial independence courts imprison intellectuals, journalists and others, a major impediment to TR democracy TR maintains laws to restrict free expression, hundreds of political prisoners in jails, questions about gov's international HR commitments TR gov right to combat terrorism 	(H) Christopher H. Smith (R - NJ) Trmil, Dem2, Trmil, ExF, ExF, ExF
	20 December 1995	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR mil's campaign against Kurdish militants poses threat to TR democracy military conducts a violent campaign that claimed 20,000 lives TR forces destroyed more than 2500 Kurdish villages death squads are responsible for hundreds of mystery killings
	(S) Larry Pressler (R – S. Dak) ExF, ExF	(H) James Bunn (R - Oregon) PKK-t
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR gov waged a brutal war against the Kurdish people TR mil destroyed 2000 villages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PKK terrorism
	(H) Christopher H. Smith (R - NJ) ExF, ExF, HR1, ExF, PKK-t, HR1, Dem1, ExF, Trmil, Trmil, HR1, PKK-t, HR1	(H) David Funderburk (R – N.Carol) Trmil, ExF, ExF, HR1
17 November 1995		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> militaristic policy against Kurds that claimed 20,000 lives TR plan to destroy Kurdish culture
(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR sec forces forcibly evacuated or destroyed more than 2650 villages 	(H) Richard Zimmer (R - NJ) HR1, Trmil, ExF

- TR dismal humanitarian record
 - military campaign against its own people
 - 2000 villages destroyed
- 10 November 1997
- (Congress HR Caucus)
HR1, Dem1, HR1
- serious HR problems persist in TR
 - total rejection of political solution to the Kurdish problem
 - mistreatment of the Kurds

(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois)
(Congress HR Caucus)
HR1, Dem1, iUSc, HR2, Dem1, ExF, ExF, Trmil, ExF

9 June 1999

(H) Patrick Toomey (R - Penn)
ExF, Trmil

- outrage at the treatment of Zana
- her prosecution is a crime against democracy and crime against freedom
- Our administration like those before it has maintained a policy of ignoring TR abuses
- Zana's case demonstrates freedom of expression, thought are problematic
- TR harassment of Kurds overflow into Iraq
- TR openly waged attack on Kurdish villages in n. Iraq
- mindless military effort to eradicate Kurds
- 40,000 Kurds dead at the hands of Turkish forces.

11 February 1998

(H) Wayne Gilchrest (R - Maryland)
Dem1, ExF, ExF, ExF

- Leyla Zana imprisoned for free speech
- TR attacking Kurds in n. Iraq
- TR persecuting Kurds
- it is the governments who persecute Kurds are terrorists

1 October 1998

(H) Michael J. Pappas (R - NJ)
Trmil, ExF, HR1, ExF, iUSc, iUSc

- TR mil has been conducting an inhumane campaign of ethnic cleansing and oppression
- TR killed over 30,000 Kurds
- Clinton Admin's double standard on TR
- double standard on foreign policy

11 March 1999

(H) John Edward Porter (R – Illinois)

Chart 1)
Congress activity on the Kurdish issue in Turkey

Chart 2) Party activity on the Kurdish question

Chart 3) Total number of discourses adopted by the Democratic and Republican Senators

Chart 4) Total number of discourses adopted by the Democratic and Republican Representatives

Chart 5) Discourses adopted by the Democrats in the Senate 1990-1999

Chart 6) Discourses adopted by the Republicans in the Senate 1990-1999

Chart 7) Discourse preferences of the Democratic members of the House

Chart 8) Discourse preferences of the Republican members of the House

Chart 9) Time-series data showing HR, Dem and ExF discourses adopted by the Democrats in the House of Representatives

Chart 10) Time-series data showing HR, Dem and ExF discourses adopted by the Republicans in the House of Representatives

Chart 11) Time-series data showing HR, Dem, ExF and PKK-t discourses adopted by the Democrats in the Senate

Chart 12) Zoom-in on the January 1994 - December 1995 period above

Appendix III – Turkish Grand National Assembly Discourse on the Kurdish question

A) Chronologically sorted.....	52
B) Various statistical graphics showing TGNA performance on the Kurdish question.....	76

Key to coding:

HR: Human Rights discourse **Dem:** Democratization/Democracy discourse **Ethn:** Ethnic difference **Law:** law-related
Sec: security discourse **Ed-dev:** Educational-developmental **For:** Foreign dark powers **ExF:** Criticism for excessive
use of force / violence **SF-VG** Criticism of security forces and/or village guards **iTRc:** intra-Turkish criticism

Support / opposition dynamics: 1: Very negative, 2: negative, 3: neutral – in transition, 4) positive, 5) very positive

Relevance dynamics: + (issue relevant) - (issue irrelevant)

15 January 1991

Ahmet Kurtcebe Alptemoçin
(MoFA-ANAP-Bursa)
sec(US+ EU+), sec(OPC+)

- we have to act together with the international community against Saddam
- OPC will contribute to Turkey's defences and will show everyone that we are with the international community

Suleyman Demirel (DYP-Isparta)
ANAP-, sec(OPC-, ANAP-)
sec(ANAP-), sec1

- why would we support the government when its doing wrong?
- By establishing OPC, ANAP is trying to provoke war
- ANAP is trying to export Turkey's defences
- there is discontent among the SE population, they are migrating to cities, no security

Erdal İnönü (SHP-İzmir)
sec(ANAP-), sec(OPC-)

- ANAP is giving a wrong impression which causes security worries in the SE
- OPC will be dangerous for Turkey

Yıldırım Akbulut (PM-ANAP-Erzincan)
OPC+

- OPC is a part of our NATO duties

24 January 1991

Kemal Anadol (SHP-İzmir)
sec(OPC-), sec(US-)

- OPC will provoke Iraqi attack to Turkey
- there is no safety for citizens

in Adana because of the US base

2 May 1991

Yaşar Topçu (DYP-Sinop)
dev(ANAP-), dev1, dev(ANAP-)

- government is not doing anything to ameliorate economic situation in the SE
- unemployment and lack of infrastructure is appalling
- governing party is pursuing corruption in the SE

19 December 1991

Abdullah Gül (RP-Kayseri)
OPC-, US-, Israel-, HR(OPC-)

- aim of OPC is to extend US and Israeli supremacy in Iraq
- Kurds are dying in Mosul and Kirkuk because of OPC

Erdal İnönü (SHP – SM-İzmir)
HR(OPC+)

- OPC is there as a buffer against Kurdish refugees

8 January 1992

Hasan Mezarıcı (RP-Istanbul)
HEP-, HR1, ExF(SF-)

- HEP deputies must condemn PKK violence
- we mustn't forget our SE citizens are our citizens too
- security forces have emptied Lice and Kulp and took its inhabitants to the countryside
- security forces have acted in undisciplined ways

Mehmet Kerimoğlu (SHP-Ankara)
ExF/Dem(SF-), SF-, Dem(SF-)

- security forces are acting in undisciplined and undemocratic ways
- local populace are disdainful of security forces

- local security commanders are acting outside government authority

21 April 1992

Mahmut Alınak (SHP-Kars)
Dem1, HR1, Dem1, HR1, ExF(SF-) ExF(SF-), ExF(SF-)

- We are having problems with democracy and legal aspect of statehood
- Democracy is being undermined in conduct towards the citizens
- in such a country, we can't talk about HR
- after a PKK raid to Bismil, the security forces fired on the houses randomly
- villages in İdil were bombed by helicopters
- evacuated villagers were fired upon

İsmet Sezgin (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
HR3, SF+, SF+, Sec+

- every citizen has equal rights
- security forces were practicing self-defence in İdil
- security forces are being blamed needlessly
- priority is our territorial and national integrity

30 June 1992

Ökkeş Şendiller (MÇP-Kahramanmaraş)
sec(ANAP-), dev1, sec1, sec(ANAP-)

- the government isn't taking steps towards bringing security in the SE
- local population cannot engage in economic activities because of lack of security
- government cannot establish

security in kahramanmaraş

İsmet Sezgin (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
sec2(SF+)

- security forces are working hard in pushing back terrorism

5 November 1992

Zübeyir Aydar (SHP)
ExF, Ethn1, Law1, ExF

- mystery killings provoke Turkish-Kurdish animosity
- political party leaders are being targeted
- law doesn't apply when it comes to mystery killings
- in the emergency territories 350 mystery killings occurred

Mustafa Baş (RP-İstanbul)
pkk(OPC-), pkk(US- EU-),
sec(US- EU-), sec (OPC-)

- there are rumours on OPC craft helping PKK
- we have captured US and EU made supplies in PKK armory
- Western agents instigate discontent
- OPC presence will provoke war with Iraq

9 March 1993

İsmet Sezgin (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
Sec, Sec, pkk(FC-), Dem3, HR3,
Sec2

- PKK is against our TI
- it seeks to partition our country
- PKK has foreign support
- a representative democracy and lawful HR practice we will be able to defeat terrorism

Uluç Gürkan (SHP-Ankara)
Dem(EM-), Ed-Dev1, HR1,
ANAP-, DYP-, ExF, ExF,
ExF(DYP-)

- emergency measures are antidemocratic

- SE problem is economic and social
- government is trying to limit freedoms and rights to fight terrorism
- both anap and dyp are pursuing this matter clumsily
- current measures target civilians
- 300 mystery killings have taken place
- government is pursuing a policy based on fear and violence

Cemalettin Gürbüz (SHP-Amasya)
sec1, VG-, Dev-Ed1, ExF, HR1,
Ethn1, Ethn(DYP-), ExF, Dem1

- security situation in the SE is dire
- village guard system is corrupt and undemocratic
- unemployment and lack of infrastructure is problematic
- security measures only, won't suffice
- had there been ethnic tolerance in the past, PKK problem wouldn't be there
- government has to be respectful of ethnicity of the Kurds
- there are undisciplined acts from the security forces
- unconditional democracy will be essential

Ahmet Sezal Özbek (DYP-Kırklareli)
sec1, Dev-Ed(ANAP-),
sec(ANAP-), sec(ANAP-)

- security situation in the SE is dire
- ANAP investments have been left half
- ANAP is weak in combating terrorism
- we have killed more terrorists than ANAP

Ahmet Remzi Hatip (RP-Konya)
Dem1, ExF, Law(SF-), ExF, Dev-Ed1, Law(SF-), ExF, Pkk(OPC-),

sec1

- emergency measures are antidemocratic and cause strife in the region
- emergency measures cause illegal activities by the security forces
- this problem cannot be solved solely by police measures
- economic backwardness and infrastructure neglects are supporting the problem
- security forces are acting undisciplined and illegally
- mystery killings enable PKK activities to widen
- OPC enables PKK activities
- this is not a counterterrorism campaign, this is a war

İsmet Sezgin (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
sec3, Law3, Pkk(Arm-), TI, Dev-Ed2, Dev-Ed2, SF+

- our recent operations have defeated most forces of the PKK
- we undertake terrorism within legal norms
- Armenia supports PKK
- Pkk terrorism aims at partitioning our country
- GAP will provide for the country
- we consider SE as primary development zones

Mahmut Kılınç (SHP-Adıyaman)
Law(EM-), ExF, HR1

- there are increasingly illegal state activities in emergency measure cities
- more than 600 mystery killings take place in Turkey
- Kurds believe they are discriminated against

Mahmut Alınak (SHP-Şırnak)
sec(EM-), HR1ExF(EM-), Dev-Ed1, EU-, TI

- emergency rule intensifies the

- problem
- torture, burnings and killings take place under emergency rule
- military measures create economic backwardness
- the EU is using the SE problem as a blackmail issue
- Kurds and Turks are one

5 October 1993

Mahmut Alınak (SHP-Şırnak)
ExF(EM-), HR1, DYP-, Law1,
ExF(SF-), Law(SF-), ExF(SF-),
Ethn1, DYP-, DYP-,

- 77 people died under emergency measures in just a day
- food embargo has been applied to Şırnak
- government is overlooking the crisis
- Turkey is not a legal state
- security forces fired upon civilians
- special forces are acting illegally
- security forces have fired upon randomly
- Kurdish Turkish polarization has been intensified
- PM, MoI, and army chief must resign
- there is no governmental authority

2 November 1993

Işın Çelebi (ANAP-İzmir)
ExF, Dem1, Dem1, ExF

- 400 houses were burned in the recent clashes between security forces and PKK
- There is a mistrust between citizens and the government
- Democracy is being undermined through polarization
- Security only policies are bankrupt

Oktay Öztürk (MÇP-Erzurum)
Pkk(Arm), sec1, ANAP-, DYP-, TI

- PKK is ASALA's remnant
- There is no such thing as economic sources of terrorism
- Terrorism shouldn't be made a party-political issue
- TI is paramount

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
Ethn-, Dem3

- PKK aims to create ethnic conflict
- We are pursuing PKK within democratic limits

25 November 1993

Mustafa Ünalı (RP-Konya)
Ethn-, sec1, EM-, TI

- terror problem has nothing to do with ethnicity
- security situation is dire
- emergency measures must be lifted
- we are united as Turks and Kurds

26 May 1994

Selim Sadak (SHP-Şırnak)
ExF, ExF(SF-), ExF, ExF, ExF

- my electorate is being driven out of their homes
- special teams and village guards force local populations out of their homes
- in March many villages of Şırnak were bombed
- our citizens cannot be ruled by violence
- local mayor is not doing anything and threatening these people

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
Dev-Ed2

- we are allocating billions for reconstruction and protection

of the region

1 September 1994

Suleyman Demirel (Pres-DYP-Isparta)
Ethn-, TI, HR3, sec(OPC-), US-,
Law3, Law3, Law3, sec1, TI,
Pkk(US- EU-), sec(US- EU-), TI

- existence of different ethnicities don't necessarily mean the existence of minority
- if we consider every ethnic group as a different nation, we won't be saved from turmoil
- we can't overlook the suffering of our Kurdish, Turkmen and Arab brothers
- power vacuum in northern Iraq contribute to the terrorism
- I am saddened by the fact that the US Congress has limited aid to Turkey
- Turkey's safeguard against human rights abuses are not less competent than in other countries
- human rights violations are crime for us
- there is no arbitrary legal practice in Turkey
- they have killed innocent civilians, civil servants, teachers...
- They want to partition Turkey within the framework of Sevres
- terrorism has been supported by the Europe and the United States
- while the world supports the fight against the PKK, they make this impossible through human rights violation allegations
- we can't allow disintegration

6 September 1994

Bahaddin Elci (RP-Bayburt)
Ethn+, HR1, Law+

- Turk-Kurd, Alawite-Sunni are being forced into a family feud
- all handicaps to basic freedoms must be eliminated
- a law-based system is a system in which Turks-Kurds, Alawites-Sunnis can all live together

13 September 1994

Mustafa Ateş Amiklioğlu (ANAP-Çorum)
sec1

- PKK is damaging our property, our people, destroying and pillaging

Musa Demirci (RP-Sivas)
sec1, Arm-, Isr-, sec1, sec1, sec1, Pkk (Gr- Arm- OPC-)

- The PKK is widening its area of effectiveness
- What is the aim of the dark power? Creation of Armenia or Israel?
- PKK killed numerous people in the last days
- We can't establish security even in a large city like Sivas
- PKK massacre in the Selimiye village
- security forces did not arrive on time to the Pkk attack
- PKK terrorism has Greek, Armenian and OPC sources

Bekir Sami Dağ (DYP-Adana)
Sec3, sec1, sec1, sec(SF+)

- we have inflicted serious damage on the PKK terrorists
- PKK has killed numerous citizens in the past weeks
- terrorists have burned houses in the villages
- Turkish army is pursuing the terrorists

20 September 1994

Sabri Öztürk (ANAP-İstanbul)
Pkk(SHP-)

- a constructor affiliated with SHP aids PKK

28 September 1994

Şevket Kazan (RP-Kocaeli)
Dem1, Dem1, Dem1

- Will people who came to Diyarbakir because of force migration participate in the elections?
- Aren't the immigrants electors?
- You are taking away their electoral rights

Lütfü Esengün (RP-Erzurum)
Dem1

- The people on forced immigration will not be able to cast their votes; shame on you!

5 October 1994

Ziya Halis (SHP-Sivas)
ExF(SF-), Law1, ExF, Law(SF-)

- Istanbul police chief may be proud of having ordered numerous executions without trial, however this mentality is archaic and diseased.
- There has been executions without trial
- I am against all forms of terrorism, including state terrorism
- our policemen are not acting legally

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
HR2

- our aim is to discern between terrorist and civilian

6 October 1994

Vahdet Sinan Yerlikaya (SHP-Tunceli)
ExF, Law1, ExF(SF-), ExF(SF-), ExF(SF-), Dem1, Law1, HR1, HR1, ExF

- Today in Tunceli, people disappear, villages are being burnt, houses are being burnt, people are being forced out of their homes
- 9 inhabitants of Tunceli have been missing and we cannot get an answer to inquiries on their whereabouts
- Since burnings take place in the morning, we see who is burning the houses; the security forces
- We have been asking the minister of interior to relocate 500 people who took shelter, but we cannot get an answer from him.
- but we saw that commando forces explicitly burned the villages too
- noncombatants in Tunceli are suffering from the operations
- Don't confuse people of Tunceli with the PKK
- Democracy and primacy of law are there for the rights of the people. Had Turkey interiorized democracy, our people wouldn't suffer from anti-democratic measures
- While combating terrorism the state is obligated to protect the rights of its innocent civilians
- PKK's onslaught is terrorism. But I ask you: are applying food embargo or burning villages considered state terrorism?
- State power is not measured with military might, but its respect to human rights

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
HR+, SF+

- Not harming innocent civilians is the duty of the state
- the rumors on security force misconducts are propaganda campaign of the PKK

7 October 1994

Esat Bütün (RP-Kahramanmaraş)
sec(OPC-)

- terrorism increased since the vacuum in northern Iraq

11 October 1994

Orhan Ergüder (ANAP-Istanbul)
SHP-, SHP-, SF+

- [Köylüoğlu] has to inform allegations of security force misconducts to the Prime Minister, Interior Minister, if you don't do this, you have to resign
- You cannot make statements to press without confirming these allegation with the senior officials
- Turkish army cannot burn villages!

Azimet Köylüoğlu (SM-SHP-Sivas)
ExF(SF-), ExF(SF-), Law+, Dem+, HR+, Law+, SF-, Law+

- municipal of Ovacık says that villages were burned by the security forces
- 20 muhtars claim that villages were burned by the security forces
- antidote of terrorism is law, democracy and human rights
- if you are evacuating a village you have to relocate them
- solution of terrorism is not emptying villages, burning houses; it is law, a regime based on law
- solution to terrorism is democratization, human rights
- we can't solve this through militaristic or policing methods, we have to use legalistic methods

Gürol Soylu (ANAP-Istanbul)
HR3, SF+

- Villages aren't burned, villagers evacuate their houses

on their free will and PKK inhabit these villages. The burned villages are the products of military operations against such villages.

- Our security forces have reasoning

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
sec2, sec2, Dev-Ed2

- security forces arrived very late
- state is there to protect innocents
- repairing those unwanted burning is our duty

13 October 1994

Ahmet Remzi Hatip (RP-Konya)
Dem1

- 500,000 cannot vote because they were relocated because of terrorism

18 October 1994

Mustafa Kul (SHP-Erzincan)
Dem1, HR2, sec1, ExF, ExF, EM-, sec1, sec1, TI, Dem+ HR+

- If the assembly doesn't offer solutions to problems, 'other' powers function above judiciary and executive branches
- It is good news that ideas that are considered 'separatist' are now in the parliamentary report
- one of the biggest problems in the region is the right of living, security
- a lot of mystery killings take place in Turkey
- mystery killings in the south-east reached high numbers in 1992-93
- emergency rule has been enacted since 1987, but problems aren't solved; and if followed, it is certain than

they will not be solved

- state is obligated to protect lives and property of people in a country
- terrorism threatens security of citizens
- it is certain that terrorism is directed towards partitioning the country
- this problem doesn't get solved with money, emergency rule, security or economic measures,

Mehmet Keçeciler (ANAP-Konya)
sec1, HR+, TI, TI, DYP-, SHP-, DYP-, SHP-, HR1, Law1, Dev-Ed1, sec(DYP-)

- In the south-east there are places where people can't even go to the mosque
- we have to refrain from heavy-handed measures against civilians in the region
- fight with separatism is the primary duty of the state
- none of the democratic rights can lead to the right of betrayal to the state
- government is using the PKK as a way of getting votes; using this as an issue of domestic politics
- coalition parties should first discuss this among themselves, then make statements
- we saw people living in tents, it is the government's duty to secure them
- you can't let people face the PKK alone in a legalistic state
- you have to build these people a home
- the prime minister says "we have finished terror", in a country where the terror is finished, PKK cannot burn 17 villages

Fetullah Erbaş (RP-Van)
Ethn+, Ethn+, sec1, ExF, sec1, VG-, ExF(SF-), sec1, SF-, sec1,

SF-, Dem1, Ethn1, OPC-, EU-, US-

- crux of the matter is recognition of Kurdish identity
- Kurds say “you have Turkish nationalist political parties, but say we can't exercise our nationalism”
- there is no security in the region
- mystery killings pile up
- any time a bomb might blow up when you are shopping
- if you have village guard, the PKK kills everyone
- when the PKK leaves, soldiers come and arrest everyone for 'aiding the PKK'.
- You can't herd your flock, PKK might attack
- security forces burned mosques, Qoran
- if the PKK has attacked your village, you want the state on your side, but you can't get an answer from anyone
- PKK harasses an army regiment from the town, the army considers all town as terrorist and fires from their panzers, tanks, RPGs
- official positions in towns are given to specific tribes, they don't allow anyone outside that tribe
- terrorism cannot be solved through assimilation
- we don't know who OPC serves
- foreign powers try to partition us

Ömer Lütfi Coşkun (DYP-Balıkesir)

Sec+, Pkk(FC-), TI+, HR3, sec3, Law3, TI+, Dev-Ed2, Dev-Ed3, Dev-Ed3, Dem1, SF+

- terror incidents are of primary importance
- PKK has foreign support
- Turkey's territorial integrity

cannot be questioned

- basic human rights is the right to live; this is under state assurance
- because of security measures, PKK has lost its power
- we made good progress in identifying mystery killings, 172 mystery killings have been identified
- territorial integrity cannot be questioned
- still, we have sent considerable funds to the region
- we made progress on mystery killings
- we seek to provide security to the citizens
- we have sent 10,000 teachers, opened hundreds of schools
- GAP project will be hastened and eradicate unemployment
- basis of terrorism is not ethnic discrimination but democratic discrimination
- security forces work selflessly to protect the citizens

Seyfi Şahin (RP-Kayseri)

Pkk(Arm- Gr- Syr-), Pkk(Arm-), Pkk(Arm-), TI, Ethn-, TI, Ethn-, TI, Pkk(Arm-), OPC-

- PKK is ASALA's heir and is supported by Armenia, Greece, Syria
- Abdullah Ocalan is originally Armenian
- Their aim is to create a greater Armenia
- Kurds are indispensable part of Turkey
- recognition of Kurdish identity, recognition of Kurds as a separate group will lead to territorial disintegration
- if we strengthen local administrations at the expense of the central administration, PKK will benefit from it
- if we recognize every ethnic minority we will lead to disintegration

- local administrations issue cannot be accepted
- this Armenian organization should be defeated at its home OPC should be lifted

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
HR3, HR+, Dem+, Law+, HR3, Law3, TI, Ethn-, Ethn3, TI, SF+, HR3, Dev-Ed2, sec+, Pkk(FC-), Ethn3, TI, sec3, Law2, EM-, Dev-Ed2

- our government has taken softer stance against our citizens its primary goal
- we seek to apply democracy and human rights based on law
- every citizen is first class citizen and all are equal under law
- political solution will lead Turkey to disintegration
- there is no ethnic problem in Turkey; we have geographical problems, economical problems
- all our citizens have equal rights
- identifying ethnic groups will take turkey to disintegration
- security forces have served selflessly
- state cannot burn forests or villages
- we are building homes right now
- terror is financed from abroad
- Kurds can become anything they want, there is no discrimination
- PKK's strategy is first autonomy, then disintegration
- people can go to Şırnak easily
- we are pursuing mystery killings
- we want emergency rule to end
- our aim is to allocate trillions of money to the region

Hüsamettin Korkutata (RP-Bingöl)
Em-, Dem1, VG-, ExF, Dem(DYP- SHP-)

- there is emergency rule since 1984 and citizens' concerns are growing
- a regional administrator has been discharged because he gave us information on human rights abuses
- village guards are engaged in extortion, drug trafficking...
- village evacuations might be justified, but you have to provide alternate housing before doing that
- the governing coalition did not even provide voting rights to people in the region

Kamer Genç (SHP-Tunceli)
SF+, HR+, sec1

- security forces are working selflessly, heroically
- state has to provide evacuated villagers with new homes
- there is no security in the region

19 October 1994

Kazım Ataoğlu (RP-Bingöl)
ExF, ExF(SF-), DYP-, DYP-, SHP-, ExF

- official documents exist showing army burning of the villages
- burnings have been undertaken by the Diyarbakır commando regiment
- Although I have reported this to the president and prime minister, I couldn't get any replies
- President, Prime Minister, Interior Minister did not respond to my reports
- while there is no armed confrontation there, you cannot explain such burnings

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
SF+, Dev-Ed2,

- burnings happen because of PKK

- we are working to provide housing for the citizens

25 October 1994

Süleyman Hatinoğlu (ANAP-Artvin)
Sec(DYP-, SHP-), sec1, SHP-, EM-, sec(DYP- SHP-)

- 49th government said terror law over, but its still on
- if terror is over, who is burning the villages?
- The SHP law shouldn't pass when people are dying
- We should remove the emergency law
- DYP-SHP are appeasing terrorism

Coşkun Gökalp (SHP-Kırşehir)
ExF, ExF(SF-), HR1, ExF(SF-), HR1, ExF(SF-)

- There have been a number of mystery killings in the past month
- security forces have been heavy handed in Istanbul
- right of living has been compromised
- police have exercised extra-judicial killings
- our citizens have been killed, for their possibility of being terrorists
- police had the possibility of arresting them, but they chose the easy way and destroyed them

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
SF+

- the alleged mystery killing incident was self-defence

Yücel Seçkiner (ANAP-Ankara)
Sec(SF+), DYP-

- we gave all support to our security forces so that they can provide security
- Şırnak mayor is doing DYP

propaganda on terror

Fecri Alparslan (ANAP-Ağrı)
Sec(DYP-)

- During the tenure of the former mayor, everything was secure, DYP ruined it

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
Sec2, Dev-Ed+, Dev-Ed+

- terrorism is slowly disappearing
- we have to provide economic and social improvement in the region
- we have to create jobs there

1 November 1994

Mehmet Keçeciler (ANAP-Konya)
DYP-, SHP-, ExF(SF-)

- state ministers give conflicting accounts of village burnings
- if villages are burnt by the security forces, you have no right to leave these people there in the cold

Ercan Karakaş (SHP-Istanbul)
Leg1, ExF(SF-), sec1

- you may empty villages, but they have to be done within a legal framework
- counter-terrorism has to be done within democratic principles, if security forces burn villages, state is no longer a state
- the state has to protect the lives of the citizens

Ekrem Pakdemirli (ANAP-Manisa)
ExF(SF-),

- If village burning incidents are true, the commander of the arms forces must resign

13 December 1994

Seyfi Şahin (RP-Kayseri)
Ethn-, TI, Ethn-

- we cannot accept the law on regional administrations, since it attempts to give Kurds a separate identity
- Turkish nation is one and unitary
- Giving Kurds a separate cultural and linguistic identity is an act against the Kurdish state

Yüksel Yalova (ANAP-Aydın)
Law1

- PKK problem and arrest of 6 parliamentarians is a result of a problematic legal framework

Hacı Filiz (DYP-Kırıkkale)
HR2

- By the end of PKK we will become a center of human rights

Yaşar Erbaz (RP-Yozgat)
TI, TI

- PKK attempts to partition Turkey
- We will not allow a Kurdish state

28 December 1994

Murat Karayalçın (SHP – MoFA)
PKK(Iraq-), sec(Iraq-)

- PKK has camps in Iraq
- We are worried about the authority vacuum in n. Iraq

İsmail Safa Giray (ANAP-Istanbul)
DYP-, SHP-, OPC-, SHP-, SHP-

- the governing parties used to criticise OPC, now they are supporting it
- The OPC is being extended without a clear definition of its purpose
- SHP is being unclear about the OPC extension purposes
- Does SHP has a back up plan

if we vote NO to OPC? I think not

Mehmet Adnan Ekmen (SHP-Batman)
TI(OPC+)

- OPC is against establishment of a Kurdish state, they promote Turkish terr. Integrity

Mukadder Başgeğmez (RP-Istanbul)
OPC-, TI(US-, EU-), sec(US- EU-), TI(US-), TI(OPC)

- Every six months, during OPC extension debates you say “sovereignty belongs to people”, but after calls from Washington, you change your mind
- The US, and EU are establishing a Kurdish state in northern Iraq
- The aim of the US and EU is to create instability by using the Kurdish issue
- We don’t want OPC, the US wants it to create a Kurdistan
- OPC is against Turkish territorial integrity

Orhan Kilercioğlu (DYP-Ankara)
HR3, sec(OPC+), sec(OPC+), sec(OPC+)

- we had helped refugees in n. Iraq
- the OPC helped us destroy PKK camps in n.Iraq
- we get intel on PKK through OPC
- OPC works to eradicate the power vacuum in n. Iraq

Murat Karayalçın (SHP – MoFA)
Sec(OPC+)

- OPC is there to prevent more migration

Bülent Ecevit (DSP-Zonguldak)
Sec(OPC-), OPC-, US-, EU-, TI(Dem-), US-, OPC-

- a power vacuum in n.Iraq was deliberately created by OPC
- OPC is a trap
- While western allies left Turkey to deal with this problem, they also criticized Turkey for using military options.
- ‘democracy’ as prescribed by the West will lead us to partition as well as some Turkish statesmen
- the US is threatening us against termination of the OPC
- the OPC is beneficial for the US only to restrain Turkey

Abdüllatif Şener (RP-Sivas)
OPC(DYP- SHP-), Pkk(OPC-),

- DYP and SHP act on US orders on OPC
- Everybody knows OPC aids the PKK
- NGOs are spies, agents and saboteurs
- PKK is terrorizing the countryside

10 January 1995

Hasan Mezarcı (RP-Istanbul)
HR+, Ethn+, Ethn+

- military measures should be taken, but civilians shouldn’t be harmed
- we should specify the linguistic definition of nationhood
- if we don’t solve cultural rights issue at TGNA, we will give the KPE justification

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
Sec+, TI, Ethn-, Ethn3

- PKK is the biggest security concern
- PKK attacks our territorial integrity
- PKK is trying to spread the belief that our southeastern

- citizens are of different ethnicity
- All citizens are equal

17 January 1995

Sabri Öztürk (ANAP-Istanbul)
Sec(DYP-)

- The prime minister messed up everything she tried, especially terrorism

Mahmut Alınak (SHP-Şırnak)
HR1

- the government will oppose if I say 'terrorism should be dealt with democratically' or 'emergency rule should be lifted'

24 January 1995

Bekir Sami Daçe (SM-DYP-Adana)
Sec+, TI, Dem+

- there are two types of terrorism: in the southeast and in the cities
- their aim is to destroy our territorial integrity
- terrorism threatens our democracy

21 February 1995

Cevat Ayhan (RP-Sakarya)
Pkk(EU-)

- European Union assists the PKK

28 February 1995

Selçuk Maruflu (ANAP-Istanbul)
sec(Dyp- SHP-), ExF(SF-), HR(SF-)

* the DYP-SHP coalition is incompetent against terrorism

- time to time security forces 'sadden' citizens

- some security forces are charged with human rights violations

1 March 1995

Cevat Ayhan (RP-Sakarya)
Pkk(EU-)

- EU supports the PKK

Orhan Kilercioğlu (DYP-Ankara)
Pkk(EU-)

- EU criticizes Turkey on PKK but its incapable of stopping violence elsewhere

14 March 1995

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
Sec(ANAP-), Sec(EM+)

- Why didn't the Özal government respond to Erug and Şemdinli raids?
- We need to extend emergency measures because of the security situation

Eyüp Aşık (ANAP-Trabzon)
HR(EM-), sec(DYP- SHP-), Sec+, Law+, sec(DYP- SHP-), Sec(DYP- SHP-), sec(DYP- SHP-), ExF, Dev-Ed(DYP- SHP-), HR(DYP- SHP-), HR1, HR1, ExF, Sec1, VG-, ExF, ExF

- emergency rule is a measure that restricts rights
- DYP-SHP coalition couldn't provide security
- Counter-terrorism is a self-defense issue for a state
- Counter-terrorism must be practiced within legal framework
- Coalition government is not united against terrorism
- The government hasn't provided security forces with equipment
- Çiller government has been unable to cope with the security situation

- 2200 villages were emptied, 1500 mystery killings
- government has been unable to make investments to the region
- has the government thought what happened to the inhabitants of the emptied villages?
- Human rights are deteriorating
- With mystery killings, village evacuations, with truncheon suspects, we are getting lower in HR
- Terrorism has spread to cities outside emergency rule
- We have 65,000 village guards, that have no education but right to kill
- Civilian casualties cannot be explained by 'combating terrorism'
- 2200 villages were emptied but nothing is being done about them

Orhan Kilercioğlu (DYP-Ankara)
Law+, Law+

- the matter is the operation of emergency measures under legal framework
- we are aware of the fact that we have to undertake counter-terrorism within international law

Ural Köklü (CHP-Uşak)
Pkk(FC-), Pkk(OPC-), Pkk(Syr-Gr-), Dev-Ed1, Dev-Ed1, Sec1, Dev-Ed1, Dem1, Dem+, Dev-Ed+, Dev-Ed1, Dem+, HR+

- some foreign powers give aid to the PKK
- PKK reached its current power through the Gulf War
- Syria and Greece might be supporting terrorism
- Terror is a product of regional underdevelopment
- Lack of education and jobs create conditions that favor PKK

- PKK is causing security concerns for the villagers
- Another problem is economy; lack of funds enable PKK to prey on local villagers
- Lack of democracy in Turkey disable citizens to speak
- We have to develop democracy not only for the south-east but for the whole county
- We have to prepare accommodation for the inhabitants of the burned villages and get them work
- Our closed schools must be reopened
- We are in favor of solution of this through Democratic and HR measures

Hüsamettin Korkutata (RP-Bingöl)
SF3, Sec(DYP- SHP-), VG-, ExF,
Pkk(FC-), US-, Sec1, Sec(US-),
Dev-Ed1

- military did its duty, but the coalition government failed its
- village guards are engaging in corrupt acts
- mystery killings take place in large numbers
- foreign countries aid the PKK
- CIA has many agents in the region
- An overall security deficiency is observed
- CIA agents instigate discontent
- No serious investment has been made on SE

Abdüllatif Şener (RP-Sivas)
DYP-, SHP-, DYP-, SHP-,
sec(DYP- SHP-), sec(DYP-SHP-),
US-, FC-

- DYP-SHP couldn't change emergency measure conditions in the SE
- Coalition couldn't undertake a legalistic approach on this matter too
- Terror problem is increasing

- under the coalition
- More security force members died during the coalition than before
- A CIA agent commented on CNN that agents are relocated into Turkey
- Many agents of different countries are relocated to SE

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
Sec3, Sec3, Law+, Sec3

- PKK terrorism is in decline
- You can travel to Şırnak and Siirt easily today
- Emergency rule is a constitutional matter
- We purchased new armored vehicles for our army

Muharrem Şemsek (MÇP-Çorum)
TI, Pkk(FC-), Ethn-

- Our territorial integrity is being undermined
- Foreign powers don't want Turkey to be a superpower so they instigate the PKK
- Kurdish identity issue is a misguidance

23 March 1995

Bülent Ecevit (DSP-Zonguldak)
Sec+, OPC-, US-, EU-, Dem+,
HR+, Dev-Ed+, HR(SF+)

- we should understand that cross-border operations will yield no results. We have to establish a buffer zone in n.Iraq
- Western powers use Turkey as a peon in OPC
- Turkey should ameliorate its democracy and HR situation
- We should ameliorate our economic situation to combat PKK
- TAF actively contribute to the well being of N.Iraq citizens

Engin Güner (ANAP-Istanbul)

Ethn+,

- we have to be tolerant towards all ethnicities

28 March 1995

Erdal İnönü (MoFA-SHP-Izmir)
Sec+

- We are not invading N.Iraq, we are there to provide security for our citizens

Cemal Şahin (SHP-Çorum)
Ethn+

- The essence of fighting is Turkishness- Kurdishness matter

29 March 1995

İbrahim Halil Çelik (RP-Urfa)
Ethn1, Ethn1

- According to official history, there is no Kurdish problem or Kurds
- We were told 'there are no Kurds' but Kurds did not disappear

30 March 1995

Salih Kapusuz (RP-Kayseri)
Pkk(EU-)

- EU is trying to weaken Turkey against PKK through CU conditions

11 April 1995

Erdal İnönü (MoFA-SHP-Izmir)
Sec+, EU-, Iraq-, Sec+

- N.Iraq incursion is self-defence
- Some groups in the EP are deliberately trying to divert discussion on our cross-border operation
- PKK exploits the authority vacuum in n.Iraq

- Cross border operation aims to provide security

Tunç Bilget (DYP-Aydın)
PKK(us- eu-), sec3,

- Our western allies created the PKK problem and now criticizing us
- Crossborder operation has been successful

13 April 1995

Engin Güner (ANAP-Istanbul)
Pkk(neth-)

- PKK flag was drawn in a meeting in Neherlands

Salih Kapusuz (RP-Kayseri)
Pkk(eu-)

- Some EU countries are allowing PKK to function

18 April 1995

Muharrem Şemsek (MÇP-Kayseri)
Pkk(neth-), Ethn-, Neth-, EU-

- Allowing Kurdish parliament in Netherlands, is Dutch's intervention to our domestic politics
- Our Turkish citizens, that are called 'Kurdish'
- Netherlands has waged a political war on Turkey
- Turkey has to reasses its relations with the West

Erdal İnönü (MoFA-SHP-Izmir)
Pkk(EU-)

- Some European countries have been hosting KPE

25 April 1995

Hasan Dikici (RP-Maraş)
Dev-Ed1

- animal farming has been completely terminated by the government party on the basis of combating terrorism

2 May 1995

Erdal İnönü (MoFA-SHP-Izmir)

EU-, Sec+, EU-, EU-, TI(EU-),
Pkk(EU-)

- EP decision on Turkish crossborder operation is very misguided
- Crossborder operation is against terrorists
- The EP is against us
- EP decision interferes in our domestic matters
- EP implies disrespect on our territorial integrity
- EU capitals allow MED-TV which is against our operations

Abdullah Gül (RP-Kayseri)
Pkk(EU-), PKK(EU-), TI(EU-),
TI(UK-), TI(EU-), HR(EU-),
OPC-

- EP decision mentions the PKK as if its a liberation organization
- EP has become a place of anti-Turkish foci
- EP wants Turkey's partitioning
- Some British MEPs mentioned changing of the borders
- EP's dictations of democracy are directed only towards partitioning
- The EP has been ambivalent towards mosque burnings or violence against Muslims
- We must cut OPC short

Engin Güner (ANAP-Istanbul)
EU-, Sec+, Pkk(EU-), TI(EU-),
EU-, EU-, EU-

- EP's language shows that it has bad intentions
- TR state is fighting terrorism, not freedom fighters
- EP is trying to portray PKK terrorism as Kurdish

independence

- MEPs mentioned Sevres many times, it shows what direction this thing is going towards
- EP cannot ask for a calendar from the TGNA; no parliament has the right to do this
- We have realized that MEPs have no knowledge on the nIraq issue
- EP's biased decision is based on prejudices

Mehmet Tahir Köse (CHP-
Amasya)

Pkk(EU-), EU-, Sec+, HR1, Dem1,
HR(SF+)

- EP is denying the terrorist nature of the PKK
- The report is rife with contradictions
- Crossborder operation is a self-defence issue
- Although EP decision is bad, i have to say that the inability of TGNA of passing HR and Dem resolutions caused this
- For years no progress was made on Dem and HR fronts
- I commend tha TAF for no civilian casualties

Sait Kemal Mimaroglu (DYP-
Ankara)

EU-, Dem1, HR1

- EP decision was hasty
- Were we able to pass any democratization measures?
- Could we make way for free thinking?

Ekrem Pakdemirli (ANAP-
Istanbul)

EU-

- In terms of amendment of article 8 of terror-law, we have been subject to EP pressures' Its not democratization

4 May 1995

İbrahim Kumaş (RP-Tokat)
EU-, TI(EU-), OPC-

- EP is trying to internationalize our domestic issues
- EP's recent decision is a Sevres re-make
- OPC has to withdraw

Onur Kumbaracıbaşı (SM-CHP-Hatay)
EU-, sec(EU-)

- EP decision is mistaken and biased
- The decision overlooks Turkey's fight against terrorism

Cevat Ayhan (RP-Sakarya)
Dev-Ed(DYP-SHP)

- the government isn't providing soldiers in the SE with jobs after their services

Ahmet Neidim (DYP-Sakarya)
Pkk(Gr-)

- Greece supports the PKK

Yıldırım Aktuna (SM-DYP-Istanbul)
PKK(Gr-)

- Greek and PKK flags were side by side

17 May 1995

Hasan Mezarıcı (RP-Istanbul)
HR1, Law1

- TGNA couldn't enable freedom of expression
- A writer was unjustifiably jailed for 'supporting PKK'

Zeki Ergezen (RP-Bitlis)
Dev-Ed1

- SE entrepreneurs await TGNA attention

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
Sec3, TI(FC-)

- SE cities are accessible, secure
- There are foreign powers that aim to partition Turkey

25 May 1995

Mehmet Elkatmış (RP-Nevşehir)
Sec(DYP-, SHP-)

- Government has been unable to stop terrorism

Fetullah Erbaş (RP-Van)
Dev-ed+

- Solution of the SE problem is economic

Ökkeş Şendiller (MÇP-Maraş)
DYP-, HR-

- The minister of justice doesn't do anything about the PKK posters in jails
- You consider PKK propaganda as freedom of expression

30 May 1995

İbrahim Kumaş (RP-Tokat)
Law+

- Solution to the PKK problem is law based politics

6 June 1995

Mahmut Orhon (ANAP-Yozgat)
TI

- amendment of the article 8 leads to separatism

7 June 1995

Musa Demirci (RP-Sivas)
Pkk(Arm-)

- PKK has Armenians in it

20 June 1995

Mustafa Baş (RP-Istanbul)
DYP-

- DYP is using military equipment for party purposes

Hasan Korkmazcan (ANAP-

Denizli)

Dem1, DYP-, sec(DYP-), sec1

- Anti-terror law is not the only anti-democratic aspect of our law
- DYP is excessively using the terror problem in their election campaigns
- DYP says they solved the terror problem, but we are still having casualties
- PKK is now in the cities

21 June 1995

Emin Kul (ANAP-Istanbul)
Sec(DYP-)

- DYP claims they solved the terror problem but it's still active

23 June 1995

Fetullah Erbaş (RP-Van)
HR1

- bearded or headscarved people are taken into custody as if they are terrorists. This restricts freedom of expression

27 June 1995

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
Sec3, sec+, sec3, EM+, Dem2

- numerous PKK terrorists have been killed
- PKK terrorism took many lives of our citizens
- We have captured numerous PKK terrorists
- Local citizens will need emergency measures for protection
- Extension of the emergency measure will not harm democratization moves

Mustafa Balçılar (ANAP-Eskişehir)
Pkk(FC-), sec(DYP- SHP-),
Pkk(Syr- Gr-), sec-, Dev-Ed+,

Dev-Ed1, ExF, sec(DYP- SHP-),
sec1, SHP-, DYP-, SHP-,
sec(DYP-)

- PKK has foreign support
- Coalition government couldn't do anything about the terror issue
- We can't prevent our neighbours helping the PKK (and Greece)
- A security-only approach will not yield results
- Social, economic and cultural measures have to be taken
- Schools are closed, teachers are being killed
- You empty 2000 villages, then don't relocate its inhabitants
- Because of government's wrong policies, Kurdish parliaments are being established abroad
- PKK can attack the same outpost 3 times a week!
- DYP uses military equipment for party purposes
- Azimet Köylüoğlu says "there are HR violations in Turkey"; how can the people trust that minister in charge of HR?
- Both DYP and SHP ministers are discoordinated
- The situation deteriorated since DYP's come to power

Ural Köklü (CHP-Uşak)
Pkk(Fc-), Pkk(Fc-), Law+, Dem1,
Dev-Ed1, ExF, Ethn+, SF-, HR+,
Dem+, Ethn+, Dem+, Dem+

- terrorism is foreign sponsored
- some foreign powers may support PKK
- we can't put all the blame on foreign powers; we have to do our legal reform
- there is no civilian-state relationship in the SE
- social rights or developmental improvements weren't made
- SE people understand police or gendarme when mentioned about 'state'

- Kurd-Turk racism is extremely mistaken
- In terms of selection of the security forces, racist people are given prominence
- Security forces must abide by HR and democracy
- We can't differentiate between our citizens on ethnic grounds
- Rather than Kurdish or SE, I consider this democratization problem of Turkey
- Solution to the problem is democratization

Hüsamettin Korkutata (RP-Bingöl)
Sec(EM-), EU- US-, Law1,
ExF(SF-), HR1, Arm-, Gr-, EU-

- extension of emergency rule worsens terrorism
- war against the pKK benefits EU and US
- we couldn't bring any legal improvements to the problem
- some security force members can go into a village and destroy their electricity
- our citizens are refugees in their own homeland
- Armenia, Greece and some Europeans act against Turkey

İsmail Köse (DYP-Erzurum)
TI, Dem-, Dev-Ed+, Ethn-, Ethn-,
TI

- PKK problem is in essence territorial integrity problem
- There is no democratization problem in Turkey
- SE problem is in essence food, jobs and housing
- SE doesn't want to speak a different language, they want jobs
- PKK problem will be solved by de-emphasizing differences
- PKK fight will be won through national unity

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
Sec3, Dev-Ed+

- there is an increase in number of captured terrorists
- economic measure will be resumed

Abdülattif Şener (RP-Sivas)
TI, Pkk(US- EU-)

- PKK aimed to destroy our TI
- PKK serves the hegemonic powers in the world

İbrahim Kumaş (RP-Tokat)
TI(EU-), OPC-

- EP is against Turkey's TI
- OPC must be withdrawn

Erdal İnönü (MoFA-SHP-Izmir)
OPC+, PKK(OPC-)

- OPC operates under Turkish jurisdiction, there is no incident in which OPC aircraft has operated without our knowledge
- PKK terrorism stems from authority gap in N. Iraq

11 Temmuz 1995

Selçuk Maruflu (ANAP-Istanbul)
Law+

- Constitutional amendments have to be made regardless of separatist tendencies

Mehmet Seven (ANAP-Bilecik)
ExF

- 1046 villages were evacuated but the government didn't build housing for them

Edip Sadfer Gaydalı (ANAP-Bitlis)
Dev-ed(DYP- SHP-), HR1, Dev-
ed1

- government has forgotten economic development of the region
- emptied villagers' inhabitants are not relocated
- Bitlis became half-investments

cemetery

1 October 1995

Süleyman Demirel (Pres-Isparta)
Sec+, Sec+

- 18000 terror incidents have happened, killing many people
- terrorists have killed clergymen, teachers and students

3 October 1995

Vahdet Sinan Yerlikaya (CHP-Tunceli)
HR+, HR1, ExF

- We shouldn't punish citizens of SE because of PKK
- We are punishing local populace
- We can't fight terror with terror

Necmettin Cevheri (SM-DYP-Urfa)
Dev-Ed1, Dev-ed+

- there are schools that are waiting to be opened
- a reason why GAP is not working is terror

10 October 1995

Tansu Çiller (PM-DYP)
Sec3, Dev-ed3, Dev-ed3

- we have expelled terrorists out of our country
- we have initiated a repair project on the SE
- we are developing economic packages for the SE

13 October 1995

Nevzat Ercan (DYP-Sakarya)
Ethn-, TI, Pkk(n.iraq-), sec+, PKK(EU-), sec3

- PKK claims Kurds have a

separate identity

- It aims to create a Kurdistan in the SE
- Authority gap in N Iraq benefits PKK
- PKK has killed many clergymen, teachers
- PKK has been using EU as propaganda
- We have killed 6000 terrorists

Abdüllatif Şener (RP-Sivas)
sec(DYP-), US-, PKK(US-, EU-)

- DYP has been unable to control terrorism which resulted in village evacuations
- If you act on Clinton's orders, you can't solve terrorism
- Washington's, EU's, IMF's orders won't solve PKK problem

Mesut Yılmaz (ANAP-Rize)
Sec(DYP-), sec1, sec(Pres-)

- Governing parties misguide people by saying 'terror is over'
- Terror is not over
- President is giving wrong information on PKK terrorism

Deniz Baykal (CHP-Antalya)
ExF, law+, dem+, sec3

- villages in the SE have been evacuated by the state
- we are eliminating PKK within legal and democratic framework

Tansu Çiller (DYP-PM-Istanbul)
Sec3

- we have killed numerous terrorists

27 October 1995

Şevket Kazan (RP-Kocaeli)
Law1, EU-

- we have to amend the whole anti-terror law

- making amendments just because EU wants it is wrong

Orhan Ergüder (ANAP-Istanbul)
EU-, Gr-, Law-

- we are not interfering to France's Corsica matter or Basque matter
- Greeks tried to beat an MP for saying 'turk'
- You are appeasing terrorists by amending this law

Mahmut Alınak (CHP-Şırnak)
Ethn1, Dem1

- antiterror law is a racist and discriminative law
- it punishes media channels

Bahaddin Elçi (RP-Bayburt)
Dem1, HR1, Ethn-, Pkk(US- EU-), HR-

- we don't have a real democracy
- our HR situation is problematic
- we have to solve our Dem and HR problems not because foreign powers tell us to
- State should be equidistant towards all ethnicities
- Western states make us fight with Kurds
- Freedom of thought is beneficial for normal people, but we can't do this for the terrorists

Murat Başesgioğlu (ANAP-Kastmonu)
Sec+, Dem-, SF+

- security concerns enable a country to take limiting measures in terms of democracy
- amendment to the antiterror law demoralizes security forces

Mehmet Kerimoğlu (CHP-Ankara)

Ethn1, EU-

- You can't combat terrorism through racism
- The EU can't put pressure on us

Bekir Sami Dağ (M o Justice-DYP-Adana)

Pkk(FC-), HR-

- terrorism is foreign sponsored
- this is not only a freedom of though issue

28 October 1995

Ural Köklü (CHP-Uşak)

TI, Pkk(TI), Dev-Ed+, Dem+

- terror is against TI
- PKK has foreign support
- We have to engage in developmental measures in SE
- We must initiate reform towards democratization

Mustafa Balcılar (ANAP-Eskişehir)

DYP-, Law(VG-), HR1, sec(DYP-), sec(CHP-), sec(DYP-), Law-

- DYP is doing a very bad job in terms of SE situation
- Village guards are not subject to any legal framework
- Village evacuations may be justified but its inhabitants are not relocated
- Because of DYP policies, terrorists are in the cities
- CHP has brought terror sympathizers to the TGNA
- During DYP, terrorists have increased dramatically
- Antiterror law amendment has been demoralizing

Fetullah Erbaş (RP-Van)

Sec(DYP-), Dev-ed1, ExF(SF-), SF-, SF-, sec(OPC-), SF-, law(SF-), HR1, EM-, Pkk(Gr- Syr-, Nord-), Dev-ed1

- During DYP government terror incidents skyrocketed

- Economic situation in SE is dire
- Mountain commandos burn villages at will
- There is no coordination between military units
- Our intelligence is not working properly
- OPC is exposing our intel to PKK
- Gendarme commanders are disorganized
- Gendarme is operating semi-legally
- People are out in the cold and nobody is dealing with them
- Emergency rule is benefiting the PKK
- Syria, Greece, Nordic countries have ties with PKK
- 5000 school are closed

İsmail Köse (DYP-Erzurum)

TI, Dev-ed-, TI, SF+, Sec3

- PKK's aim is to partition Turkey
- The problem is not economic, its national unity problem
- Some political opportunists say that special forces are burning villages
- We came to a very strong point in fight against PKK

Zeki Ergezen (RP-Bitlis)

Sec-, HR+, ExF, sec(DYP-)

- region's inhabitants don't want any more tanks, they want kind treatment by the state
- region's people are oppressed, villages evacuated
- the government couldn't stop terrorism

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)

Pkk(FC-), Sec3

- foreign powers support terrorism
- terrorism has weakened 50 per cent

Nahit Menteşe (MoI-DYP-Aydın)
Sec3, Leg3, Dem3, EM+, Dev-ed3

- PKK recruits are going down
- We are within legal democratic boundaries in fight against terrorism
- Local populace want extension of emergency rule
- I opened new schools there recently

Hüsamettin Korkutata (RP-Bingöl)
Sec(DYP- CHP-), Dev-ed+

- government isn't doing its job properly and gives all the load on the security forces
- we have to allocate more aid to the region

Mehmet Keçeciler (ANAP-Konya)
Law1, sec1

- we have to loosen the anti-terror law
- terror has increased and spread to the cities

Engin Ergüder (ANAP-Istanbul)

OPC-, OPC-, DYP- CHP-, Pkk(n.iraq-), Pkk(EU- US-), Pkk(OPC-)

- OPC is not deterring Saddam
- OPC is working against Turkey's interests
- Government doesn't have a foreign policy
- Authority gap in n.Iraq enables PKK
- Great powers are intent on the establishment of a Kurdish state
- OPC aims to promote PKK

Cevat Ayhan (RP-Sakarya)

UK-, OPC-, Pkk(OPC-), OPC-, Pkk(OPC-)

- a British OPC officer has slapped one of our mayors
- OPC copters aided PKK in 1992

- Eşref Bitlis' copter was harassed by OPC craft
- OPC enables PKK to operate freely

3 November 1995

Algan Hacaloğlu (CHP-Istanbul)
Dem+, Ethn+, Dem(right-),
Law(right-), HR+, Dem+, HR+,
HR1

- we are emphasizing a democratic system in which cultural and ethnic rights are respected
- right and far right parties are preventing democratization
- right parties prevented the amendment of article 8
- SE terrorism should be eliminated but with respect to local citizens and within democratic frameworks
- Emptied villagers must be relocated
- Village evacuations are serious HR abuses

Deniz Baykal (MoFA-CHP-Antalya)

Sec1, PKK(FC- Gr-)

- constitutional amendments may not be sufficient but terrorism prevents such steps being taken
- foreign countries support PKK
- Greece is supporting PKK

13 November 1995

Algan Hacaloğlu (CHP-Istanbul)
ExF

- We have emptied 2000 villages because of terrorism

Cemil Tunç (RP-Elazığ)
HR1, HR1

- 2 million people are immigrants in their own country
- our people are living in tents

16 April 1996

Çetin Bilgir (DSP-Kars)
Sec1

- people are running away from terrorism, migrating to big cities

Ülkü Güney (MoI-ANAP-Bayburt)
Dev-ed2, Dev-ed2

- we have prepared conditions for safe return for evacuated villagers
- GAP will be improved and provide for the region

17 April 1996

Aykon Doğan (DYP-Isparta)
Pkk(FC-), Dem+, HR+, TI

- terror has foreign support
- it is the biggest threat in front of our democracy
- separation of terrorists and noncombatants is the key issue
- terror threatens our national unity

Necmettin Erbakan (RP-Konya)
Sec+, TI, Dev-ed+, Dev-ed+

- terror is primary security problem
- terror is against our national unity
- we have to improve animal husbandry in order to improve conditions in SE
- we have to subvent the farmers

Murat Başesgioğlu (ANAP-Kastamonu)
Sec+

- we consider terror as the biggest prevention to our democracy

18 April 1996

Mustafa Kamalak (RP-Maraş)

Ethn+

- both the terrorist and the civilian are children of this country

Ertuğrul Yalçınbayır (ANAP-Bursa)

Dev-ed+, Law+, Dem+

- we have to provide for region's people
- we have to undertake constitutional reforms
- we can't prevent freedom of thought and expression

Turan Alçelik (RP-Giresun)
HR1

- thousands are refugees in Turkey because of village evacuations

Bülent Akarcalı (ANAP-Istanbul)
Pkk(FC-)

- PKK is supported by foreign countries

Zeki Çakıroğlu (CHP-Muğla)
PKK(FC-)

- PKK has foreign support

20 April 1996

İrfan Demiralp (ANAP-Samsun)
Pkk(Syr-)

- Syria is supporting terrorism

Bülent Akarcalı (ANAP-Istanbul)
Pkk(Syr- EU-)

- Syria is protecting PKK
- PKK can function in the West

Ali Dinçer (CHP-Ankara)
Pkk(Iran-)

- We know that İran funds the PKK

Temel Karamollaoğlu (RP-Sivas)
Pkk(OPC-)

- OPC enables PKK to function

21 April 1996

Ömer Vehbi Hatipoğlu (RP-Diyabakır)

Dev-ed+

- most terrorists are uneducated

Agah Oktay Güner (ANAP-Ankara)

Dev-ed+

- terror is a result of lack of education

22 April 1996

Cihan Paçacı (DYP-Elazığ)

TI, Pkk(Syr-), Sec3

- terror aims to partition Turkey
- Syria is actively supporting PKK
- Terrorists are being defeated

Deniz Baykal (CHP-Antalya)

Pkk(Iran-), RP-

- İran trains and funds PKK
- RP is guilty for meeting with İran

Metin Şahin (DSP-Antalya)

Pkk(Iran- US-)

- İran has supported PKK
- US-made buffer zone is benefiting PKK

Gökhan Çapoğlu (DSP-Ankara)

HR+

- we have to be kind towards SE people

Necmettin Erbakan (RP-Konya)

Dev-ed+

- we have to provide for the SE citizens

Nahit Menteşe (SM-VP-DYP-Aydın)

TI, TI, Sec+, Sec3, TI(FC-), Syr-, Ir-

- PKK aims to partition Turkey x 2
- Pkk uses terrorist tactics
- its getting weaker

- foreign countries will not be able to impose Sevres
- Syria harbors PKK
- İran aids PKK

7 May 1996

Avni Doğan (RP-Maraş)

sec1, SF-, VG-, SF-, Dev-Ed+

- region is under constant threat of terrorism
- there are doubts about the regional brigade commander
- village guards and commander have overlooked the attack
- infrastructure must be laid down to make counter-terrorism easier

Ülkü Güney (MoI-ANAP-Bayburt)

sec3

- PKK is weaker in the rural areas

6 June 1996

Kamran İnan (ANAP-Bitlis)

US-, US-, US-

- House of Reps decision to limit aid is hostile
- US-Turkish alliance is questionable
- We have to stand up to the US

Kamer Genç (Sp.o.Parl-I)

US-

- If US is our ally, it should act like one; if not, its our enemy

18 June 1996

Kamran İnan (ANAP-Bitlis)

HR(ICHR-)

- If we have HR problems, we should address them but ICHR are playing tricks on Turkey

Bülent Ecevit (DSP-Istanbul)

Pkk(OPC-), Pkk(Iran- Syria-), TI, US-, Pkk(OPC-), Dev-ed1,

- by OPC PKK's infiltration

- into Turkey became easier
- İran and Syria are supporting PKK
- International organizations work against TR TI
- US has ulterior motives in Iraq
- OPC has increased terrorism
- Schools are closed for years, which enables young people to fall into PKK hands

Necmettin Dede (DYP-Muş)

HR(OPC+), DSP-

- OPC is there for the HR of N. Iraqis
- DSP is against the OPC because it is opposition

İsmail Safa Giray (ANAP-

Balıkesir)

OPC-, DYP-

- OPC isn't beneficial to Turkey
- DYP isn't calculating the costs of the OPC

Cevat Ayhan (RP-Sakarya)

OPC-, OPC-, TI(US- EU-),

Pkk(OPC-)

- OPC craft is encouraging refugees to flee to Turkey
- OPC and international force is working against Turkish interests
- Western countries are trying to impose Sevres on us
- OPC craft has supplied PKK in the Cudi mountains

Nahit Menteşe (SM-VPM-DYP-

Aydın)

Pkk(N.iraq-), TI

- authority gap in n.Iraq supports PKK
- PKK should be prevented in terms of TI of Turkey

Hasan Çağlayan (BBP-Çorum)

OPC-, OPC-

- OPC is in a serious distraction of political purpose
- OPC has to leave

Ülkü Güney (MoI – ANAP-Bayburt)
Law2, sec3, Law+

- we are working on legal amendments on emergency measures and village guards
- although we are winning the war on terror, we need legal framework on it

İstemihan Talay (DSP-Mersin)
sec-, EM-, Dem1, Dev-ed+, Dev-ed+, Dev-ed1, US-

- terror is not only a security issue
- emergency measures are not solutions
- government is depriving SE people from democratic rights and ignoring developmental aspect of the issue
- terror will be solved through improving economic conditions of the SE people
- education measures must be hastened
- developmental loans are not well managed
- Turkey is being dragged along US interests

Ömer Vehbi Hatipoğlu (RP-Diyarbakır)
HR(EM-), EM-, sec1, US-, ISR-, HR+, Dem+, Dev-ed1

- emergency rule is against HR, Democracy, and universal legal rights
- it is the biggest threat to HR, Dem and Leg.
- A vote on extension of emergency rule shows that terror isn't over
- Emergency rule applies extra pressure on civilians
- Washington and Tel Aviv won't partition this country

- A system that cannot provide rights and democracy to citizens promotes terrorism
- No jobs and infrastructure remain in SE

Fatih Atay (CHP-Aydın)
EM-, Dev-ed+, sec+

- terror was born within curfews and developed in emergency measures
- social-cultural and economic approach must be taken
- decisive action against terrorism must be adopted

Mustafa Balcılar (ANAP-Eskişehir)
Pkk(FC-), sec+, Ethn-

- terror has foreign support
- we have emphasized security aspect
- PKK aims to create a Kurdistan, emphasizing Kurdishness

Mehmet Ekinci (RP-Ankara)
sec-, PKK(n.iraq-), ExF, ExF

- you can't eliminate PKK by only military measures
- Barzani will provide for PKK
- Military has to stop measures that render people suffering
- Military has to distinguish between combatant and noncombatant

Ünal Erkan (SM-DYP-Ankara)
EM+, sec+, Dem-, TI

- emergency rule is necessary for security
- terror is the reason for relocations
- we can't talk about a political solution
- terror is against Turkey's TI

20 June 1996

Kamran İnan (ANAP-Bitlis)
Pkk(Gr-)

- Greece is supporting the PKK

25 June 1996

Hikmet Aydın (ANAP-Çanakkale)
TI, Dem-, HR-

- HADEP congress shows that they want to partition Turkey
- Democracy and HR should not be regarded as trampling the country's TI

Ayvaz Gökdemir (DYP-Kayseri)
Dem-

- Democracy is not an authority-less administration

Ömer Vehbi Hatipoğlu (RP-Diyarbakır)
sec1, TI,

- terror is on the increase
- we are one nation

30 July 1996

Ayseli Göksoy (DTP-Manisa)
Dev-ed1, Dev-ed1, SF-, Dev-ed+

- infrastructure in the SE is appalling
- lack of roads benefit PKK
- we don't support the military servicemen
- we have to engage in education

1 October 1996

Süleyman Demirel (Pres)
Pkk(FC-), OPC-, SF+, TI, Dem+, HR+, Dem-, HR-, Dev-ed3, Dev-ed3

- there are countries in our

- region who support terrorism
- Gulf crisis had adverse implications on Turkey
- Our security forces have been successful
- Terrorists seek to partition turkey
- Democracy HR and legalism is our primary objective
- The origin of threats to the state is not HR or democracy
- Security forces have been
- We have built thousands of schools and infrastructure
- We have brought basic infrastructure to the SE

2 October 1996

Nizamettin Sevgili (ANAP-Siirt)
ExF(SF-), ExF, ExF

- security forces have wreaked havoc upon Varto's citizens
- there are arbitrary arrests, abuse and destruction and there were no PKK militants
- villagers are not relocated

8 October 1996

Orhan Veli Yıldırım (CHP-Tunceli)
HR1, Dev-ed1, Dev-ed1, Dev-ed1

- Tunceli suffered most from village evacuations
- Education has been stopped completely in Tunceli
- Health services are deteriorating
- Animal husbandry is deteriorating

23 October 1996

Erdoğan Toprak (DSP-Istanbul)
PKK(n.iraq-), Dev-ed+, Dev-ed1

- northern Iraqi situation promotes PKK
- base of the terror is lack of education and infrastructure
- 2000 village schools are

closed because of terror

28 November 1996

Meral Akşener (DYP-MoI-Istanbul)
EM+, Sec3, Dev-ed+

- continuation of terrorism necessitates emergency rule
- PKK is on the retreat
- Economic and social precautions should be taken

Yahya Şimşek (CHP-Bursa)
EM-, RP-, EM-, HR1, VG-, SF-, Dev-ed+, Dem+, Dem+, Law+

- emergency rule must be lifted
- RP said they would lift the rule, but they are continuing
- Rural populace suffers from emergency rule
- We are making rural people suffer through the emergency curfews
- Village guards engage in corruption
- Special forces cause strife among local population
- We have to change the feudal order in the region
- Democracy is the only solution to the problems
- We all want democratic and legal state

Akın Gönen (ANAP-Niğde)
RP-, Pkk(FC-)

- RP said they would lift the emergency rule
- PKK collaborate with foreign powers

İstemihan Talay (CHP-Antalya)
RP-, Dev-ed1, OPC-, Dem+, Law+, VG-

- RP promised lifting of the emergency rule
- 1000 schools are closed
- Gulf War was detrimental to Turkey

- We have to pursue democracy and legalism within state practices
- We have to eradicate village guard system and improve jobs

Ali Oğuz (RP-Istanbul)
EM-, sec+

- We want emergency rule to end
- But it promotes security

Hayri Kozakçıoğlu (DYP-Istanbul)
EM+, sec+, sec(n.iraq-), Dev-ed+, sec+

- emergency rule is justified because of security
- there is no authority in n. Iraq
- Syria and Greece are aiding PKK
- We have to provide infrastructure to the region
- In order to take infrastructure to the region we have to establish security

Turhan Tayan (MoD-DYP-Bursa)
EM+, sec+, Dem2, sec+

- emergency rule is necessary because of security
- our government is taking steps towards democratization
- reason for the state is first, security

Sebgetullah Seydaoğlu (ANAP-Dbakır)
Dem(EM-), ExF, VG-, SF-, Law1, Law1

- emergency rule is anti-democratic
- 3000 villages are emptied and 5000 mystery killings took place under emergency rules
- village guards are corrupt
- security forces approach all citizens of SE as terrorists
- there is a legal gap in the region

- we don't know what is going on with the missing persons

Recep Kırış (BBP-Kayseri)
Sec1, VG-, Pkk(FC-)

- why doesn't terror get solved
- village guard system is deteriorating
- foreign states fund PKK

14 December 1996

Cihan Yazar (DSP-Manisa)
Dem+, TI, Sec+, VG-

- we have to undertake counterterrorism for the sake of democracy and TI
- region's people are wary of village guard system

Mehmet Ali Şahin (RP-Istanbul)
Law+

- counter-terrorism has to be made within legal framework

Yahya Şimşek (CHP-Bursa)
HR1, Law1, ExF,

- the state has lost its human rights and legalistic aspects
- mystery killings reached 3000

Mustafa Kemal Akyurt (DYP-Denizli)

Sec+, PKK(us- eu-), Dev-ed1

- security is the primary problem
- even our NATO allies support PKK
- terrorists target our education an infrastructure

Aslan Ali Hatipoğlu (ANAP-Amasya)
Sec+

- without security, terror will not end

Meral Akşener (MoI – DYP-Istanbul)
TI, TI, Sec3, Dev-ed2, Law3

- terrorism threatens TI
- TR is an indivisible country with a single nationality
- PKK has suffered major losses
- GAP will provide development in the region
- TR is a legal state

7 January 1997

Sebgetullah Seydaoğlu (ANAP-Dbakır)
VG-, HR1, HR1

- state has been careless in its village guard policy
- due to terrorism, HR violations and repressions people are being evacuated
- in the middle of winter people are out in the cold without supplies

Lütfü Esengün (SM-RP-Erzurum)
Sec+

- PKK is the biggest terrorist threat

8 July 1997

Tamer Kanber (DSP-Balıkesir)
Sec1, Dev-ed+, HR1, HR1, VG-

- security deficiency is still a valid reality
- economic and social dimension of the problem are overlooked
- emptied villages are not relocated
- we have lost respect in terms of HR
- village guard system must be withdrawn

Yahya Şimşek (CHP-Bursa)
Sec1, Dev-ed+

- terrorism is still ongoing
- economic, social and democratic reforms have to be enacted

Mustafa Kemal Akyurt (DYP-Denizli)
EM-, Dev-ed-, Ethn-, TI, Dev-ed-, Ethn-, Pkk(FC-)

- emergency measures did not produce expected results
- it is very wrong to define the problem as social, economic and identity problem
- PKK aims to establish another country
- Basing this problem on education, social rights, economy and identity is very dangerous
- Our allies aren't accepting PKK as a terrorist organization

Mehmet Keçeciler (ANAP-Konya)
TI, sec+, Pkk(syr- gr- iran-), Dev-ed+

- we are protecting our territorial integrity
- security comes first
- Syria, Greece and İran are supporting PKK
- We should go on pursuing economic development of the region

Murat Başesgioğlu (MoI-ANAP-Kastamonu)
Sec3, Dev-ed1, Dev-ed1, VG2

- we are making progress on counter-terrorism
- unemployment in the SE is a major problem
- many children lack education
- village guard system will be improved

1 October 1997

Süleyman Demirel (Pres)
sec(n.iraq-), pkk(syr-), law+, dem+, TI, Dev-ed+, Dem3, HR3, Dev-ed+

- authority gap in n. Iraq is dangerous for Turkey
- Syria is supporting terrorism

- Counter-terrorism has been undertaken by legal and democratic means
- Terrorism aims to eradicate TI of the Turkish state
- Region has to be economically improved
- Contrary to allegations, Turkey is a country that respects HR and Dem
- Counterterrorism necessitates a financial improvement campaign in the SE

2 October 1997

Ünal Erkan (I-Ankara)
pkk(n.iraq-), EM+, Pkk(iran-, syr-), sec(n.iraq-)

- authority gap in n. Iraq enables PKK to operate
- security situation necessitates emergency measures
- Iran and Syria support PKK
- Northern Iraqi situation is against our security

Turhan Arınç (DTP-İzmir)
EM-, Dev-ed+, Dem+, HR+

- emergency rule must be lifted
- the state has to bring economic measures
- we have to provide democratic and HR for the SE people

Yahya Şimşek (CHP-Bursa)
Sec-, Dem+

- seeing this issue as an only security related problem is wrong
- we have to look for ways to deal with this within democratic principles

Ali İlksoy (DSP-Antep)
sec-, Dev-ed+, SF-, VG-, Dev-ed1, Dev-ed1

- security is not the only factor; there are economic and social factors too

- security forces aren't careful in differentiating civilians from terrorists
- some village guards have been involved with illegal activities
- there are tons of incomplete investments in the region
- there are severe infrastructure deficiencies

Ömer Vehbi Hatipoğlu (RP-Diyarbakır)
EM-, EM-, Dev-ed1, ExF, sec1, Dev-ed+, HR+, Dev-ed+, Dev-ed+

- security measures create strife
- security measures create disturbances in the region
- unemployment, agriculture and education have been severely deteriorated
- thousands of villages have been evacuated and burned
- local populace are disdainful because we cannot protect them
- counter-terrorism will be complete by enabling social-economic improvements
- all civil servants must be educated on HR
- infrastructure must be improved
- organized industrial complexes must be complete

Mehmet Keçeciler (ANAP-Konya)
Pkk(FC-), Dev-ed+, HR+

- PKK has foreign support
- We have to provide for the economic and social deficiencies in the region
- We have to relocate evacuated villagers

Nevzat Yanmaz (BBP-Sivas)
sec1, TI

- terrorism might expand to East
- PKK is against TI

Murat Başesgioğlu (MoI-ANAP-Kastamonu)

Dev-ed+, Pkk(FC-), Pkk(Gr-), Dem3, Law3

- social and economic measures must be undertaken
- terrorism has a foreign dimension
- Greece supports PKK
- We are conducting our efforts within democratic and legal ways

21 December 1997

Bekir Aksoy (DYP-Çorum)
Pkk(OPC-), Ethn-, HR-

* after the gulf war, PKK activities intensified

- cultural-linguistic rights are dangerous, that's what the PKK supports

Cihan Yazar (DSP-Manisa)
TI, Dem+, Dev-ed+

- TI and Dem are core principles
- We think economic and educational measures must be taken in the SE

Mustafa Zeydan (DYP-Hakkari)
Pkk(Arm-), Pkk(Arm-), Ethn-, SF-, HR1, sec(n.iraq-)

- PKK aims to create Kurdistan and a greater Armenia
- PKK is ASALA's extension
- There is no such thing as Kurdish problem
- Security forces are unable to differentiate noncombatants with terrorists
- Evacuated villagers must be relocated
- Authority gap in n. Iraq must be filled

Mehmet Keçeciler (ANAP-Konya)
sec1, Pkk(syr- gr-), Pkk(EU-)

- terrorist acts aren't over yet
- Syria and Greece are

- supporting PKK
- EU might support the PKK

Yahya Şimşek (CHP-Bursa)
Law+, Law+, HR+,

- security forces have to undertake their operations within legal limits
- legal boundaries shouldn't get trampled
- police forces must be educated on HR

Murat Başesgioğlu (MoI-ANAP-Kastamonu)
sec3

- terror is under control

24 March 1998

Ali İlksoy (DSP-Antep)
ExF, Dev-ed1, HR1, VG-, Dev-ed2, Sec3, Dev-ed3

- thousands of villages are evacuated
- thousands of children lack education and infrastructure
- local people lack trust to the state because of its inability to distinguish between terrorist and noncombatant
- village guards are illegal
- economic and social measures are being taken
- we are on the upper hand against terrorism
- we are providing for the infrastructure of the region

Algan Hacaloğlu (CHP-Istanbul)
Dev-ed1, Dev-ed1, Sec3, HR1, Law1, ExF, SF-, ExF(SF-), Pkk(Syr-, Iran-), Ethn+, Ethn+, Ethn+

- our people are living under the tents
- 2000 schools are closed
- PKK is crippled
- Human rights are violated on a massive scale
- We are not a legalistic state

- There are mystery killings
- There are gang establishments within the security forces
- Security forces have recently attacked little children in Diyarbakır
- Syria and Iran are supporting terrorism
- Kurdish problem is a respect for the minorities problem
- If you don't like them watching MED-TV, establish a Kurdish tv station
- People in the SE want respect for their ethnic identity

Hüseyin Yıldız (FP-Mardin)
Dev-ed1

- health infrastructure is severely deficient in the region

Necmettin Dede (DYP-Muş)
sec(EM+)

- emergency measures must continue until terror is finished

Ülkü Güney (ANAP-Bayburt)
ExF, Dev-ed2

- 4000 villages are evacuated in the region
- we are undertaking a project on reopening schools

Muzaffer Arıkan (DTP-Mardin)
VG-, HR+

- village guard system is corrupt
- noncombatants must be separated from terrorists

Murat Başesgioğlu (MoI-ANAP-Kastamonu)
Sec3, Ethn3, Dem3, Law3

- there is a fall in terror acts
- we regard everyone as equal citizens
- we support democracy and law

Musa Okçu (FP-Batman)
HR(SF-)

- security forces cannot distinguish between terrorists and villagers

15 July 1998

İsmail Köse (MHP-Erzurum)
Sec1, Pkk(Gr- Syr-), Pkk(EU-)

- terror is far from over
- Greece and Syria support terrorism
- EU aid goes directly to the PKK

Mehmet Ağar (DYP-Elazığ)
Pkk(Fc-), Law+, HR-, Dem-

- PKK has foreign support
- Some people want to portray legal counterterrorism efforts by the security forces as illegal
- Framing counterterrorism within HR and Dem context is dangerous

18 November 1998

Mesut Yılmaz (PM-ANAP-Rize)
sec3, Dev-ed3, Dev-ed3, pkk(syr-)

- PKK is on the run
- We have started reconstructing SE
- Terror is against education as PKK's killing of teachers shows
- We have forced Syria to expel Ocalan

Bekir Aksoy (DYP-Çorum)
ANAP-, ANAP-, DSP-, ANAP-DSP-

- Ocalan crisis is being used as political profiteering by the governing party
- Government doesn't have a serious plan
- Government's foreign relations are appalling

Mehmet Tahir Köse (DSP-Istanbul)
Pkk(syr- rus-), HR3, Law(Ita)

- we have forced syria and

- russia to expel Ocalan
- our citizens have equal rights
- italy has to abide by international law

Abdullah Gül (FP-Kayseri)

TI(Ita-), Pkk(EU-),

- italian PM is giving references to sevrès
- our so-called allies are supporting PKK

Bülent Akarcalı (ANAP-Istanbul)
ita-

- italy has to be aware of the situation

13 March 1999

İsmail Cem (MoFA-DSP-Kayseri)
Pkk(EU+), EU-, Law3

- EU countries are closing doors to PKK
- EU countries are acting as if Turkey is their colony
- our actions are based on law

Hayri Kozakçıoğlu (DYP-Istanbul)
EU-, Pkk(Syr-, Gr- EU-, EU-)

- EU is interfering into our domestic politics
- Syria was supporting terrorism
- EU has been ignoring terrorism
- Greece is especially supporting it
- PKK supporters reside in EU

Mehmet Bedri İncetahtacı (FP-Antep)

Pkk(EU-), Dem1

- The EU makes ideological and mental support to PKK
- If we are democratic enough, foreign aid wouldn't be the determining factor

Ülkü Güney (ANAP-Bayburt)
Pkk(Syr, Grx4, Ita)

- Syria has been supporting terrorism
- Greece has aided Ocalan x 3

- Italy and Greece support ocalan

Gökhan Çapoğlu (DEPAR-Ankara)

Law+

- Turkey has to take steps towards full legalization

16 June 1999

Nidai Seven (MHP-Ağrı)

Pkk(Fc-), Ethn-, TI, Dev-ed+

- even Ocalan says foreign powers support terrorism
- some people are disgracefully thinking about the ethnic side of conflict
- we are a national whole
- there has to be infrastructure reforms

27 June 1999

Faruk Çelik (FP-Bursa)
sec3, Dev-ed(DSP-), Dem+, Dev-ed+, sec-

- Security situation is improving
- Ecevit government did not undertake reconstruction
- Democratic improvements and development must be made, rather than security

Cihan Yazar (DSP-Manisa)
sec3, HR-, Ethn-, Pkk(syr, gr, iran, arm)

- we are making progress on terrorism
- HR and cultural rights conceal PKK's aim of partition
- Neighbouring countries have supported PKK

Kemal Çelik (DYP-Antalya)
Dev-ed+, SF+

- we have to undertake economic and social measures
- security forces have been

successful in combating terrorism

23 November 1999

Abdülkâki Erdoğan (ANAP-Dbakır)

TI, Dem+, HR+

- within territorial integrity, democracy and HR is the only solution

Hüseyin Balak (MHP-Tokat)

TI, Dem-, HR-, EM+, Ethn-, SF+

- when territorial integrity is the question, there may be sacrifices on HR and Dem
- lifting emergency measures depend on establishing security
- identity claims are misleading
- security forces have been succesful

Hayri Kozakçıoğlu (DYP-Istanbul)
Pkk(Fc-), Dev-ed3, sec3, Dev-ed+, Dev-ed+, Dev-ed+, Dev-ed+

- foreign countries support terrorism
- GAP project will win the SE
- Terror is on decline
- We have to undertake concrete economic steps
- Animal husbandry must be improved
- Forestry and reconstruction has to be undertaken
- Educational and jobs must be created

Hasan Fehmi Konyalı (DSP-Ordu)
sec3, sec+

- security situation is improving
- terror has been destructive

Murat Başesgioğlu (ANAP-Kastamonu)

sec-, HR+, Dev-ed+, Pkk(Fc-), Pkk(Arm-), Dev-ed+

- this is not only a security problem, this is a social and economic problem
- foreign countries support terrorism
- PKK is the new ASALA
- Social and economic aspects must be highlighted

Zeki Ergezen (FP-Bitlis)

sec1, EM-, US-, EU-, Dev-ed1, Dev-ed1, DSP-

- terror isn't over yet
- emergency measures intensified terrorism
- foreign agents are swarming the area
- government has neglected the economic infrastructure of the region x2

Evliya Parlak (DSP-Hakkari)

HR1, Dev-ed1

- local citizens are unhappy since they cannot enjoy rights
- economic restructuring isn't properly made

Kamer Genç (DYP-Tunceli)

sec3, Dev-ed1, Dev-ed1, Dev-ed1

- terror has decreased
- economic restructuring hasn't been made
- schools are closed
- there is severe unemployment

Saadettin Tantan (MoI-ANAP-Istanbul)

Law3, Dev-ed+, sec3

- we have been fighting separatists within legal limits and we are doing it now
- animal husbandry has to be revived
- terror is broken

Aggregate break-down of discourse types in the TGNA*

1) Party and state activity on the Kurdish question 1991-1999

2) ANAP activity

3) DSP activity

4) SHP-CHP activity

5) RP-FP activity

6) MHP activity

7) State ministers, Ministers of Interior, Foreign ministers, Prime Ministers and Presidents

8) Cone-plot graph of comparative discourse preferences of parties