

Dr. ISMAIL BESIKCI

M.KEMAL ATATURK,  
*UNESCO* &  
DESTRUCTION OF KURDISH  
IDENTITY IN TURKEY



Dr. ISMAIL BESIKCI

M. KEMAL ATATURK,  
U N E S C O &  
DESTRUCTION OF KURDISH IDENTITY  
IN TURKEY

---

KURDOLOGIA PUBLICATIONS No.6-1988  
P.O.BOX 607, LONDON NW8 ODT - U.K



## Preface

This letter was presented to UNESCO by the Turkish sociologist Dr. Ismail Besikci in 1981. The Ankara government reacted violently; Besikci was jailed from that time until he was released from prison in September 87, although he is still under house arrest.

Mr. Recep Maraşli, the owner of the Kurdish publishing house "KOMAL" in Turkey, has been sentenced to 32 years imprisonment for publishing Dr. Ismail Besikci's books and other books related to Kurds and Kurdistan.

On top of the 32 years he has been sentenced to another 4 years for defending himself in Kurdish in court.

This letter was published in Turkish by "Dengê Komal" in Stokholm 1983.

Then it was published in English by "Committee for Decolonization of Kurdistan" in Australia.

Now the Kurdish publishing house "Kurdologia" presents this letter again to all Kurdish people friends in the world.

London 1-2-1988

JAWAD MELLA



I have carefully read UNESCO's decision dated Oct 27, 1978 concerning the 100th anniversary of Ataturk's birth. I want to explain some of my thoughts about this decision when the 100th anniversary of Ataturk's birth is being celebrated in 1981.

## INTRODUCTION

It is explained in the decision that Ataturk initiated and successfully concluded the first anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist liberation movement. It is claimed that Ataturk "held the guiding light for the oppressed, captive nations of the East, he showed them the path of liberation". It is alleged that "Ataturk's liberation struggle was not just for the Turkish nation. His aim was to show the path to the oppressed captive nations of the East, to blaze the trail for them. He wholeheartedly wanted them to get organized to free themselves from captivity, to become free and independent. This was the primary aim of his struggle against imperialism and colonialism." It is also emphasized that Ataturk was successful in achieving this aim. It is said that all oppressed and colonized people of the world inspired by Ataturk's guiding light and knowledge have one by one achieved their freedom and independence.

UNESCO is an international institution which the aim of ensuring the supremacy of justice and legitimacy, of freedoms necessary for a democratic way of life through education, training and cultural activities. It endeavors to promote the understanding of basic human rights and fundamental liberties, and the concept of equality among all nations. It attempts to make these concepts reign supreme in the political life of all communities. Ensuring contribution to cultural development by all citizens of a country is one of the foremost aims of UNESCO. It expends considerable efforts in order to make these concepts reign supreme in the economic, social, political and cultural fields. Vis-a-vis the political authorities, it is important to establish civilian control and to strengthen it. Enrichment of inner lives is possible with the protection and development of human rights and human dignity against the political authorities, that is, the Government.

UNESCO aims at protecting and developing the culture of all people. It is in the midst of reaching the source of culture and of enriching the world culture. Hence, the development and strengthening of cooperation and interdependence among peoples and nations manifests itself as a UNESCO aim which cannot be ignored.

However, the claims in UNESCO's decision concerning the 100th anniversary of Ataturk's birth are not scientific, that is, not factual. They are ideologically inspired. They are the products of an official ideology based on lies, that is, the Turkish Government's ideology. Therefore they are repudiated by tangible facts, concrete realities of life. They are rejected. No doubt, this is a serious contradiction for UNESCO whose aim is to realize the ideals of the U.N. via education, training and culture. There is benefit in explaining, in shedding light on this situation.

Throughout the world individuals have had profound impacts on the

history of a region, a country or a government. They may be military or political leaders, heads of political parties or of states, or guerrilla leaders etc. No doubt, history makes reliable judgments about them. For this purpose along with their sayings, their deeds are also given due consideration. Without simultaneously looking at these two aspects, there can be no reliable, no lasting, no scientific assessments.

Ataturk is one of those individuals. He has profoundly affected the history of the Middle East. He has deeply influenced the history of the Turkish nation, the Kurdish nation, the Turkish State and Middle Eastern States such as Iran, Iraq and Syria. In turn, he has influenced the world history. And no doubt, when assessing Ataturk, it is not sufficient to merely look at his expressed thoughts, writings and speeches. This is most inadequate. It is also as much incorrect. Such assessment is also far from being able to explain facts and their correlations. What matters is the research into the nature of Ataturk's deeds. Hence, it is necessary to look at Ataturk's writings and sayings, that is his thoughts, along with his actions. It is necessary to evaluate them simultaneously.

Ataturk's most significant deed is the 1919-1922 war. It is the party he founded (the Republican People's Party). It is the Turkish Republic to the establishment of which he made very significant contributions. Ataturk's deeds must be looked at along with his thoughts as a whole. In this letter, I will specifically dwell on the issue of Kurdistan. That is, I will assess Ataturk's thoughts and deeds in view of the question of Kurdistan. In analyzing the nature of both his thoughts and his behavior, I will hold in my sight the reality of the Kurdish nation and Kurdistan. In short, I will assess his thoughts in view of his conduct towards Kurdistan.

## I. THE PARTITIONING OF KURDISTAN

The application of the 'divide & rule' principle to Kurdistan and Ataturk

In March 1933, Ataturk spoke as follows: "...Look at the sun which will rise from the east. Today just as I see the rising of the sun on the horizon, so do I see in the distance the awakening of all nations in the East. There are many fraternal nations yet to achieve their freedom and independence. Their rebirth will favor progress and prosperity. Notwithstanding all the obstacles, all the difficulties, these nations will triumph and reach the independence which awaits them. Imperialism and colonialism will forever disappear from the surface of the earth and in their place an age of cooperation and harmony irrespective of color, creed and race will reign."

Going by these statements, it is easy to conclude that Ataturk was against imperialism and colonialism. Ataturk stressed that all oppressed, captive, colonized nations of the East, of the world would achieve their independence. He emphasized that he wholeheartedly supported the liberation movements of those nations. It was claimed that "Imperialism would disappear, the discrimination based on color, creed and race would vanish."

These views are not sufficient for properly understanding and assessing Ataturk. There is more to Ataturk than these views. There are also his doings. The nature of his deeds, too, needs to be understood and evaluated. Hence, it's important to understand and explain his deeds, as well.



During and in the aftermath of WW I, many events affecting Kurdistan developed. The partitioning of Kurdistan in the first quarter of the 20th Century is one of the most significant events which took place in the Middle East and which continues to affect us today. Perhaps it is the foremost event. The application of the 'divide & rule' principle to the Kurdish nation, the partitioning of Kurdistan by the imperialist and colonialist powers amounts to a very significant turn in the history of the Middle East. The confiscation of the Kurdish nation's democratic rights and their right to establish a free and independent state is one of the most significant realities in the Middle East that affect our lives. The attempts to isolate the parts of Kurdistan through barbed wires, fields of mines, guard towers along with efforts to maintain and perpetrate the oppressive status quo via military forces armed to the teeth amount to one of the most important facts of our time.

The colonial partitioning of Kurdistan, the application of the 'divide & rule' principle to the Kurdish nation is, no doubt, the work of the colonial powers of that time. The Sykes-Picot agreement between the British, the French and the Czarist Russia and the following understandings aimed at partitioning of the Ottoman Empire. In the process, Kurdish land, too, was carved up. Following the 1917 October revolution, the Bolsheviks withdrew from these secret treaties. Another most important consequence of the October Revolution was to fundamentally alter the balance of power in the Middle East. The socialist political thought came to power and began to have a new impact on the world political relations. The interaction between the Western Imperialists and the Socialist world made the creation of a Turkish State as a continuation of the Ottoman Empire in Asia minor as an inescapable conclusion. And thus, as the successor to the Ottoman Empire this new political entity managed to provide room for manoeuvres between the Western colonial powers (Britain, France, Italy etc.) and the Bolsheviks. Hence, in the midst of this process the most significant development we see in the Middle East is the partitioning of Kurdistan. It's the carving up of Kurdistan by the colonial powers. It's the application of the 'divide & rule' principle to the Kurdish nation. Another significant event is the virtual annihilation of the Armenian population via massacres and mass deportations.

The manoeuvres to divide Kurdistan took place between 1919 and 1925. Undoubtedly, some of the reasons have their roots in the 19th and even prior centuries. But, it is particularly necessary to study the events between 1919 and 1925. The collaborators with the British and the French Imperialists are the Kemalists. As is known, before WW I, the Arab lands such as Iraq, Syria, Arabia, Yemen, Lebanon, Palestine, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia and Algeria were within the borders of the Ottoman Empire. The Balkan countries such as Albania, Bulgaria, Greece etc were also within the Empire's borders. Following WW I, the Kemalists made no claims on these lands. They did not say, "These lands belong to our ancestors", "Our ancestors fought for these lands", "These lands were cleared by our ancestors with sweat and blood", "These lands were irrigated with blood of our ancestors" etc. The Kemalists did not resort to the rhetoric of "For centuries we lived together with these people in fraternal harmony; they're our religious brethren etc." They easily concluded agreements with Britain and France with regard to Arab lands. In the Balkans, the national movements for freedom and independence had already triumphed (by the time Kemalists assumed power-Tr). The Balkan nations had achieved their independence by destroying the Ottoman sovereignty, by throwing off their yoke. The Kemalists accepted this reality, too. The Kemalists saw one particular point eye to eye with the British. And that was about the Sultan/Caliph. The British wanted to take

the Caliphate (i.e. the religious leadership) from the Turks and entrust the Arabs with it. M Kemal Ataturk, on the other hand, wanted to expel the Caliph. He wanted to rid the Turkish political life of this institution. There were also some understandings about Gen Enver (or Enver Pasha, who along with Talat & Cemal Pasha's, engineered the depopulation of Armenia-Tr) and about (the ruling-Tr) 'Unity & Progress' party.

Before WW I, a very large part of Kurdish land as well as a very large part of the Armenian land were within the borders of the Ottoman Empire. The Kemalists who had made no claim whatsoever on the Balkans and the Arab lands were putting up resistance about the Kurdish and Armenian lands. They would say "These lands belong to our ancestors", "Our ancestors cleared these lands with sweat and blood", "These lands have been irrigated with the blood of our ancestors, they are left to us by our ancestors." They indulged in the rhetoric of "For centuries we have lived together in harmony, our religious brethren...". The British and the French, on the other hand, were very much aware of the oil wealth in Kurdistan. They did not want the Kemalists to get away with it. And thus, the Kemalists, under the guise of fighting the British and French imperialism, started a struggle to get a significant part of Kurdistan. They opposed the legitimate demands of the Kurdish nation for democratic rights. The Kemalists pretended to be unaware of them. To stifle these demands, the Kemalists became collaborators with the colonial powers.

Whereas since towards the end of 1918, there was, especially in Southern Kurdistan, a very significant on-going movement. The Kurds were in the midst of a national liberation struggle. But, the Kurds' democratic and national struggle was being drowned in blood by the British. In Southern Kurdistan, the Kurds under the leadership of Sheikh Mahmud wanted to set up an independent state. The British, however, were very much against the Kurdish demands for freedom and independence, for the right to establish their own government. The British were endeavoring to incorporate a very large part of Kurdistan into the newly created Iraqi kingdom under its mandate. The Kemalists, too, wanted Kurdistan, especially the oil rich Kerkuk and Musul regions.

During the war the Kemalists were also saying that the Turks and the Kurds were brothers. They were saying that with the conclusion of the common struggle the Kurds, too, would achieve their full national and democratic rights. The Kemalists were skilfully exploiting the friction between the Muslims and the Christians. They were pointing to the threat to the Kurds by saying, "The enemies will make Kurdistan a part of Armenia." With this saying, on the one hand, the Kemalists were accusing the Western imperialists and on the other hand they were creating and bellowing animosity between the Kurds and the Armenians. And they wanted the Kurds to be on their side as well. They were employing the ploys of the Unity & Progress party and the Ottoman Empire's previous policy (of preventing unity and cooperation between and among the Kurds and Armenians-Tr). The Kemalists were opposed to the demands of the Kurds for freedom and independence. They were cold and calculating with ulterior motives. They were toying with these demands to gain some time after which they would stifle them.

The resistance by the Kemalists, who made no claim whatsoever on the Arab and Balkan lands, with respect to the Kurdish and Armenian lands is worthy of close scrutiny. The Kemalists' efforts to subjugate the Kurds and lay claims on Kurdistan are one of the most significant developments of the 1919-1923 period that can be observed and studied.

The struggle between the Western imperialists and the Kemalists to keep Kurdistan subjugated was, no doubt, won by the former. But, this brought with it an understanding between the Western imperialists and the Kemalists. This understanding is about the partitioning of Kurdistan. It is about the confiscation of the Kurdish people's right to set up their own state. It is about the drowning of the Kurdish people's national & democratic rights. It is about the division of Kurdistan and the application of the 'divide & rule' principle to the Kurdish nation. It is about efforts to annihilate the makings of the Kurdish nation.

The Kurdish nation wanted to be free and independent. It did not want to become a fugitive. It did not want to remain oppressed and captive. Therefore, it resorted to all sorts of struggles. But, the Western imperialists and their collaborators in the Middle East, colonialist bullies, were powerful enough to hold them in bondage. At that time, under the prevailing conditions of the 1920's, the imperialists and the colonialists had the necessary means and power. Following the 1920's, the imperialist and colonialist policies were institutionalized. They have survived to our day.

The imperialist and the colonialist policy of partitioning has destroyed the skeleton of Kurdistan. It has tampered with its nerve center. The aim of the 'divide & rule' policy is to prevent Kurdish unity and efficacy. The Kurds have been divided by barbed wires, fields of mines, guard towers and military posts. Prevention of contact between the Kurds and their growing up as strangers have been decreed. In accordance with such policy of division, in the 1920's Southern Kurdistan came under the British control and Southwest Kurdistan under the French control. The Kemalists took North Kurdistan under their own control. East Kurdistan, on the other hand, has been under the control of the Iranian Monarchy since the Middle of the 17th Century. Thus, Kurdistan came to be divided into four parts at the beginning of the 20th Century. And since then, each and every budding democratic and national movement in whatever part of Kurdistan has been suppressed through the collaboration of these imperialist and colonialist powers. Because of the division of Kurdistan and the dispersion of the Kurdish forces, efforts to annihilate and obliterate them have become commonplace. At this point, there is benefit in pointing out the splitting of that part of Kurdistan under the Iranian Monarchy. One of these parts had been within the borders of Czarist Russia. Now, it is within the Soviet Socialist Republic of Armenia.

The Treaty of Lausanne was signed between the Western imperialists and Turkey in 1923. The most significant aspect of this treaty is its giving legitimacy to the imperialist division. The 'divide & rule' policy which was put in practice with the division of Kurdistan and the Kurdish nation was also given legitimacy with this treaty. Thus, the division was guaranteed internationally.

The demands of the Kurdish nation since the proclamation of the (Turkish) Republic have been brutally suppressed. The national existence of the Kurds' has been denied. Mustafa Kemal and other Kemalists who, in 1919-1922, said "Kurds and Turks are brothers" and "The Kurds will achieve their national rights after victory over the common enemy" later had no qualms about denying the very existence of the Kurdish nation. They pretend the Kurds to be non-existent. It is claimed that "There is no nation called Kurds. There is no language called Kurdish." "Kurds are Mountain Turks. The language called Kurdish is really a Turkish dialect." They expend efforts to prove their allegations. To obliterate the Kurdish language and culture, to annihilate the makings of the Kurdish nation all sorts of measures are designed and implemented. An-

nihilation via mass slaughters, executions, internal & external exiles, and through forced assimilation etc.

The Government is using the ideological instruments of oppression such as the press, radio, educational institutions, public service, religion etc to destroy the characteristics making up the Kurdish nation, to achieve assimilation. And against those who advocate the makings of the Kurdish nation, those who want to preserve the distinct aspects of the Kurdish society, the Government mobilizes all sorts of coercive instruments of repression. The police, gendarmerie, the army, the courts, the prisons, and the gallows are effectively utilized. These measures amount to nothing but enslaving, shackling and subjugating the Kurdish nation.

This is the intensification of the colonialist policy applied to the Kurdish nation since the days of the Ottoman Empire. Its aim is to destroy all tangible and intangible values of the Kurdish people. It is to strip them of their identity. It is to transform them into an oppressed, captive, subservient people with no honor and no dignity. It is to gradually make the Kurdish nation non-existent, to erase it from literature and history.

Here my purpose is not to write the history of Kurdistan and of the Kurdish nation, not even briefly, not even as a basic outline. It is not my purpose to explain the imperialistic partitioning of Kurdistan, the application of the 'divide & rule' policy. My purpose is to assess Ataturk's sayings and doings together, to evaluate his words and deeds at the same time. To bring an important aspect of his deeds out into the open, there is benefit in recollecting the facts pertaining to Kurdistan in a basic context. This is the reason for stressing the foregoing facts. Hence, the following are the questions that must be asked:

How could Ataturk speak of freedom and independence for oppressed nations, when he was designing and implementing harshest measures against the Kurdish people? How could he claim to enthusiastically support the oppressed nations' movements for freedom and independence? How could he say imperialism and colonialism will disappear from the surface of the earth at a time when the 'divide & rule' policy was being applied to the Kurdish nation, when most oppressive and destructive measures were being implemented in Kurdistan? How could Ataturk say he was against imperialism and colonialism when he was in fact collaborating with the Western imperialists in the partitioning of Kurdistan, in applying the 'divide & rule' policy to the Kurdish nation? At a time when he was utilizing all the resources of the State to obliterate the identity of the Kurdish nation, how could Ataturk assert that equality between all people and nations will come into being? How could he stress that he too was working towards this aim? How could he stress the claim that discrimination due to color, creed, race and tongue will be removed? How could he speak of freedom for the oppressed nations when he was mobilizing the States every sort of ideological, political, economic and military instruments of repression to destroy the makings of the Kurdish nation? When most repressive measures were being implemented against the awakening as well as the national and democratic demands of the Kurdish people, how could he say "...Just as I see the rising of the sun, so do I see the awakening of the oppressed, captive nations of the East"? How could Ataturk assert that he wholeheartedly supports the liberation struggles of oppressed nations, when Ataturk adopted as one of his primary aims to crush, blight and thwart the Kurdish people's claims for national and democratic rights? How could Ataturk, who collaborated with imperialism to annihilate the national existence of the Kurdish nation, claim to be the torch-bearer for the struggles of the oppressed nations against imperialism and colonialism?

One must remember that harsh oppressive measures were in force against the Kurds in 1933 when Mustafa Kemal uttered these words. Kurdistan was being ruled by Inspector-Generals, that is, by Governor-Generals. On the one hand, the Kurds were claimed to be Turkish, to be 'Mountain Turks'. On the other hand, there were harsh measures in force to oppress and exterminate them. Under the rubric "Forced Resettlement", deportation laws were being made and put into effect. The Kurds, men & women, young & old alike were being deported to the western parts of Turkey. Towns and villages were being evacuated, tribes as a whole were being uprooted and sent into internal exiles. Forbidden zones were being declared. There was a totally arbitrary rule in Kurdistan. The law epitomizing this arbitrary rule was the Tunceli law which was passed and put into effect in 1935. The provisions of this law were used during the 1936-1938 Kurdish national liberation struggle in Dersim. [Translator's note: This was by far the bloodiest Kurdish struggle for freedom. Several hundred thousand Kurds were killed; more were deported to the Turkish regions and many perished en route. Kurds were shut up in caves and burned alive; the forests were set ablaze to exterminate the Kurds in hiding. There were mass suicides; Kurdish girls threw themselves into the Monzur river. Dersim was re-named Tunceli at the end. Another law was passed to absolve all Turks-military & civilian- of their atrocities. And still the Turks say to the Kurds, "Remember Dersim, we can do it again!"]. Moreover, the 'Forced Resettlement' law #2510 passed in 1934 is also characteristic of this period.

It is therefore imperative to dwell on the views put forth by Ataturk in March 1933. I pay particular attention to these views and I propose that these views have no basis in facts. They are ideological, politically motivated. There is benefit in explaining the basic premises of this ideology and the way it came about.

## II. THE PRIMARY ASPECTS OF THE TURKISH REPUBLIC AND THE KEMALIST IDEOLOGY

As stated above, the Turks, Arabs, Cherkas, Albanians, Bulgarians, Greeks, Lazas, Armenians etc lived together within the borders of the Ottoman Empire. From this point of view, the Ottoman Empire was a cosmopolitan political entity. In the 19th Century the Balkan nations waged armed struggles for freedom and independence against the Ottoman Empire. They successfully concluded their national liberation movements. They established their own independent states. The Greeks, Bulgarians, Romanians etc. achieved their independence in the 19th Century. During WW I, on the other hand, we see the Arab people's secession from the Empire. Before this war, the Albanians, too, had seceded from the Empire. The Arabs established colonized states under the British and the French mandates. At this time, the Kurds also started their liberation struggle. But, the Kurdish people's quest for freedom and their efforts to set up an independent state were drowned in blood by the Western imperialism. The most significant collaborator with the Western imperialism in this process was the Kemalist Government. And so, Kurdistan was divided, partitioned. The 'divide & rule' policy was applied to the Kurdish nation. Consequently, a large part of Kurdistan and the Kurdish people remained within the borders of Turkey. The new Turkish State claimed a large part of Kurdistan.

This new state was reorganized after the Turkish-Greek and Turkish-Armenian wars and the drowning in blood of the Kurdish demands for freedom in the years 1919-1922. The new state was being set up as a continuation of the Ottoman Empire. But, it was based on "Turkish nationalism". Hence, the new state was claimed to be a "one-nation" state. It was alleged that everyone living within the borders of the Turkish

Republic was a Turk.

In the final days of the Ottoman Empire, one of the views put forth to save the Empire was "Turkish nationalism". The other two alternatives namely, the concepts of Islamic unity and Ottomanism had failed. The Turkish nationalism advocated reorganizing the Empire under the leadership of the Turks with other nations as followers. In the 1920's, however, Turkish nationalism was restricted to a geographic area defined by the so-called National Pact (Misak-i Milli).

Here lies the crux of the subject matter. Many nationalities lived within the Ottoman Empire. Hence, it was described as a cosmopolitan political entity. Within the Turkish Republic, which goes on as the continuation of the Empire, live at least two nations: the Turks and the Kurds. In spite of this, the claim was made early on that "The new Turkish State is a one-nation state. There are no people other than Turks within Turkey." Undoubtedly, there were nationalities other than Kurds, too. There were Armenians, even though their population had been greatly diminished through massacres and population transfers engineered by the Unity & Progress party in 1915. There were the Lazes. Not concentrated in a specific region but spread throughout Anatolia and Kurdistan, there were the Cherkas. The most significant of these was, no doubt, the Kurds. The Kurds were not only more numerous but also concentrated in a cohesive region, their own homeland, Kurdistan. On the other hand, Kurdistan also stretched into Syria, Iraq and Iran.

Hence, we are face to face with a sociological reality. This is the reality of the Kurdish nation. Ataturk, however, was not in favor of finding a solution through democratic means. He favored a solution via repression, brute force, harsh measures, prisons. And he was in favor of an ideology to give legitimacy to all these measures. Of course, there is no possibility of describing as democratic the mentality that collaborated with the Western imperialism in partitioning Kurdistan and in applying the 'divide & rule' policy to the Kurdish people.

We first see in the 1924 Constitution attempts to solve a sociological issue through ideological means. This ideological solution was no doubt also supported by military measures. According to the 1924 Constitution everyone living within Turkey's borders was ethnically Turkish and moreover was content to be a Turk. And again in line with this edict, "Turkish State with its territory and people is an indivisible unity." Thus, attempts were made to solve a sociological and political issue through constitutional edicts. The aim was to change the reality, the facts of life via these edicts. To achieve this aim intense efforts were initiated. Since everyone in Turkey was a Turk according to the Constitution, the Kurds, too, had to be Turks. Since the Constitution alleged everyone to be a Turk, the "Turkishness of the Kurds was thus ascertained". This situation then behooved the Kurds to accept their Turkishness by renouncing their national identity and ethnic heritage.

It became necessary for them to shout, "I am a Turk, therefore I am blessed", "What a blessing it is that I can call myself a Turk". In the face of all this, those who claimed to be Kurds, those who demanded Kurdish national rights were declared to be guilty of constitutional violations. They were declared to be traitors. That such people be eliminated was alleged to be a constitutional requisite. They were isolated from the community. The impact of their thoughts had to be decimated. Annihilation via mass killings. Annihilation via executions. Elimination via deportations. Measures to intensify forced assimilation. All these were the outcomes of those views and behavior.

In the years following 1923, great amounts of efforts were expended in order to make the real situation conform to the notions in the Constitution. The very existence of the Kurdish nation was denied, it was repudiated. Those who did not deny the identity of the Kurds and Kurdistan were subjected to harsh repressive measures. Deportations were frequent occurrences. The Kurds were deported en masse. Towns and villages were emptied and their inhabitants were forcibly resettled. Tribes as a whole were deported. Forbidden zones were created. The aim was to make the Kurds disappear within the Turks and the Turkish culture; to annihilate the makings of the Kurdish nation. The Kurds were resettled in the western and central Anatolia, Thrace, the Egean and the Mediterranean regions. At the same time efforts were made to resettle the Turkish population in Kurdistan. Intense efforts were expended to settle the Turks who for various reasons migrated from Yugoslavia, Romania, Greece, Bulgaria and the USSR in Kurdistan, in areas from where the Kurds had been evacuated. When such measures were perpetrated in the Turkish Republic under the leadership of Ataturk, the British were engaged in similar activities in southern Kurdistan. In southwest Kurdistan the French and in eastern Kurdistan the Iranians were more or less implementing similar measures. Even if the measures were implemented in different ways they had the same aim.

Here, one of the primary aspects of the Turkish State and the official ideology becomes very obvious. This is the anti-Kurdish aspect. Erasure of the words Kurd and Kurdistan from literature, annihilation of all distinct aspects making up the Kurdish society is a primary aim. And for this purpose, the slogan "the indivisible ethnic and territorial unity" has been much ballyhoed as propaganda.

The second primary aspect of the Turkish State is its being anti-communist. No doubt, it has other aspects, too. The principles that it has adopted such as the separation of the Church and the State. But all other aspects can be looked at within the framework of the two primary aspects. As stated above, here I want to concentrate on the anti-Kurdish aspect of the Turkish State. That is, I want to concentrate on its racist and colonialist aspects.

Hence, one of the principal factors in making the official ideology relates to the reality of the Kurdish nation. Owing to its denial of the concrete facts and the pretense not to see tangible reality, its development was based on lies. I therefore call it the ideology based on lies. It puts forth the lie as a primary premise. This lie constitutes its starting point. It formulates its defense along this lie. It endeavors to present the "ideological truth" in lieu of tangible, concrete real life facts. And it demands everyone to respect this "ideological truth". It demands everyone to deny concrete reality, real facts of life, tangible evidence.

I can best explain the relation between the Turkish official ideology and the lie as follows. For example, let's take the case of someone who calls the elephant "tree", one who perceives the elephant to be a tree. How factual are the things this person says, can say about the elephant. After such a wrong perception, how reliable is his reasoning about the elephant? Clearly, this is an unreliable situation, because the elephant is perceived to be a tree. After this, all views put forth will be about trees, not elephants. Hence, the ideology formulated based on the premise that the Kurds are really Turks can be no more reliable. As in the foregoing analogy, all views put forth will undoubtedly be about the Turks.

It's claimed that "...though Ataturk is nationalistic, the principle of

Ataturk's nationalism is not racist. He accepts as Turk everyone in Turkey who regards himself/herself as a Turk. He gives expression to his belief via his saying 'Fortunate is he who can say he is a Turk'. As seen, it is alleged that "Kemalism accepts as Turks all who live in Turkish land and regard themselves as Turks". First, northwest part of Kurdistan is incorporated into Turkey. Harsh colonialist and racist policies are implemented and the issue is solved via ideological means. The Kurdish land is declared to be Turkish homeland. Then, it is decreed that "Everyone living in Turkey is a Turk. Everyone who sees himself/herself as a Turk is a Turk".

It begs the question: Is it possible to annihilate sociological realities by decrees in the Constitution, by court judgments, by the rulings of appeals tribunals? If this is possible, why doesn't the Turkish State apply the same policy to Cyprus? For example, firstly, all of Cyprus is occupied. Immediately afterwards, a constitution is drafted. Decrees such as "Everyone in Cyprus is a Turk", "The State of Cyprus with its people and territory is an indivisible unity" are incorporated into this constitution. Thus, the Greek Cypriots are Turkified. The makings of the Greek Cypriot community are annihilated. And the Cyprus issue will have been resolved. Just as Kurdistan was declared to be Turkish homeland, just as the Kurds were deemed to be Turks and just as the national and political existence of the Kurds is denied, the Greek lands, too, can be declared to be Turkish homeland. The national and political existence of the Greeks is then denied, presumed non-existent. The Greeks will thus have been Turkified.

Under these conditions, those who advocate the Greek national and democratic rights are declared separatists, divisive elements. Those who are not Turkified are declared "traitors". It can be claimed that "The internal and external enemies want to divide Cyprus which with its people and territory is an indivisible unity." Those who deny the "sacred" decrees in the Constitution, those who advocate the Greek national and democratic rights are subjected to police and judicial inquiries. They are put on trial. They're thrown into prison.

All these are of course nothing but day dreaming. There is no possibility of realizing them. Because the Greeks are not as dispossessed as the Kurdish people. Here we see international bodies such as the U.N. We see the effective use of international instruments. The Turkish authorities know only too well the Greeks' influence at European and world bodies such as the U.N. They know only too well of the Greeks' political muscle with various governments and international organizations. Therefore, the Turkish authorities dare not deny, annihilate and make disappear the existence of the Greeks via constitutional decrees, court orders, political and executive decisions.

The Turkish authorities also know only too well that the Kurdish people are dispossessed. During the years from the end of WW I to 1923, the Kurdish nation was divided, partitioned. It was turned to an international colony. The 'divide & rule' policy of imperialism and colonialism destroyed the skeleton of Kurdistan, damaged its nerve center. This racist and colonialist policy attempts to hide the Kurdish national and democratic movements from the democratic people of the world. It aims to deprive the Kurdish people of moral and material support.

The potential for a Kurdish national and democratic movement is always there. Undoubtedly the States who are exploiting Kurdistan as a colony will attempt to destroy, to misdirect it and to make it fail. In fact, for the last 55 years this policy has been pursued. For example, the British imperialism frequently used RAF against the Kurdish national



liberation movements in southern Kurdistan in 1923-1938. It prevented the Kurds from exercising their right to self determination and becoming an independent nation. In north Kurdistan, the Kemalist regime intensified its racist and colonialist oppression. Annihilation via mass killings, annihilation via deportations, elimination via forced assimilation. All these measures have been intensely and speedily implemented. In Syria the French imperialism and in Iran the Shahenshah monarchy perpetrated similar measures.

The racist and colonialist Turkish Government knows only too well that the Kurdish nation is a dispossessed nation. It knows the Kurdish nation is deprived of international support. It knows the Kurdish nation has many enemies with very few, if any, friends. Hence, it knows that no government will oppose it whenever it intensifies its racist and colonialist policies in Kurdistan. The issue will not be taken to international fora and complaints will not be lodged against Turkey. Organizations such as the U. N., UNESCO and Council of Europe will pretend to be unaware of the racist and colonialist policies the Turkish Government perpetrates against the Kurdish people. The organizations who concern themselves with "human rights", "the right of nations to self determination", "anti-racist and anti-colonialist" forces will pretend not to understand, not to hear the Kurdish people's national and democratic struggles. Moreover, the Turkish press, the Turkish writers that are the pivots of racism and colonialism will show no reaction. The university circles, professors, writers who concern themselves with concepts such as human rights, basic freedoms and fundamental liberties, democracy, equality will remain silent. They will not make an issue of racism and colonialism. Even the Turkish socialist movement will attempt to cover up the racism and colonialism through appearing to be internationalist and via sharp rhetoric. In spite of all these harsh repressive measures, they will continue to reiterate the slogan "Kemalism is anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism. It is on the side of the oppressed people".

In this regard, there is a very significant, very profound difference between the Palestine national liberation movement and the Kurdish national liberation movement. The Palestinians are waging their struggle among friendly powers. They have one enemy: Israel. The friends of the Palestinians are also the enemies of Israel. For example, when it became difficult for the Palestinians to remain in Jordan, they were able to move to Lebanon. When they face difficulties in Lebanon, they can go to Syria, from there they can go to Iraq. They can go to Kuwait, S Arabia, Algeria etc. Fairly easy. They get political, economic and military assistance from all Arab countries. From Kuwait to Libya, from UAE to Syria, from S Arabia to Algeria, from Egypt to Iraq, from S Yemen to Morocco all Arab countries give political and economic support to the Palestinian movement. Furthermore, all Islamic countries give political and economic support. They give encouragement. Increasingly the world revolutionary and democratic forces, the Third World countries give moral and material support to this movement. For example, the USSR and the People's Republic of China, that on many international issues hold diametrically opposite views, on this movement exhibit the very same posture and behavior. Here, no doubt, the power that the Arab countries hold in international relations plays a major role. Oil lies at the foundation of this power. The Palestinian issue is, in a way, the Arab issue.

The Kurds, however, are waging their national liberation struggle among hostile forces. And they are fighting against these hostile forces. The Kurds virtually have no friends. The division and partitioning of Kurdistan has produced this outcome. The countries that control and exploit

as a joint colony are engaged in intense hostilities towards the Kurds in order to maintain status quo. The countries that are against the Kurds also collaborate with each other. When the Kurds are hard pressed in their struggle for autonomy or liberation against one government, they have no where to go. On the contrary, the borders are closed. Participants in the national struggle are caught at the borders and handed over to the other side. Gallows are thus erected as a joint effort. The Kurds receive no military and political assistance, because it is not easy to cross the barriers raised by the racist and colonialist oppressors (in Kurdistan-Tr). In this regard, none of the facilities available to the Palestinians is available to the Kurds.

The manifestation of Turkish thinking based on double standards is quite lucid here. The Turkish State which keeps the Kurdish nation under a racist and colonialist oppression, supports all national and democratic rights of the Palestinians including their right to an independent state. The same goes for the Turkish democrats, Turkish press, university circles, in short, this is the Turkish mentality. And the Kurds are thrown into jails for saying "I am a Kurd. There are Kurds in Turkey." They are subjected to all sorts of inquiries. Nevertheless, the Turks who so frequently speak of "Racist Zionism" cannot thereby hide their own racism.

Since the racist and colonialist Turkish State knows the prevailing indifference to Kurdistan, it easily perpetrates its oppression and exploitation of the Kurdish nation. It knows that it will not be criticized for the racist and colonialist policies it perpetrates in Kurdistan. It knows it will not be protested in international fora. On the one hand it claims to stand for human rights, equality, freedom and democracy, on the other hand, it perpetrates harsh racist and colonialist measures against the Kurdish nation without difficulty.

Hence, organizations such as the U N and UNESCO are obliged to pay close attention to the Kurdish question in the Middle East. They are obliged if they really want to pay more than lip service to basic concepts such as human rights, rights of nations to self determination, equality, democracy, if they want to realize them in real life. This is the only possibility of creating and developing equality among all nations, of achieving real peace, of protecting and strengthening the concepts of our time.

### III. The TURKISH "DEMOCRACY" and The KURDISH QUESTION

The view that the Kurds are really Turks has been meticulously advocated throughout the life of the Turkish Republic. That this is the scientific view has been put forth. This is a view whose veracity cannot be in doubt, a view which cannot be criticized, discussed, touched. Even though it is contrary to the reality of the Kurdish nation it has been advocated in a determined manner. Its supremacy has been guaranteed by the Constitution, by the Penal Code and by the threat of penalty. Behavior contrary to this view has been tied to the penalty of imprisonment. Efforts have been made to impose this view on the public through pressure, force, repression and imprisonment.

This view was reiterated in the 1961 Constitution via "Turkish State with its people and territory is an indivisible unity." We see this

principle in its barest form in the Turkish Political Parties law #648 enacted in 1966. Article #89 which deals with the "Closure of Political Parties" is exactly as follows:

"Political parties cannot claim that there are within the Turkish Republic minority groups emanating from ethnic, religious, cultural or linguistic differences.

Political parties cannot have as their aim destruction of national unity in the Turkish Republic via protection or development of languages or cultures other than Turkish."

The following conclusions may be drawn from this article. There are, as matters of fact, within the borders of the Turkish Republic a language other than Turkish language and a culture other than Turkish. But, saying they exist is outlawed. It is against the law to protect this language and this culture. It is forbidden to want to develop them or to propagate them. As evident, a sociological fact, a concrete reality is presumed non-existent by law. It is stressed that the Turkish nation and the Kurdish nation add up to one nation and that is the Turkish nation. With the penalty of imprisonment, attempts are made to block mentioning the Kurdish nation's existence. This means that the Turkish political parties will not bring factual contributions to the social and political composition.

In this regard, the legal terminology, "Turkish citizenship" is mixed up with the sociological reality of the Kurdish nation. And attempts are made to keep them mixed up. For example, both the 1924 and 1961 constitutions say the following:

"...Whoever says 'I am a Turk' is a Turk. Regardless of their blood all those who sincerely say they are Turks are Turks. The only requisite is that they feel in their hearts and minds the good fortune of being Turks."

The conclusion is that Ataturk's nationalism, that is, the Turkish nationalism has a "nationalistic" not racist characteristic. It is said that "All who sincerely regard themselves as Turks are Turks." And it is stressed that the constitution and other laws provide no edicts. The question is resolved on a voluntary, goodwill basis. However, the issue is not so simple as to be resolved with one or two pieces of legislation. In other words, a sociological reality cannot be resolved through legislation.

It begs the question: What measures will be taken against those who don't regard themselves as Turks, those who want to remain Kurds, those who want to protect the makings of the Kurdish community? The laws say "all who sincerely regard themselves as Turks are Turks". This is the source of the issue. The issue arises from what measures will be taken, are taken against those who say they are Kurds.

In real life we see the following. Measures taken against such people are pressures, repression and imprisonment. Because it is illegal to claim that within the Turkish Republic there are cultures other than Turkish culture and languages other than Turkish language. It is a felony to say they exist. Both the Constitution and the Penal Code provide penalties for this crime. Hence, there is no possibility of seeing any tolerance, any free will, any choice in the saying "...all who sincerely regard themselves as Turks are Turks." Such edicts are the cornerstones of the State terror in Kurdistan. Because, it demands that everyone be a Turk. It is stressed that there is no possibility for anyone to benefit from public service without saying "How fortunate I am to be a Turk". The Turkish State takes all sorts of measures to Tur-

kify those who want to be Kurds, those who want to preserve the makings of the Kurdish society. Despite all the measures, it becomes necessary to eliminate those who are still not Turkified. And this is what's done.

Today Kurdistan is an international colony in the heart of the Middle East. It's a colony common to Turkey, Syria, Iraq and Iran. In fact, the status of the Kurdish people is very much lower than that of colonies.

For example, in Turkey even the very existence of the Kurds is not acknowledged. All sorts of efforts are expended to suppress the identity of the Kurds and Kurdistan, to disperse and to annihilate them. Equal treatment of the Kurds with the Turks has been made conditional on being Turkified. And this amounts to racism that is unparalleled in the world. It is also colonialism. For in the whole world, no other people's national and democratic rights, national identity have been confiscated while it is presumed not to be and its existence is denied.

In spite of all these, the Turkish State presents itself as a democracy. It presents itself as a country which respects human rights. In fact, it claims to be one of the rare few countries in the world that respect human rights. On the one hand it perpetrates a racist and colonialist policy in Kurdistan, on the other hand it claims to be one of the rare few countries. It attempts to suppress, dilute and annihilate the makings of the Kurdish nation and claims to be a democracy. On the one hand it attempts to enslave the Kurdish nation, to chain the Kurdish nation, on the other hand, it pretends to be on the side of the oppressed nations. It pretends to support the liberation movements of the oppressed nations. To perpetrate all these contradictory and mutually exclusive deeds. All these are the factors in the formulation and the development of the official ideology of the Turkish State. They're the most important elements of the official ideology. The public service, universities, judiciary, all sorts of educational institutions, political parties, unions, associations etc all have been made to accept the official ideology based on lies. And all these organizations have uncritically accepted this ideology to be "the only truth, the only reality". It's important to study the impact of the official ideology on Turkish thought. It is also a necessity.

The Turkish thought develops along double standards. Facts are viewed through double standards, multi standards. They're evaluated so. The primary reason for looking at facts and evaluating them along double standards, multi standards is the question of Kurdistan. The divergence in thoughts, views, attitude and behavior manifests itself in the approach to the issue of Kurdistan. It may best be illustrated with an example.

According to the prevailing Turkish thought, since the Reforms of 1839, the Ottoman Empire and its successor the Turkish Republic has accorded everyone equal treatment irrespective of "language, race, creed and denomination". Here, this is what is meant by saying "absence of discrimination due to language or denomination": The Ottoman administration did not interfere with the religion and the religious practices of the Christian and Jewish peoples under its sovereignty. It did not endeavor to forcibly convert them to Islam. It accorded them religious freedom. This is also the policy of the Turkish State, which has not forcibly converted any Jew or Christian to Islam. There is no such intention or plan of action. This is the explanation, whether it is factual or not, whether it reflects the practices or not is another matter. Whether the explanation lines up with historical events or not is another subject for research.

However, there is no such explanation for the saying, "absence of dis-

crimination based on language and ethnic origin". There is no explanation compatible with democratic views. In line with foregoing explanation, one would expect the makings of nationalities other than Turks, too, to be recognised. Just as the distinct characteristics of the Christians and of the Jews are recognised, the distinct characteristics of the Kurds, too, should be recognised. However, the characteristics making up other nations, for example, the Kurdish nation are not recognised at all. Even the existence of the Kurds is denied. This expression that there is no "discrimination due to language and ethnic origin" has the aim of Turkifying the Kurds. Only after the Kurds have been subjected to such a process, that is, Turkified, are they treated equally. This type of equality which is conditional upon denying one's ethnic identity, culture, heritage and language is extremely anti-democratic. It is an affront to human dignity. It is opposed to the very essence of being human, opposed to the concept of human rights. It is in conflict with the basic concepts of our time, with the primary aspirations of this day and age. Anyone who denies his identity, his very being is on the way to slavery, is a slave. Anyone who denies his identity, assumes another's identity is in the advanced stages of slavery, of bondage. It means nothing that the Kurds who repudiate their Kurdishness and adopt Turkish identities benefit from public services. What's left of the person who has denied his identity, his very being? That such a person can become a representative, senator, governor, diplomat, professor, general etc cannot hide the underlying condition not to ever claim his true identity and heritage.

Thinking along double standards is a primary characteristic of the Turkish thinking. The Turkish thinkers vehemently support all liberation movements around the world. Depending on time and place, they applaud them. They praise the successes of these movements. They are saddened by their failures. Yet, the very same person or institution adopts a hostile attitude toward the liberation movement in any part of Kurdistan. They belittle these movements as "Imperialism's stir up's".

The Turkish universities, Turkish press, educational institutions, judiciary etc condemn the 1920 Treaty of Sevres. They view this treaty as the imperialists' plan to divide the Turkish homeland. And they regard the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne as a victory. In Lausanne, the 'divide & rule' policy was applied to the Kurdish nation. The Kurdish homeland, that is, Kurdistan was partitioned. And with the aim of erasing the names Kurd and Kurdistan from literature and history. The Treaty of Lausanne is in its fullest sense an agreement by the imperialists to divide the spoils. Yet, the Turkish thinkers who deny and don't see the reality of the Kurdish nation, applaud such division as "revolution", as "national liberation". They praise it.

However, the facts of life, the tangible reality clearly show the following: The Treaty of Sevre was still-born in 1920. There was no possibility of implementing it. Nor was there a power that seriously wanted to implement it. Moreover, the Treaty of Sevres did leave a Turkish homeland in central Anatolia. The purpose of applying the 'divide & rule' policy to the Kurdish nation, the purpose of dividing Kurdistan was to annihilate the makings of the Kurdish nation. What is the view on the events that led to the partitioning of Kurdistan of the Turkish thinkers who claim, "The Treaty of Sevres was dividing the Turkish homeland. We tore up the imperialists' designs. We founded the new Turkish Republic through the first anti-imperialist struggle" etc? When reminded of Kurdistan, the Turkish writers either remain silent and behave as if no question is raised, or else they claim "There is no nation known as Kurds" and thereby leave no room for discussion. They avoid discussions. Or else they lodge complaints about you with the country's security forces, for dividing the Turkish State.

Double standards dominate the Turkish thought. It is possible to see the examples of this reality anytime, anywhere. For example, in Europe, particularly in W Germany, there are many Turkish workers. With their dependents they number around 1.5 million. The Turkish Government shows concern about all aspects that affect their lives. Here, the cultural issues have a special place. Significant measures are taken to insure that the Turkish workers' children to grow up with the Turkish culture. The Government takes every kind of measure to insure that they don't forget their native tongue, that is, Turkish. The measures taken by the Turkish Government are feverishly supported by the Turkish thinkers. The measures are applauded. They are encouraged. The same Turkish Government also takes every kind of measure to assimilate the Kurdish children, to annihilate their ethnic identity. The Turkish Government that takes measures to insure the Turkish children in W Germany are schooled in Turkish puts behind bars those who say, "In Turkey everyone should be taught in their native language in primary schools". It takes them to court and puts them on trial. It closes down the political parties that adopt such proposals. Because the word "everyone" includes the Kurds, too. And the need for the Kurdish children to be schooled in their native language, that is, Kurdish makes its appearance. But, the primary aim of the Turkish government is to obliterate Kurdish, to demolish the makings of the Kurdish society and thereby to effect forced assimilation.

The Turkish press and the Turkish writers applaud these measures by the Turkish Government and say, "This is the most democratic", "This is the most humanitarian". To the extent the Kurdish children forget their native tongue, that is, Kurdish, to the extent they are alienated from their own culture and heritage, they become "the most democratic" "the most humanitarian" and "the best human beings". The press, the unions, the associations, the universities and the political parties are in the midst of this process. We must not forget the fact that the Turkish Government always attempts to present racist and colonialist repression as "services". The Turkish writers, press, radio, television, etc are party to these efforts and also they encourage it [In Turkey radio and television networks are state owned & operated -Tr]

Thinking along double standards, making others think along double standards is one of the primary aspects of the official Turkish ideology. The Turkish university whose primary function is to generate new knowledge also toes the line.

The Turkish universities, the Turkish press, the judiciary, political parties, unions, associations deny the existence of the Kurdish people. All these institutions and organizations say "Everyone in Turkey is a Turk". But, this is not a scientific proposition. Because, the starting point of science is facts. Science deals with facts. Scientists have no authority to deny the existence of the Kurdish nation. They cannot possess such authority. Through science we learn, we appreciate every kind of reality. The university which is supposed to generate new knowledge doesn't have the authority to deny the facts of life either. Through the scientific process we can understand, appreciate and explain this fact. The denial of this fact is ideological. In this regard, the Turkish judiciary, political parties etc. are already compromised right from the start via their denial of the Kurdish reality. But facts are the indispensable starting point of scientific inquiry. It's a starting point one cannot do without. The mentality that denies and presumes this reality to be non-existent gives these institutions the job of building up and propagating the official ideology based on lies.

In scientific research, facts are highlighted in proportion to their impact. Putting forth pleasant facts in an exaggerated manner and overlooking unpleasant facts is contrary to the scientific way. It's a conduct unacceptable in scientific way. What's more, the pleasant fact that is highlighted in an exaggerated manner may have no particular explanatory role in the correlation of the facts. On the other hand, the fact which is overlooked for being unpleasant may play a role in the explanation. It may have the role of determining the changes. Ignoring certain facts may simplify the thinking to a certain extent. Thus, the fewer the variables the easier it may be to analyze a situation. But, the conclusions arrived at are undoubtedly not reliable. They're bound to be deficient. They're bound to be wrong. Because all relevant facts must be looked at. Some facts affect other facts and some are affected by others. To fully appreciate one fact it's necessary to understand its connections with others. The principal condition governing all this is the acceptance of all facts. It is giving each fact due emphasis.

The Turkish university, the Turkish press, instead of trying to understand and appreciate the Kurdish reality, take the easy way out by denying it. Thus, they rid themselves of the burden to understand and appreciate. They make propaganda for the official ideology based on lies presented to them by the State. At various times and places, they espouse contradictory views. They behave in conflicting manners. But, science provides the most reliable way to generate new knowledge. And the same procedures are followed at all times and places. The Turkish university refrains from entering into the process of understanding, appreciating and explaining the Kurdish reality. It avoids this at all costs in a cold and calculating manner. But, it puts the Kurdish reality on trial. It puts on trial those who concern themselves with the question of Kurdistan. It puts on trial those who attempt to explain the Kurdish society's composition. It incriminates them. Undoubtedly, this, too, is not scientific. It's ideological. It's also apparent that it provides a certain amount of simplicity. Because, understanding, appreciating and explaining is a difficult job. They demand intense efforts. It's much easier to accuse, to conduct a trial.

The Turkish university, scientists, the press, the writers etc who think along double standards favor the Kurdish nation's enslavement and the disappearance of its identity. And they put forth their subjective values, their personal wishes as reality. At the same time, they advocate them as prerequisites to being a democrat, being a revolutionary, being a defender of human rights.

The judgments of the lower courts and the higher courts such as the Constitutional Court and the Court of Appeals are political not judicial. The Turkish judicial organs deny concrete facts by maintaining that "According to the Constitution, the Turkish State with its people and territory is a unity". In this regard, there is no difference whatsoever between the views of the Turkish public service, the political parties with representatives in the Grand National Assembly (ie House of Representatives-Tr) and the courts. And thereby, the "judicial institutions" with their rulings expend efforts to legitimize the confiscation of the Kurdish nation's national and democratic rights. With such behavior the courts, the Constitutional Court, the Court of Appeals are no longer "judicial institutions". They become executive agencies for implementing the Turkish Government's colonialism over Kurdistan and the Kurdish nation, just like the Government, the police, the gendarmes, the military posts, public service. Such an institution becomes a part of the executive and is controlled by it. Thus, the institutions that are supposed to "dispense justice", "to bring out the truth", make efforts to suppress the truth, make the official ideology based on

lies reign supreme. The courts which are alleged to be "independent" have thus been transformed into the most significant advocates of the racist and colonialist ideology. And deeds for ideological convenience are perpetrated by the allegedly "independent judiciary" and the "independent judges".

In spite of all these racist and colonialist deeds, the Turkish Government is able to present itself as a "democratic" and "an advocate of freedom". The Turkish university and learned circles are able to stress that these views and deeds are "democratic" and "pro-freedom". They accuse those who want, who advocate Kurdish national rights of attempting to sabotage the development of this "democratic" and "pro-freedom" attitude. Because the Turkish thought always presents the racist and colonialist policies perpetrated in Kurdistan as "services".

The courts, the Admin Appeals Tribunal, the Court of Appeals, the Constitutional Court impose penalties on those who entertain views other than these. In 1971, Turkey's Workers Party was closed down by the Constitutional Court because of this reason. Because, it said there are Kurds in eastern Turkey. Because it adopted a resolution acknowledging the existence of the Kurds. In 1980, Turkey's Labor Party was closed down for the same reason and again by the Constitutional Court. Because it said the Kurds ought to have the right to be educated in their native language. Because it included in its platform something similar.

I quoted the article on closing down political parties above. That within the borders of the Turkish Republic the existence of languages other than Turkish language and the existence of cultures other than Turkish culture cannot be advocated and their development cannot be requested was stressed in the article. In spite of this, article 12 of the 1961 Constitution was invoked. According to this article,

"...everyone is equal before the law regardless of language, race, sex, political views, philosophical beliefs, religion and religious denomination.

No privileges can be accorded to any person, family, group or class."

In Kurdistan racist and colonialist policies will be perpetrated, the Kurds' existence will not be mentioned and at the same time it will be alleged that no privileges are given to any group. It won't be possible to say that there are languages other than Turkish language, cultures other than Turkish culture and at the same time there will be talk of equality, freedom, democracy.

All these show that the Turkish thought follows double standards in theory. Parallel to this thought, practice, that is, behavior, too, is based on double standards. Political, social, cultural and economic policies put into practice follow this line. The main reason for this divergence in thought and behavior is the question of liberation, is the question of the Kurds.

On the one hand the Kemalists are in the midst of stifling, of annihilating the Kurdish nation. And on the other hand, they aspire to project an image of being revolutionary, democratic, anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist and defenders of national liberation movements. With their left hand, the Kemalists are attempting to stifle, to annihilate the Kurdish nation. They prevent the Kurds from being heard. At the same time, they raise their other arm and shout, "...we waged the first anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist war in the world. We became the leaders of all oppressed nations. We held the guiding light for their



national liberation movements". They are full of contradictions. They want to give up neither their efforts to stifle, to annihilate the Kurds nor their claim of leadership for all the oppressed and colonized people. There is only one way for the Kemalists out of these views and policies. And that is to outlaw critical views. To throw into prison the critics. Nevertheless, the anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist, revolutionary-democratic image Ataturk and the Kemalists who follow him attempt to create is lost in the shadow of the Kurdish question. The transparency of the image they want to create becomes obvious in view of the policies applied to the Kurdish people. It becomes ineffective, unimpressive. Here, there is benefit in touching on a few deeds and views of the U N.

#### IV. The UNITED NATIONS, TURKEY & The KURDS

UNESCO is an international educational, cultural and scientific organization. It helps with the development of culture and science. It encourages understanding and explanation of the world, the society, the individual scientifically. It helps with the widespread acceptance of this behavior at the grass roots levels. However, by its decision concerning the 100th anniversary of Ataturk's birth, UNESCO failed to do this. On the contrary, it sided with an ideology which freezes scientific development, paralyzes scientific thinking and makes it subservient to the official ideology.

Holding the view that Kemalism is anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist amounts to the adoption of the view held by the Turkish press, writers, scientists, judiciary, in short, the collective Turkish thought. Turkish public service, educational institutions, political parties, unions, associations, universities, religious institutions etc have uncritically, unquestioningly adopted the same view. If a survey is conducted, say, among the Turkish press, universities, judiciary, political parties, public service, educational institutions etc, close to 100% of the participants will claim Kemalism to be anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist. Moreover, if they are asked to write the foremost principles of Kemalism, at the head of the list they will put "anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist". Nevertheless, conclusions based on percentages and public sentiments are not necessarily scientific or factual. Because, in science popularity is not the measure of veracity. It's not the sentiments either. A view cannot be said to be scientific because it has widespread acceptance by a very large majority of the population and institutions. Nor can a view be described unscientific because it is advocated by but a small number. In science, there is but one measure of veracity and facts are it. If views advanced are supported by facts then it is scientific. Because in scientific thinking, it's essential to systematically observe and evaluate the facts. Then interpretation begins. Hypotheses are formulated through interpretation. And then the validity of these hypotheses are tested with facts. Thus, their validity or otherwise is ascertained. One of the indispensable conditions of scientific research is to state, to explain the conclusions honestly and courageously. Suppressing a finding because the authorities may not like it is not at all compatible with scientific principles. By the same token, distortion of the findings so that they will gain favor with the authorities is also incompatible with the scientific way.

Is there nothing to be learned from the view expressed above? Undoubt-

edly there is. It shows that the Kemalist view has been indelibly marked on the mind of just about everyone. It shows that all individuals and institutions hold this official ideology based on lies to be the fundamental starting point.

The application of knowledge that is not based on facts is naturally racist and colonialist. So is the behavior. Such attitude and behavior are diametrically opposed to the principles espoused by the U N and UNESCO. The right to be free, to develop their identity is the basic right of every nation. It belongs to not just this or that but to all nations. The same thing may be said of the right of nations to self determination. Justice, peace and economic and social development can only be achieved through the equality of nations. That some nations are kept under domination by other nations can make no contribution to peace and stability.

Kurdistan is an international colony in the heart of the Middle East. It's been divided and partitioned. All its national rights, tangible and intangible resources are confiscated. The Kurds are separated from one another by barbed wires, fields of mines, guard towers and military posts. All sorts of measures have been taken to prevent them from developing any kind of relation. They are being taken. All parts of Kurdistan are occupied by the military forces armed to the teeth. There is interference with the makings of the Kurdish community all the way down to the individual cell. All sorts of measures are resorted to in order to eliminate Kurdish culture and destroy social composition of the Kurdish society. And all this is done as a matter of course. In Turkey even the very existence of the Kurds is not acknowledged.

The Governments of Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Syria that control Kurdistan ardently desire to keep the Kurdish nation suppressed. For this purpose they collaborate with each other. These governments want the Kurdish nation to accept subjugation, to forego their national rights. They hold the view that the Kurds should not advocate the makings of the Kurdish nation. If they do then they become "traitors". If they don't demand their rights, if they resign to their fate and accept subjugation then they are described as "good citizens, decent human beings". They become "civilised". In Turkey the aim of the pressures on the characteristics making up the Kurdish nation is to make the Kurds forget and forego their language and culture. Undoubtedly, the manifestation of all this is constant pressure, repression and imprisonment. Whenever the presence of the police, gendarmes and the military is noticeably felt the authorities will claim "law and order is restored". Whenever the effects of brutally repressive measures are felt, the authorities will declare "peace in the community is restored, stability is achieved." In the Middle East, whenever the demands from the Kurdish nation are drowned in blood, the authorities will proclaim "law and order is restored, the country has attained stability". The Kurdish demands for national rights and efforts to protect the makings of the Kurdish society are deemed to be views and deeds that are anathema to peace and stability. The state terror perpetrated in Kurdistan, on the other hand, is presented as a sign of peace and stability. "Serving the public is our duty", they say.

Here again, we see a significant difference between the views on the Palestinian and Kurdish questions. It is alleged that the most significant cause of the instability in the Middle East is the occupation of Palestinian land, of Arab land by Israel. The Kurdish demands for autonomy and freedom and their efforts to change their status from being an international colony are also alleged to be a reason for the instability. The foremost requisite for political stability in the

Middle East, it is claimed, is the liberation of the Palestinian land and maintenance of the Kurdish land under occupation. Here, too, double standards in thought and behavior manifest themselves in their barest form.

However, these are fundamentally opposed to the order the U N attempts to create and to the understanding UNESCO endeavors to promote. The UN can't achieve peace and justice by siding with racist and colonialist regimes. Nor can it achieve an international order based on the equality of nations. On the contrary, it can only help protect racist and colonialist regimes. Therefore, when speaking of peace, justice, humanity it is not sufficient to be content with the views advanced by the authorities. It's necessary to be sceptical of these views, explanations and information and to investigate whether or not they are in line with facts, with reality. On the subject of Kemalism, too, it is necessary to pay due attention to the anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist image the Turkish authorities attempt to create. In this regard, the policy perpetrated by the Turkish Government in Kurdistan, rather than the authorities themselves, should be analyzed. 1981 was proclaimed "Ataturk's year" in Turkey. The year officially began on Jan 5, 1981 with the opening speech by Gen Kenan Evren, Head of State, Head of National Security Council and Chief of Staff. Gen Evren in his speech said the following:

"...Ataturk is the pioneer of anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist struggles. He blazed the trail for the oppressed nations' liberation movements. The Turkish Government favors and implements this policy to the letter."

In spite of the racist and colonialist views and policies perpetrated against the Kurdish people, the claim to be on the side of the oppressed is made. It's stressed that Turkey's domestic and foreign policies develop along this line in theory and in practice.

What happens to those who say this view is not factual? What measures await those who criticize this view? In this regard there is but one measure: strong pressure, harsh repression, detention, trials and prison sentences. Therefore, these views are not put forth for discussion. There is no possibility of discussing them. They're the views that can't be discussed, criticized, touched. They're the views whose veracity can't be doubted. They're the views that must be unquestioningly adopted, praised and applauded. Nevertheless, there is an ardent desire for saying the following, too: In Turkey, there is no such thing as Kurd. Everyone is a Turk. And everyone is content to be a Turk. Those who say there is a nation other than the Turkish nation, there is a language other than the Turkish language and there is a culture other than the Turkish culture in Turkey are traitors. They are the enemies of the nation.

In his speech Gen Evren also says the following:

"...Ataturk was a nationalist. Ataturk's nationalism is not selfish. It is not racist. It is cohesive and uniting, not divisive. His nationalism is a brand new, realistic and Turkish nationalism born out of the happiness that comes from being united by common destiny, griefs, prides and joys."

Here, it is also claimed that Ataturk's nationalism is not selfish and not racist. Can the mentality that denies the Kurdish people's right to be, the mentality that attempts to destroy the makings of the Kurd-

ish society, erase the words Kurd and Kurdistan from literature and history be described as "unselfish"? Can the mentality which melts the Kurdish nation in the Turkish language and culture, which says "If you don't become Turks, if you don't shout 'We are Turks and therefore we are content', you have no right to live" be portrayed as "not racist", as "believing in the equality of all nations", as "tolerant"? Through a deadly State terror, the characteristics making up the Kurdish nation are kept under pressure. And this is described as "cohesive, uniting" nationalism. Clearly cohesion and unity at gun point through harsh repression and State terror can't be democratic.

"Partnership in destiny, in joys" on the other hand is interpreted as follows: "Partnership in Turkish prides", "partnership in Turkish griefs". For example, as soon as the Turkish army invaded Cyprus, the slogan "partnership in destiny, joys, griefs" was intensely used to agitate. In contrast, "partnership in destiny, joys and griefs" is not at all used when there is a Kurdish struggle for autonomy and freedom in any part of Kurdistan, say, in Iran and Iraq. All sorts of measures are taken at the borders to prevent the Kurds from sending to their brethren medicine and such basic necessities as flour, sugar and salt. People are detained and questioned with the incrimination "You have helped Barzani; you have sent him sugar." Tribunals are formed to try these people. All sorts of measures are resorted to in order to prevent the Kurds from forming any association with each other. Every means is utilized. Therefore, the slogan formulated as "partnership in destiny, joys and griefs", too, is devoid of any democratic content. Whenever the Turkish nation falls into narrow political, social and economic straits "partnership in destiny, joys and griefs" is invoked. But, efforts are made to increase the gravity of perils confronting the Kurdish nation. They take their place alongside the enemies of the Kurds. Should anyone side with the Kurds, lessen the perils facing the Kurds, he is declared an enemy of the nation, enemy of the country. He is forced to confront the State's coercive instruments of repression such as the police, gendarmes, army, courts and prisons. Owing to their racist and colonialist policies, the Turks who speak of "partnership in destiny, joys and griefs" are the main source of the Kurdish nation's "griefs". They are playing with the fate of the Kurdish nation. And they deem the Kurds to be deserving of slavery and bondage. What sort of "joy" can an enslaved nation subjected to racist and colonialist policies have?

Gen Kenan Evren, Head of State, Head of the National Security Council and Chief of Staff in his opening speech at the start of Ataturk's year also said:

"The most significant view that makes Ataturk universal is his love of humanity and human ideals. Ataturk is proud of his nation. He looks at his people with pride and confidence. On the other hand, via the expression 'all nations that cooperate with us will be respected and cared about, all requisites of their nationalism will be recognized', he says 'our nationalism is not a selfish and vain nationalism.'"

Here it is alleged that Kemalism respects other nations and recognizes all requisites of their nationalism. This is not factual either. The policy perpetrated against the Kurdish people gives lie to this claim. It repudiates it. The claim that a regime which doesn't recognize the very existence of the Kurdish nation, a regime which takes all sorts of measures to destroy the distinct characteristics making up the Kurdish nation respects nations other than Turkish is a dramatic contradiction. That the mentality which aims to erase the words Kurd and Kurdistan from literature and history can be stressed to respect

the rights of all other nations must be one of the most profound contradictions.

At this point there is benefit in stating the following: The views expressed by Gen Evren are the common views held by the Turkish authorities. If "Ataturk's year" had been opened not by Gen Evren but by anyone of the preceding Presidents, more or less, they would have said the same things. Or if it was opened by Suleyman Demirel or by Bulent Ecevit [two former Rightist and Leftist Turkish Prime Ministers, respectively-Tr], undoubtedly the same sort of things would be expressed. Because these views are the official Turkish Government views. It is also a very significant fact that the Turkish public service, educational institutions, universities, mass media, unions, political parties etc have unquestioningly and unconditionally adopted this official ideology. Nevertheless, justification for the military interventions has been given as deviation from the Kemalist line of the government deposed by the military. The justification is said to be the failure of the deposed regime to properly explain the Kemalist principles to the new generation and make them internalize these principles.

Kemalists explain the Turko-Greek and Turko-Armenian wars between 1919 and 1922 as "the imperialists wanted to divide our country. They wanted to enslave the Turkish nation. They wanted to erase the Turkish nation from history, they wanted to remove Turkey from the map of the world. They wanted to cut our homeland into small pieces and swallow the Turkish nation bit by bit." There is a lesson to be learned from Kemalists' collaboration with the imperialists in partitioning Kurdistan. There is a lesson to be learned from their efforts to apply the 'divide & rule' policy to Kurdistan, from their oppression and attempts to annihilate the Kurdish nation. There is also a lesson to be learned from their efforts to cut Kurdish homeland into small pieces, and "swallow it bit by bit", erase it from history. Their portrayal of the racist and colonialist actions as requisites of their "revolution", "democracy" and their "humanity" must be one of the most dramatic contradictions of the 20th Century. As I have already stated, the Kemalists always describe their racist and colonialist policies as "services".

The Turkish democrats, Kemalists who advocate such racist and colonialist views and policies look down on the Kurds and say "they're engaged in nationalism" and "they're being chauvinists". They accuse the Kurds of "racism", of engaging in "minority racism". And they frequently reveal their attitude and behavior. The stand by the Kurdish revolutionaries, democrats and patriots against Turkish racism and colonialism face such ridicule and snarls. Moreover, these are also pointed out as serious accusations. Socialists, Marxist-Leninists, everyone is incriminated. Kurds' demands for national rights and their efforts to preserve and protect the makings of the Kurdish society, their resistance to forced assimilation are viewed as "petty nationalism" and are belittled.

The Turks implement the most reactionary, the most genocidal forms of racist and colonialist policies. And the Kurds are struggling for human rights, for democracy and for freedom. They are against being enslaved. They reject the notion of becoming captives. In spite of this, the Turks' accusations of "engaging in nationalism and chauvinism" levelled against the Kurds are a lesson to be learned. But, this is the Kurdish nations struggle for existence. It is a struggle for survival. It's a struggle not to perish, struggle to protect their dignity. It's

a struggle against being erased from history, against being removed from the map of the world. Such struggles cannot be explained merely by the concept of "nationalism".

Nevertheless, whenever the right of the Turks in Greece to form Turkish communities is mentioned, it becomes apparent just how sensitive, how "nationalistic" the Turkish democrats really are. "The Greek Government is interfering with the makings of the Turkish communities", "In N Greece, efforts are made to annihilate the Turks. The Turkish Government must act" etc. The same goes for the Cypriot Turks, the Bulgarian Turks, the Iraqi Turks, too. Whereas, be it in Greece or be it in Iraq or elsewhere the right of the Turks to form Turkish communities are recognized by the respective governments. What about the situation in Turkey? Why are the efforts of over ten million Kurds in Turkey to protect the makings of a Kurdish community, to fight against racism and colonialism snarled at as "nationalism" and "chauvinism"? It is self evident that Kemalists accuse the Kurds of "nationalism" and "chauvinism" in order to cover up their own racism and colonialism.

Human rights the right of nations to self determination, the right to equal treatment belong to all nations. They don't exclusively belong to this or that nation. Both the League of Nations and the U N have accepted these principles. The Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights both aim to protect and develop these principles. Moreover, the U N and the Covenant on Human Rights which is being developed parallel to the Universal Declaration on Human Rights have adopted the realization of these principles as a primary objective. The right of nations to self determination without preconditions is stressed in the first article of the introduction to the International Covenant on Social, Economic and Cultural Rights which went into effect on Jan 3, 1976. It is stressed that the U N will make every effort to facilitate and insure the free exercise of this right. Also, in the first article in the introduction to the International Agreement on Civil and Political Rights, the significance of these rights is stressed and the necessity of realizing them in real life is expressed.

But, neither the League of Nations nor the U N has concerned itself at all with the question of Kurdistan. The question of human rights for the Kurdish people has not attracted the attention of these organizations. The right of the Kurdish nation to self determination, their struggle for autonomy and independence have not been included in their agendas. In the early days of the League of Nations when the right of nations to self determination was vehemently advocated, Kurdistan was divided and cut into pieces. The 'divide & rule' policy was applied to the Kurdish nation. International agreements legitimizing this imperialistic partitioning were made, not withstanding the resistance and will of the Kurdish people. Hence, there is an inconsistency between the League of Nations' principles and their application. Because, in those days Great Britain carried a lot of weight in the League of Nations. Iraq was a British mandate, that is, colony. And South Kurdistan through Iraqi colonial administration was under the British control. Drowning the Kurdish demands for national and democratic rights with bloody attacks was the primary duty of the British imperialism. For a variety of reasons, the League of Nations failed to establish balanced and lasting international relations. It failed to discharge its responsibilities with respect to establishment of world peace. There were significant contradictions between what was written and what was happening in reality. There were frequent talks about the right of nations to self determination, equality of all nations, peace, justice etc. In reality, however, oppression of many nations, racism and

colonialism were intensely perpetrated. This failure brought WW II. And along with the war, the League of Nations, too, came to its end.

In 1945, international relations were rearranged with the creation of the UN. The right of every nation to self determination undoubtedly remained as an espoused principle. But, in this period the most cherished concept came to be human rights. The most significant concept characterizing the UN is this concept. In spite of new relations in the international arena, significant efforts were expended to preserve the division of Kurdistan. The 'divide & rule' policy applied to the Kurdish nation was adopted as is. Maintenance and strengthening of peace in the Middle East was made conditional upon preserving the international colonial status of Kurdistan. In Iran, Iraq and Turkey, the Kurdish nations' demands for national and democratic rights were drowned in blood. To prevent the Kurdish people from making demands for autonomy and freedom and to make incoherent, to suppress these demands as soon as they were heard, all sorts of oppressive measures were introduced.

It's self evident that despite the new order effected in 1945, the status quo in Kurdistan was meticulously preserved. During this period too there is a significant difference between what's on paper and the reality. The UNO values highly and attempts to give effect to concepts such as human rights, equality of nations, rights of nations to self determination. But the same UNO does not oppose the denial of basic human rights to the Kurdish people, their oppression and mistreatment of the Kurdish nation to the colonial status of Kurdistan. It makes no issue of all these. It painstakingly avoids putting the issue on its agenda. Because, at the UN the states that keep Kurdistan as an international colony, not the Kurds, have a voice. The states that jointly use and control Kurdistan as a colony take all sorts of measures to ensure that the Kurdish issue is not placed on the agendas of the various organizations under the UN umbrella. In this regard, I have already made a brief comparison between the questions of Palestine and Kurdistan.

However, UN's siding not with oppressed Kurdish people but with racist and colonialist governments is steadily diminishing the impact of this organization. It makes the organization's stands arbitrary. In looking at the question of oppressed nations, the UN should not appear to be using different standards. The UN should refrain from views and deeds that give legitimacy to racist and colonialist states' ideologies and their implementations. The UN which does not see the question of Kurdistan in the Middle East, which doesn't appreciate the colonial status of Kurdistan, which overlooks the application of the 'divide & rule' policy to Kurdistan, cannot make contributions to the attainment of peace, to the protection of human dignity. On the contrary, it insures the development and strengthening of racist and colonialist ideologies. It institutionalizes these ideologies. It's especially incompatible with the aims of the UN to depict as "the friend of the oppressed" the ideology which oppresses the Kurdish people, which attempts to annihilate the makings of the Kurdish society. It's diametrically opposed to the UN's ideal to depict the ideology, one of whose primary objectives is to obliterate the names Kurd and Kurdistan from history and literature, as "the best friend of the oppressed nations, of the nations that have suffered great injustices". Describing the ideology which in collaboration with imperialism divided Kurdistan and applied the 'divide & rule' policy to the Kurdish nation as anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist amounts to UN's ridiculing its own principles.

The UN is very much concerned with a variety of events taking place in the world. The UN is most concerned with the Palestinian and Cypriot.

issues. In Africa, the Namibian question, Polisario national liberation front, Eritrea liberation movement are within the UN's area of concern. So are the Islamic movement in the Philippines and the Afgan conflict. What standards does the UN use when it concerns itself with these issues, when it puts them on its agenda? What standards play roles in its indifference to the question of Kurdistan? Why isn't Kurdish national liberation movement favored by the UN? Why do struggles the Kurds wage against racism and colonialism lack support? When other liberation movements are wholeheartedly supported, why is there the pretense not to see the Kurdish national liberation movement? What sort of contributions do occupied Kurdistan and the colonial status of Kurdistan make to the political stability in the Middle East? When Kurdistan is exploited as an international colony, how can "the UN's ideal" of peace in the Middle East be achieved? How can the racist and colonialist policies applied to the Kurdish people help achieve peace and justice in the Middle East?

#### V. UNESCO, TURKEY & the KURDS CULTURAL IMPERIALISM IN KURDISTAN

UNESCO aims to promote international understanding. It's to preserve and develop human values. It's to reach the source of culture, of human values. It's to investigate communities' cultural heritages which have survived up to our day and shed light on them. Therefore, one of the most important subjects which UNESCO is involved in is culture.

Today, culture has become an inseparable dimension of economic, social and political development. And it is viewed as such. Significant plans are being drawn to democratize cultural activities. And they are being implemented. Policies on culture aim to enrich people's inner lives. Therefore, they aim at uncovering and developing indigenous and traditional cultural practices particular to and emanating from within the communities. It is well known that economic, social and political development is not possible if culture is pushed to the sidelines and sources of cultural practices are allowed to run dry. This fact is appreciated more day by day. Consequently, getting people involved in cultural activities manifests itself as an important concept and policy. And this is an issue about the right of every citizen, of everyone living in the country to "cultural practices". It's also about safeguarding the right of all citizens to equal opportunities for "cultural practices".

Toward the end of 1980, the first convention of EuroCult took place. Every country sent a delegation to this convention which was organized by UNESCO. In his opening speech, the president of Finland, Mr Urho Kekkonen said the following: "The primary aim of every nation's policy should be to insure everyone in that country participates in cultural activities". These words were made the convention's slogan.

Following these general remarks, it is now necessary to ask these questions: How can a people who is held under very oppressive measures and whose native tongue is forbidden participate in cultural activities? Can culture develop without one's mother tongue? Isn't culture a product of one's mother tongue? In the face of racist and colonialist oppression, how can a culture preserve itself, develop itself? In the case of Kurdistan, the situation is quite clear: The Kurdish language is banned. All sorts of measures are designed and implemented to make



Kurdish forgotten and obliterated. Along with the Kurdish language Kurdish culture is under severe pressures. I have already given a brief outline of the development of this racist and colonialist policy.

In view of this racist and colonialist oppression, in this atmosphere where even the existence of the Kurds is not acknowledged, how is the participation of the Kurds in cultural activities going to be insured? In the face of efforts to annihilate, to obliterate the culture which the Kurds have developed throughout the centuries and passed on, how is the enrichment of people's inner life going to be insured? When the Kurds' cultural heritages are obliterated, are kept under pressure, how are human values going to be enriched?

Kemalist policy demands assimilation of Kurdish culture. It demands that the Kurdish language be forgotten, that people be coerced into forgetting it. It demands that the Kurdish cultural practices be terminated that the Kurdish culture be annihilated. It attempts to dry up the sources of Kurdish culture. Moreover, Kemalist policy painstakingly Turkifies the products of the Kurdish culture. It presents them as the products of the Turkish culture. For example, Kurdish folkloric products, their dances, their popular songs and legends are Turkified and presented as Turkish. Singing in Kurdish, writing in Kurdish, reading Kurdish poetry all are judged to be serious crimes. Those who engage in such activities are subjected to judicial inquiries and are thrown in prisons. In Turkish press and the broadcasts of the Turkish Radio and Television Admin utterance of a Kurdish word or mention of the Kurds is judged to be "National betrayal", that is treason. Nevertheless, Kurdish songs are translated to Turkish, Kurdish folkloric dances are Turkified and looted. When the lyrics are translated to Turkish, the music too is painstakingly Turkified. So are the costumes. In the wake of such mutilation, the Turkish State with these folkloric products participates in international folkloric competitions.

Here, the efforts to confiscate, to Turkify, to assimilate, to annihilate Kurdish culture run into each other. This shows that the Turkish Government practices cultural imperialism in Kurdistan. Kurdish is outlawed and Turkish is taught. The products of the Kurdish literature are kept under 1001 restrictions. In the Kurdish social life, the Government doesn't tolerate the presence of a trace of this culture. How can one claim that such mentality respects humanity? How can one stress that it doesn't discriminate because of race and language? How can one claim it respects human rights?

However, the Government gives all sorts of considerations to those who repudiate Kurdish identity and become Turks. Those who repudiate their ethnic identity and national honor benefit from all sorts of opportunities provided by the Government. For any Kurd to receive equal treatment with the Turks has been made conditional upon the indignity of repudiating his Kurdish identity and national honor. But, he who repudiates his national identity to be treated equally has nothing left of his moral values, of inner wealth. What is left of him who accepts bondage and slavery to protect and develop? This practice, however, is diametrically opposed to the ideals of the UN and UNESCO's policy on culture. UNESCO wants to develop all cultures. It says this is how the world culture is enriched. The Turkish Government however has as its primary aim total destruction of the Kurdish culture. This is of course a racist and colonialist behavior.

Here, another subject that we need to dwell on is the subject of education. In this regard the subject of educating the very young must come first. Undoubtedly the aims are achieved only when the primary school education is done in one's native language. To outlaw one's native language is clearly contrary to UNESCO's policy on culture. Attempts to annihilate indigenous cultures, to dry up the traditional sources of such cultural practices are not at all compatible with the concept of education that UNESCO strives to develop and disseminate. Otherwise, these pupils' identity will not properly develop. The community made up of such people will be devoid of an identity.

The policy implemented by the Kemalists against the Kurds is in its fullest sense racist and colonialist. It's the most reactionary type of cultural imperialism in action around the world. It is the most destructive. There is an aim which goes much beyond estranging the Kurdish language and culture, beyond its misuse for racist and colonialist purposes. It is to totally destroy the makings of the Kurdish nation, to erase it, to obliterate it from real life. It is to erase the names Kurd and Kurdistan from memories and history. It is to make slavery and bondage reign supreme, to create a community without identity and self respect.

In Turkey, when speaking of Kemalist policy on culture "language reform", "Hat reform", "Fashion reform", "Judicial reform" etc are mentioned. Separation of the Church and the State is mentioned. First what they were during the Ottoman Empire is explained. Then, what great improvements in social life and in public interest these "reforms" brought about is explained. It's stressed that thereby the Turks participate in cultural activities more. Yet, Kemalism doesn't consist entirely of these reforms. It is of course important to mention these reforms when speaking of Kemalist reforms. But, the subjects that really need to be dwelled on are overlooked. They are the ones that are in the midst of being hidden. They're the ones whose explanation is prevented under the penalty of imprisonment. These are the racist and colonialist policies perpetrated in Kurdistan. It's the cultural imperialism practiced in Kurdistan.

At the beginning of this writing, I stressed that the status of Kurdistan was even lower than that of colonies. I explained that the status of the Kurdish nation was very much lower than that of colonized people. Typical colonies kept their own names. Colonized people, nations kept their national identities. That, is the colonizers recognized the names and the identities. The colonizers referred to the colonized people by their names and identities. In the case of the Kurdish nation, however, along with its tangible and intangible resources its honor, self respect and identity too have been confiscated. It's necessary to assess the cultural imperialism practiced in Kurdistan in view of this reality. In fact, the policies implemented against the Kurdish language and culture are far more reactionary than what is meant by the expression "cultural imperialism". They are far more destructive.

The colonial or super power builds schools in an underdeveloped country [which it colonizes or puts in its sphere of influence-Tr]. It conducts courses. It offers scholarships. It sends "Peace Corps". It teaches its own language. It inculcates its own value judgments and standards. It strives to rearrange social relations in line with its own social rules. Through such a process the indigenous culture becomes estranged. The traditional native culture is belittled. The colonial or super power painstakingly endeavors to condition the people through books, magazines and brochures which it distributes. Thereby, it enhances its

political and economic influence on that country. It cements it. Then, it attempts to control its markets through its foreign policy and economic ties. This is the way cultural imperialism generally operates in our day.

The Turkish Government's policy in Kurdistan is way, way beyond these measures. This reality cannot, however, be explained with the concept of "cultural imperialism". Because, more than estranging the Kurdish culture, the aim is to totally demolish it. The foregoing interferences undoubtedly estrange the Kurdish culture. They ruin it. But, the aim doesn't stop there. It is to annihilate the culture in its entirety. Here, more than creation of a Kurdish society to develop and strengthen Turkish colonialism, it is a question of total destruction of all that is Kurdish. The measures do of course create conditions favorable to the colonizing state. But, the aim is not the mere creation of these conditions. It is the annihilation of everything that is Kurdish. All tangible and intangible resources of Kurdistan have been confiscated. The aim is no doubt to better control and exploit Kurdistan. It is to loot Kurdistan's natural resources. Kurdistan is an important source of raw materials. It is also a good market for Turkish goods. Dominant countries with economic muscles used to control others through money-banking-credit arrangements. They would take advantage of their roles in international relations. The developing countries such as Turkey, Iran and Iraq can perpetuate such colonialist exploitation only through harsh repression. And in Turkey, colonialist exploitation is possible only through total annihilation of the characteristics making up the Kurdish nation.

In spite of all these views and practices, UNESCO has chosen to present Kemalism as "friend of all enslaved and captive peoples, on the side of all oppressed nations". Kemalism is described as having "blazed the trail for all oppressed nations' struggles for freedom and independence" by words and deeds. This action is undoubtedly contrary to UNESCO's ideals and practices. It is also in violation of the concepts and understandings whose dissemination, widespread acceptance and supremacy in the international arena UNESCO painstakingly strives to achieve. In the longer run, it can damage UNESCO's credibility and render it both ineffective and unnecessary. UNESCO cannot enhance its standing by honoring and compromising with racist and colonialist policies. UNESCO cannot achieve its aims by giving unqualified support and encouragement to cultural imperialism. It can enhance its image by siding with the oppressed nations facing racist and colonialist policies. It can enhance its standing by siding with nations whose language and culture are under racist and colonialist pressures, by siding with nations confronted with the most reactionary, most destructive type of cultural imperialism. Only this way can it realize its objectives.

In this regard, there are many subjects that the UN and the various organizations under its umbrella need to study and research. There are subjects that UNESCO, UNICEF and the UN Commission on Human Rights seriously need to inquire into. For example, in Turkey the writers are pressured and subjected to torture even in prisons. The pressure and torture are intensified as soon as it is discovered that the writer is concerned with the question of Kurdistan and wishes to critique Kemalism from this point of view.

In Turkish prisons, next to slaps, fists and kicks falaka is prevalent. These measures are undoubtedly perpetrated. The inmate or the detainee is of course stripped stark naked with the pretext "We'll search your clothes, your personal effects". Nevertheless, falaka is the foremost measure. In this process, the person is made to lie down flat on his

back. His feet are tied with tight rope coming down from the ceiling. The soles of his feet are repeatedly struck with batons until the victim falls unconscious.

Undoubtedly, the writers, too, are frequently faced with such measures. But, more commonly the writers' hands are struck with batons and rods. The following statements and threats are made:

-So, this is our writer. Let's hit the hands that write.  
 -Let's break his fingers. Let's break his wrists. Let him see what it means to write books.  
 -See how I break his fingers. See if he can hold a pencil again. -Hit him on the head, yes, on the head, blow his brain out. Don't let him think again.

Hands are struck until they swell, until the veins split, until blood starts oozing out. This is done with such excitement, with such rage, with such animosity, with such grudge, with such hatred.

Let's say this is the torture inside the prison. It is a repression inside the prison. It is the torture perpetrated against a writer who has been detained, tried, convicted and sentenced to a prison term for writing an article or a book. Such pressures, such tortures are also very common during moving the prisoner from one prison to another.

That a writer is subjected to torture for writing, for writing a book, that such torture is perpetrated in prisons is a disgrace. Especially saying "let's stem the source of the crime", "let's break the fingers, the hands that committed the crime" and striking the hands with batons, making hands bleed are not at all credits to humanity. That a writer is questioned by the prison guards as follows,

-Why did you write?  
 -Will you write again?  
 -Is it not a crime to write?  
 -Is there no one else to write books?

Moreover, that the writer is kicked, detained and subjected to torture is a reflection of what the regime really is. It is a stain that the regime cannot remove in view of history and society. That the prison guards are illiterates who cannot even sign their own names is another aspect of the regime. It's a dramatic aspect.

There is a very significant difference between science and ideology. In analyzing data, in drawing the appropriate conclusions the scientist is not concerned with the numerical superiority of his followers.

He is not concerned with how many people he is going to mobilize in support of his conclusions. What matters to the scientist is whether or not the analysis is scientific, whether or not the conclusions are supported by facts. Science deals with facts. Expression of the conclusions without fear or favor is another unavoidable principle of scientific research. The personal gains or losses resulting from expressing the research findings do not matter. In ideologies, however, especially official ideologies the number of people to be affected by views and deeds are calculated. Here, efforts to determine how many people will be attracted by a particular view or deed are noteworthy. The benefits and opportunities for favoring a particular view or deed are calculated.

For example, "The Turkish History Thesis" and "The Turkish Language

Thesis and Sun Language Theory" which were formulated and developed in the 1930's are very far from scientific views. They are ideologically inspired. These ideological views were developed with the guidance of the Turkish Historical Society and the Turkish Language Society. The professors were leading the developments. They were politicians-cum-professors. The majority of them were also members of parliament. The professors were appointed to the projects by Ataturk and they worked in line with his directives. He ardently desired to prove that his views were the most correct, most scientific views. During those years, Ataturk was the irreplaceable head of the only legal party, the Republican People's Party. Therefore, he was the President. The professors who advocated views in line with Ataturk's views were given tangible and intangible rewards. This is the most significant evidence that "scientific" views in Turkey developed along the official line.

In the 1930's, those who proposed unscientific views, indeed, embarrassingly unscientific views, were given moral and material rewards. In fact, the professors when thinking or writing never lost sight of the attitude and behavior of those in power. They painstakingly attempted to remain within the guidelines set by the authorities. They wrote and stressed what pleased the authorities. They consciously avoided furthering knowledge based on facts. They adamantly stayed away from such knowledge, because they knew that the authorities did not approve of it. And so, in the 1930's, those who were ideologically and politically close to the Republican People's Party were being promoted in the academic world. They would easily become professors. They were encouraged with tangible and intangible incentives. And today, those who criticize these views, those who say they are not scientific views are put behind bars. This of course clearly shows the difference between science and ideology. It stresses the conduct demanded by science and the behavior in line with an official ideology.

There are therefore significant differences between the views and the attitudes of the scientist and of those who are motivated by the official ideology's incentives. The scientist thinks and writes without being concerned about the numerical superiority of followers. Without this concern the scientist writes courageously and honestly what he believes to be factual. The scientist doesn't sit down to calculate his gains or losses. Those who are motivated by the official ideology's incentives, on the other hand, will calculate just how the authorities will react to their doings. For example, when a prison guard beats up a writer, subjects the writer to torture, he always thinks of his superiors' views and behavior.

Where animosity towards the Kurdish national rights and the makings of the Kurdish society is encouraged at the official level, the difficulties facing those who want to write on the Kurdish question and want to critique Kemalism from this point of view are evident.

Head of State, Head of National Security Council and Chief of Staff, Gen Kenan Evren made a public speech on Jan 17, 1981 in Iskenderun (ancient Alexandria in southern Turkey-Tr). In his speech Gen Evren spoke of "the Turkish homeland of 4000 years". He said "There are traitors who want to divide and partition the area which has been the Turkish homeland for 4000 years".

What is the meaning of "Turkish homeland of 4000 years"? Didn't the Turks come to Anatolia in the 11th Century, in 1071? Therefore, the Turks have been in Anatolia for 900 years. Why then speak of Turkish

homeland of 4000 years? This is of course about the Turkish History Thesis which I mentioned earlier. According to this thesis, which was developed in the 1930's, all civilizations in the world were established by the Turks. From Central Asia, the Turks spread to all four corners of the world and established all the civilizations. Consequently, the Sumerians who lived in Mesopotamia and Kurdistan about 4000 BC and the Hitites who lived in Anatolia around 2000 BC were Turks. Accordingly, all the world's languages are derivatives of the Turkish language.

These unscientific views served two political and ideological aims. Firstly, they're meant to prove that everyone living within Turkey's borders is a Turk. It is to pin this proof on an historical foundation. The main concern here is of course with the Kurds. It is to prove that the Kurds are really Turks. The second aim is to boost the morale of the Turks, destroying and alienating the Kurds' own values and standards. It's to facilitate their assimilation.

This ideology which is effectively used in relation to Kurdistan was also used in 1937 during the question of Hatay (ancient Antioch-Tr). To prove that Hatay was Turkish, the Arab inhabitants were referred to as the "Hitite Turks". Hence, Anatolia becomes the "Turkish homeland of 4000 years". That such far fetched views can be put forth as recently as in 1981 is the obvious evidence of just how far away the Turkish thought is from being scientific. It proves that the official ideology has made scientific thinking subservient. Moreover, that this view is put forth by the Head of State and that those who do not believe it are accused of being "traitors" is certainly remarkable.

Scientific thought and behavior reject this view. They stress that it is wrong. Ideological thought and behavior on the other hand applaud it. They don't touch this basic fallacy. They pretend not to see and not to hear of it. What's really worthy of attention here is the fact that this ideology has prevented itself from being criticized. Kemalism is an ideology based on lies. And one of its primary aspects is that it has prevented itself from being criticized, being questioned. Criticism in regard to Kurdistan is linked to penalties of imprisonment. It bestows awards upon those who praise and applaud it. And it puts the critics behind bars. Thereby, it prevents the emergence in the society of free individuals with principles.

In this regard, there are of course many things that the UN, UNESCO and the UN Commission on Human Rights are required to do. Yet these institutions that put their weights alongside racism and colonialism and pretend not to see cultural imperialism will not conduct serious inquiries.

The Turkish Government's reply to questions about torture is rather brief. "Our constitution forbids torture. Torture is a crime according to our laws. Therefore, the allegations of torture are not factual". However, throughout the world all sorts of regimes perpetrating torture always claim there is no torture. In other words, those who say "There is no torture" are the torturers themselves. They are the ones who systematically resort to torture. Moreover, the first deed of the generals that seized power on sept 12, 1980 was to suspend the 1961 constitution which advocated freedom of thought and human rights, and which outlawed torture. The Turkish Grand National Assembly (Turkish Parliament-Tr) was dissolved. All elected officials in the provinces and municipalities were dismissed after the military coup. The military regime which suspended the constitution in effect substituted itself, its own will for the constitution. Nevertheless, today thousands of youngsters

are on trial for wanting to change the constitution, for attempting to dissolve the Grand National Assembly. Again, let me say that the freedom of thought and expression, the concept of human rights etc. in the 1961 constitution will be restored "with the proviso that the Kurdish question must not be touched".

At the beginning of this writing, I expressed the need to assess Kemal's views in the light of his deeds. It is not all that meaningful to analyze views expressed in speeches and in writings. It is more meaningful to analyze the deeds. In this regard, I explained above Ataturk's views on wars of liberation. Then, I dwelled on his deeds in relation to the question of Kurdistan. I stressed that his words and deeds were contradictory.

Another example I can give is about the concept of "democracy". It's claimed that: Ataturk said, "Power to govern unconditionally rests with the people" and he met all the requirements dictated by this statement. Ataturk unequivocally believed people to be the source of political legitimacy. He always stressed that the right to govern belonged to the people. He always abided by the requisites of this belief. He was devoted to democratic legitimacy. And he explained that this was the most reliable source of contemporary ways.

There is a consensus about Ataturk's "Power to govern unconditionally rests with people." and about the conclusions to be drawn from this saying of his. Yet, the facts of life, concrete reality do not substantiate these conclusions. Ataturk founded the Republican People's Party (RPP) in 1923. He was the head (always called chairman in Turkey-Tr) of the party. The party's charter was made in 1927. In the following years, the charter was changed numerous times. But, the basic edicts remained the same. They did not change a bit. According to this charter, the head of the party is Mustafa Kemal, the Veteran (just another title Kemal bestowed on himself-Tr), and thus he personally selected all members of the Turkish Grand National Assembly. In the process he consulted the second chairman of the party and the Secretary General. But, he was the one who did the actual selection. Hence, he appointed members of Parliament as he would appoint public servants. The voters merely put the list of names prepared by Mustafa Kemal. This was the function of the electorate. They had no other function or authority.

Turkey's Grand National Assembly was made up of the people hand-picked by Mustafa Kemal to be the representatives. And in the very first sitting of the Parliament, they would elect Mustafa Kemal the President. This is what happened in the 1927, 1931 and 1935 "elections". Later on, the "elections" in 1938, 1939 and 1943 took place also according to this procedure. So did the "by-elections". Whenever a vacancy occurred in the Parliament, a new representative was appointed. And this appointment was easier than appointing a public servant to a post in a ministry. The "election" process was meant to blur this simple procedure.

There is another significant aspect to the charter of the Republican People's Party. And that was the fact that Mustafa Kemal was the irreplaceable chairman of the party. It's evident that there was a single party and the head of the party could not be replaced. He was the chairman for life. The second chairman of the party was automatically the Prime Minister. It is also seen that after 1935, the Party's Secretary General was automatically the Minister for Internal Affairs.

Undoubtedly this can't be described as a democratic process. The view that respects will of the people doesn't allow the Parliament to be

constituted via appointments. And the institution thus formed cannot be properly called parliament. This process is in fact more closely aligned with the totalitarian regimes developing in Europe in those years.

Here, it is also necessary to look at the relation between the 1924 Constitution and the RPP charter. The party's charter commanded far more attention than the 1924 Constitution. And it was implemented to the letter. It is of course necessary to look at the RPP charter and the 1924 Constitution as legal documents. In line with the Constitution, elections were held every four years and the President was elected by the Parliament. But, the more significant edicts were in the Party's charter. Because it was the charter that described the election process for the members of the Parliament. And the charter of the Republican People's Party left the process to the discretion of its chairman. Just as a public servant was appointed to a post, so were the members of Parliament. Therefore, Mustafa Kemal as the chairman of the RPP had a higher status than his position as the President. Because, he was appointing members of the Parliament in his capacity as the chairman of the Party rather than as the President of the Republic. Then, those people he appointed would in turn elect him as the President. This was the relation between the one party and the constitution.

The hub of the system was Turkey's Grand National Assembly. But, this was a Parliament only in appearance. It existed to give the political set up "the appearance of democracy". However, its make up was anything but democratic. Because, it was not an institution that came into being as a result of the people exercising their free will. The members were not elected by the people. What prevailed was the will of one man rather than the will of the nation, will of the people. It is also a truism that the doings of an institution which is not democratically constituted will not be democratic. Be that as it may, even at the time when Mustafa Kemal said "Power to govern unconditionally rests with the people" he did not fail to warn the Members of Parliament, "I am the one who gathered you here. I can dismiss you and send you back whenever I please".

All these are tangible proofs that Mustafa Kemal did not attach any significance to democratic legitimacy. It cannot be said that he respected will of the people. Nor that he was in favor of democratic views and processes.

That political systems based on the wishes of "One Man" are inconsistent with the human rights concept is also an important fact. There is a profound contradiction between the "One Man" concept and the concept of human rights. That these facts are not acknowledged, are not explained is another matter. It is one thing to say in those days there was no other choice; this was the only viable way. It is quite another thing to claim, as the Turkish press, academics, associations, unions, in short, the Turkish democracy, do, that "Mustafa Kemal very much respected democratic principles". They avoid looking at and researching the concrete facts of life. They also pretend not to see, not to hear of the repression directed at those who critique Kemalism, particularly those who critique it in its relation to Kurdistan. The Turkish democrats are devoid of the concept expressed by the maxim, "I may disagree with everything you say, but I will do all I can to enable you to say it". (This is the Turkish version of Voltaire's saying which is actually as follows: I disapprove of what you say but I will defend to death your right to say it. -Tr). The Turks pretend to be unaware, to have not heard of this statement made in Europe in the 18th Century



This mentality is not a product of the Sept 12, 1980 military regime either. The situation is the same when there is a multi-party parliament constituted by the free exercise of the will of the people, when there is freedom for the press and the unions, and when there are political rights.

At this point, it is also necessary to look at the concepts of democracy and republicanism. It is true that Mustafa Kemal changed the source of political power. In the days of the Ottoman Empire, religion was the source of political power. In the Republic, the source is nationhood. But this is the case only in theory. In principle, there isn't much difference between passing down the throne to a son and the concept of "irreplaceable chairman", and therefore irreplaceable President.

In spite of all these facts, it is alleged that Kemalism respects the will of the people and democratic way of life. This shows the development of their views and actions with regard to democracy to be based on double standards. For example, in 1930 during the Kurdish national resistance around Mt Ararat, in the face of the Kurds demanding national rights the then Minister of Justice Mr Mahmut Esat Bozkurt said the following:

"In this country only the Turks have national rights. Those who are not Turks have but one right. The right to be servants to the Turks. The right to be slaves."

Such statements were also frequently made by the second chairman of the RPP and the Prime Minister Mr Ismet Inonu. Those who speak of freedom and democracy pretend to be unaware of, never heard of these events. Despite all these, that the claim about Kemalism respecting democratic legitimacy can be made is an end product of the process of disinformation campaigns irrespective of concrete facts.

What is the situation today? The Sept 12, 1980 coup has dissolved the Parliament. It has dismissed local authorities elected by the people. They have been replaced by new appointments. The majority of the new appointees are retired army officers. All bodies that were products of elections have been disbanded. The activities of political parties and unions have been stopped. Undoubtedly all these mean lack of confidence in the multi-party parliamentary system. And therefore, it means lack of confidence in the will of the people and the democratic mechanisms.

The Sept 12 regime says that a Founding Congress will commence functioning and will draft a new constitution in the spring of 1981. It has already been announced that no one representing the political parties will be allowed to join the Founding Congress. It is stressed as a matter of importance that no one from the dissolved parliament will be allowed to join the Congress. As it becomes clear who cannot, that is, who will not be allowed to join the Founding Congress, who will join and how they will join also becomes more or less clear. Roughly, this body can consist of persons nominated by the National Security Council (ie, the generals who seized power-Tr). Undoubtedly, this is not a democratic approach and action. It is anti-democratic. Nevertheless, the National Security Council claims that democracy will be restored, that it is attempting to establish democracy. Though this is anathema to democracy, it is very much in line with Ataturk's behavior. I have already stated that Ataturk made the appointments to Turkey's Grand National Assembly.

A constitution drafted by the NSC, one that reflects its own views may

be accepted as the constitution for the Republic of Turkey. In any event, although the announcement of forming a Founding Congress has been made, it is also stressed that the NSC will have the final say. The Founding Congress will act as an advisory body to the NSC. It can prevent the draft constitution from being openly discussed in the press, on radio and television. This too is of course not a behavior espousing freedom. But, it is in line with Ataturk's deeds. It is also clear that as the NSC claims to be following in Ataturk's footsteps, it views Ataturk with his similar deeds. Anyone who claims to be "pro-Ataturk" cannot be against this process, that is, these arbitrary appointments.

With the Sept 12 coup, the Parliament in Turkey was dissolved. The representatives' constitutional right of immunity from prosecution was suspended. The majority of them are detained. Legal actions have been initiated against them. And Gen Kenan Evren, Head of State, Head of NSC and Chief of Staff, in every speech levels serious accusations at the (former) Parliamentarians, the Parliament and political parties. Nevertheless, about 12 members of this dissolved Parliament continue to take part in the meetings of the European Council. At the Council's meetings these people say "the Military Regime has promised to return to democracy." They praise the views and actions of the NSC. "There is no torture in Turkey. Even if there is, the Government looks seriously at the allegations of torture. It investigates the allegations and brings the perpetrators to justice", they say. And the NSC is very eager to have such representatives at the European Council.

At this point it is of course important to ask the following questions:

In what capacity are these people participating in the European Council's meetings, since their status as parliamentarians was revoked with the Sept 12, 1980 coup? What is the mechanism for people who do not have parliamentary status in Turkey to join the European Council's regular meetings? Are these individuals participating in the meetings as parliamentarians? Since their parliamentary status in Turkey has been revoked, how do they continue in their relations with the European Council? Why does the NSC want this relation to continue? For what reasons does the European Council want this arrangement to continue?

All these are closely related with double standards in views and behavior. The situation is the same in their approach to "democracy", too. Double standards apply to the European Council's views and conduct as well. The European Council has made no inquiries into the question of human rights in Turkey. The Turkish Constitution claims the Turkish Government to be a lawful government based on respect for human rights.

It is stressed that respect for human rights is paramount in public service, at the universities, in the judiciary and in political parties. But, the policy directed at the Kurdish people is diametrically opposed to the concept of human rights.

The 1950 European Covenant on basic human rights and fundamental liberties aims to protect and develop human rights in member countries. The governments that are prepared to accept these fundamental principles are allowed to become members. Turkey, however, declares its acceptance of these principles and at the same time perpetrates its racist and colonialist policy in Kurdistan. At the beginning of this writing I attempted to explain the policies directed at the Kurds. It is not possible for the members of the European Council to be unaware of these policies.

Consequently, when evaluating the life of any leader, any party chief or a statesman one must look at their deeds more than their words. At

the very least, both their deeds and words should be analyzed. On the other hand, it is not possible to ascertain whether a government respects human rights by looking at the Constitution or the judicial verdicts. It cannot be determined by the letters of the laws. It can be determined by looking at concrete, tangible reality. It can be ascertained by looking at whether or not the laws are enforced. The subject cannot be properly analyzed by the quality of the laws. Analysis must be through sociological research. Reasons for the inconsistencies between the laws and their applications need to be researched.

## CONCLUSION

1. That people do not change their views, behavior and knowledge is out of the question. Individuals and institutions can always renew themselves via questioning, criticism and self-criticism. But, in the short term, there is no possibility that the Turkish writers and "democrats" will criticize Kemalism in its relation to the Kurdish question. The Turkish press, university circles, political parties, associations etc cannot engage in such criticism and self-criticism. Because, the Kemalist ideology has enveloped the Turkish society, the intellectuals as a strait jacket, as a mediaval armory. The university circles, the press, the educational institutions etc have uncritically adopted this ideology. They claim the ideological views to be the most fundamental factual knowledge. They deem this knowledge to be over and above criticism and discussion.

And Kemalism is frequently praised. Those who praise Kemalism more and those who do so more skilfully are given awards. All state institutions give awards. Private organizations such as Banks and Chambers of Commerce too give awards. There is an intense competition to praise Kemalism. And those who criticize Kemalism, especially those who do so in its relation to Kurdistan are put behind bars. Thus, Kemalism has been cemented. The ever new praise, statutes and busts have no meaning other than contributing to Ataturk's inflexibility. Yet, the widespread acceptance of Kemalist views and their adoption by various groups in the society as well as their aloof status as over and above criticism do not prove that they are factual, scientific. They only show how powerful Kemalist ideology is. They show that the ideology based on lies dominates and manipulates the public, organizations and various classes. It is necessary not to forget that Kemalism is an official ideology based on lies.

2. There is benefit in explaining why Kemalism cannot be criticized in its relation to Kurdistan. At the start of my writing, I explained the relations between a person, an elephant and a tree. More correctly

I explained the information to be revealed by a person who had perceived an elephant to be a tree. If the person's perception is wrong, for example, due to a defect in his/her sense organs, the perception can be corrected once the defect is rectified. The person can then recognize the error. In such cases, there is no question of ideologically inspired behavior. The error in this person's knowledge is solely due to wrong perception. With technological advances new knowledge may be uncovered which may necessitate a change in current views. Persons who are not ideologically motivated, who are not obliged to adjust their beliefs in conformance with an ideology will readily accept the changes.

In Turkey, however, the claim that the Kurds are really Turks is not due to a defect in sense organs. Nor is it due to lack of sufficient evidence. It is downright ideological. It is a view in conformity with the official ideology. This view is maintained in spite of concrete evidence to the contrary. The person clinging to this view and this attitude cannot engage in criticism and self-criticism. This is a fixation. It is a belief. Questioning this belief will deprive the person of all the benefits provided by the official ideology.

Whenever doing something or advancing an argument, those who conform to an official ideology are always mindful of the authorities. They calculate beforehand whether or not their argument or action will please the authorities. In science, however, facts are what matters. The concern is not with how many people will be led how far. The scientist explains everything that may be supported and proven by facts. In doing so, the scientist is not concerned with the numerical superiority of followers.

Science is the most reliable way of furthering knowledge. It is the most dependable way of understanding and explaining nature, history, society etc. Ideologies however do not further knowledge. They merely reiterate the existing knowledge. Depending on circumstances at a particular time and place, they may reinterpret existing knowledge. Ideologies are frozen, hardened moulds. They are unable to renew themselves. If no longer useful, an ideology may be discarded and replaced by a more useful one. In science, there is but one standard at various times and places. It is the scientific way. There is no substitute for it. Ideologies in contrast use different standards at various times and places.

3. It is evident that in Turkey, scientific activities, especially in social areas are along political lines. Efforts to criticize Kemalism are thwarted.

But the world doesn't consist of Turkey alone. In every part of the world there are individuals and institutions espousing democratic views. And the views are developing further. There are individuals and scientists who look at events scientifically everywhere. The number of individuals and organizations with courage and integrity to explain events is increasing daily.

It's important to reassess Kemalism and review the information on this subject on the anniversary of Ataturk's 100th birthday. UNESCO and world democratic public opinion can do this. In meetings on Kemalism this subject can be dealt with. Measures can be taken to insure that scientists explain their views and perspectives of Kemalism. But, Kemalism cannot be properly assessed by ignoring the facts surrounding the question of Kurdistan. It is necessary to research and assess Kemalism from this perspective, too. UNESCO can be helpful in this process.

Hence, the issue is not the analysis of views, that is the written and the spoken words. It is the analysis of deeds. That is what matters is research not into what was said and written down, but into what was done. It is important to ascertain the contradictions between what was said and written and what was in fact done. So is the explanation of the reasons.

4. Human rights is one of the primary concepts giving direction to the 20th Century. So is the right of nations to self determination, democracy, equality and freedom. Respect for human rights is the most significant evidence of being contemporary. Human rights are for all

human beings. They cannot be made subject to preconditions. However, in Turkey the exercise of human rights by the Kurds has been subject to one important condition. They can exercise human rights to the extent they repudiate their heritage, their national identity. To the extent they are Turkified they can exercise human rights. This condition however is diametrically opposed to the very basis of the human rights concept. It negates it. For example, a person's right to learn his mother tongue comes well before the right to read newspapers. But, a person whose mother tongue is banned cannot be said to benefit from this right. It cannot be said that if you want to read newspapers you have to learn such and such language. It cannot be said that only those who know Turkish can read newspapers. In fact, making such a condition a prerequisite for the right to read newspapers destroys the very essence of the right. Because, social, cultural and artistic activities are most successful when carried out in one's native language.

Insuring the democratization of social and cultural activities and the development of civilian rule are the most significant dimensions of being contemporary. All these are closely linked with affluence and increased participation in cultural activities. This is one of the concepts UNESCO endeavors to develop in international relations. Kemalism, however, makes every possible effort to annihilate the Kurdish language and culture. It has made the repudiation of Kurdish ethnic identity, language and culture a precondition for the Kurds to participate in cultural activities. This is of course a racist and colonialist attitude. It is cultural imperialism. Hence, UNESCO should also assess this dimension of Kemalism on the 100th anniversary of Ataturk's birth. What is UNESCO's view of the cultural policy of Kemalism and of the cultural imperialism practiced in Kurdistan? Can the cultural policy of Kemalism be properly assessed by pretending not to see the racist and colonialist policy implemented in Kurdistan?

5. Kurdistan was partitioned in the first quarter of the 20th Century. The 'divide & rule' policy was applied to the Kurdish nation at the same time. This policy is one of the most significant factors behind the political instability in the Middle East. It also prevents peace in the Middle East. Because, freedom, democracy, self determination are the natural rights of every nation. These are the rights whose exercise cannot be restricted through preconditions and preferences.

Kurdistan, however, is an international colony in the heart of the Middle East. It has been divided and partitioned. It is the common colony of Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Syria. All its intangible riches, its language, culture and heritage have been confiscated. Its very existence is denied. All its material wealth is plundered. Therefore, it is only natural that the Kurdish nation is struggling for freedom and autonomy. It is natural that it wages national liberation struggles to free itself from international colonialism. Its struggle for the right to exist cannot be thwarted.

The Kurdish nation has been waging national liberation struggles for freedom and autonomy for more than 60 years, despite the imperialist and colonialist 'divide & rule' policy. The Kurdish efforts are viewed as disturbing the peace and stability in the Middle East. And the efforts to tighten the grips of imperialist and colonialist policy are presented as measures to establish peace and political stability. This is of course the natural result of viewing national liberation struggles with different standards.

Early in the 20th century, those who partitioned Kurdistan and applied the 'divide & rule' policy to Kurdistan did so to perpetuate and regenerate political instability in the Middle East. This is readily

observed when one looks at the political make up in the Middle East.

The Islamic movement under Ayatollah Khomeini in Iran defeated the Shah with the slogan, "You can't go against will of the people". According to Khomeini, the Shah frustrated will of the people. He was a despot. He negated the people's freedom. That's why he lost. But, once in power Khomeini violently opposed to the demands from Kurdistan for freedom and autonomy. He attempted to suppress by force the Kurdish nation's demands for freedom, equality and democracy.

In fact, he adopted the Shah's policy towards Kurdistan exactly. He went to pains to implement this racist and colonialist policy. He resorted to every type of measure to prevent changes in Kurdistan. He armed the reactionary forces in Kurdistan. He encouraged them to collaborate with the central government in opposing the demands for freedom, autonomy and democracy. He gave weapons to the landlords, tribal chiefs and Sheikhs who agreed to collaborate, that is, those who agreed to oppose the Kurdish national movement. He made efforts to invoke the 'divide & rule' policy and set the Kurds against one another. He collaborated with SAVAK (The Shah's notorious police-Tr). His opposition to the will of the Kurdish people thus made him a new Shah, a "bearded Shah". Insistence on racist and colonialist policies cannot produce any other outcome. Therefore, those who do not develop democratic alternatives in relation to the question of Kurdistan will be unsuccessful in implementing their views in the name of "revolution".

Let's look at the 1975 Algiers agreement between Iran and Iraq, which was arranged with Algeria's mediation as well as overt encouragement and covert participation by Turkey. The fundamental factor behooving the two governments to reach an agreement was the question of Kurdistan. According to the terms, the Shah closed the border to the Kurds and cut off the supplies. In return, Iraq made territorial concessions in the Shatt-al Arab region. This agreement made the Kurdish national movement in southern Kurdistan, in other words, northern Iraq, collapse. The war between Iran and Iraq which started in September 1980 clearly shows how shaky the foundations of this agreement were. It shows how short term and void the agreements reached at the expense of the Kurds, at the price of the Kurds' suffering really are. Because, territorial concessions to Iran in 1975 created repercussions against the Baath regime in Iraq and in the Arab world. So, the Iraqi regime was waiting for an opportunity to retake the territory. The opportunity presented itself in 1980 when the Iranian Government appeared to be too fragile.

In Turkey one of the most important reasons for political instability and the failure to maintain law and order is again the question of Kurdistan. Economic developments, social and political changes and penetration of capitalism into the rural areas make the impact of the Kurdish nation's question felt more and more everyday and push it towards the top of agendas. Rural migration to the cities, the growing impact of mass media, events unfolding in Iran and Iraq, national liberation movements in the Middle East and the world all are raising the consciousness of the Kurds. Political developments in the world, in the Middle East, in Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Syria are enhancing the Kurds' awareness of their own political status.

On the other hand, Kurdistan is not the same old Kurdistan. It is developing rapidly. Research into the history of Kurdistan and social make up is increasing daily. The Kurdish culture and language are better understood and explained. In such an environment where scientific research is taking place, the claim "There are traitors. They want

to cut Turkey into pieces. These are the ploys of our external enemies , of imperialism" is laughable. Because, it is Kurdistan that has been cut into pieces. It is the Kurdish nation that has been subjected to the 'divide & rule' policy. And the collaborators with the imperialism's 'divide & rule' policy with the most blood on their hands are the Kemalists. All these are readily documented. In any event, the real facts of life, concrete reality verify this. There can be no doubt that scientific research will move forward.

The Turkish State has adopted the policy of suppressing, of thwarting all these developments as one of its fundamental and inexorable aims. This policy necessitates an authoritarian approach. It behooves interferences with with "democracy", "fundamental freedoms" and multi-party political systems. Consequently, the State becomes militaristic. The military and the security forces grow and become dominant. The State's emphasis on human rights via its concept of "law & order" is fundamentally contrary to the Kurds' demands for equality, freedom and democracy. And it necessitates the development and strengthening the State inspired terror. Nevertheless, it is an obvious fact that through force and violence thinking and scientific inquiries cannot be halted.

Moreover, the racist and colonialist policy applied in Kurdistan is one of the most significant factors in the development of a fascist movement. The State terror and the fascist terror are coming together. The Government is overlooking the development of a fascist movement and from time to time encourages it. Because, the slogans used by the fascist movement and the givens of the official ideology are very close to each other, especially with respect to the question of Kurdistan. Fascist movement is secular. Therefore, it is more easily used to prevent the development of the leftist movement in Turkey. This reality is an important dimension of political development in Turkey. It is an important factor in the instability and absence of peace in the society.

The imperialists partitioned Kurdistan in order to perpetrate and renew political tensions in the Middle East. There can be no doubt about it. This is the primary aim of the 'divide & rule' policy. To keep political instability alive and dynamic and thereby to strengthen their control over social and economic forces in the region. Preservation of the status quo intensifies the control. Super powers are also involved. They too make every effort to prevent changes, to maintain status quo. From time to time, using the Kurdish nation as a threat they attempt to get the governments concerned to accept their policy terms. The policy of the super powers has so far developed in this manner.

Undoubtedly, all these can't prevent the Kurdish nation from struggling for its national rights. They can't halt its struggle for freedom and independence. Therefore, one of the important responsibilities of all democratic and revolutionary forces is to support the Kurdish people's struggle for their national and democratic rights. It is a primary responsibility to take a stand against the racist and colonialist policy in Kurdistan and to decipher the status of Kurdistan as an international colony. It is necessary to prevent the states that have divided Kurdistan and maintain it as an international colony from using the Kurds as a threat and an instrument of pressure against one another. The super powers should not be allowed to do the same thing through their delicate diplomacy and via their economic and military policies. It's necessary to decipher these policies and applications.







