TURKEY’S US BACKED ‘WAR ON TERROR’: A CAUSE FOR CONCERN? – By Desmond Fernandes.¹

With the US government’s stated aim of vigorously assisting the Turkish state with its ‘operations’ that are targeted at ‘hunting down’ and ‘eradicating’ the ‘rebel’ Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK),² many human rights organisations, concerned Kurdish and Turkish civilians, peace campaigners and public interest groups are justifiably concerned that the genocidal and ‘psychological warfare’ linked ‘policies and practices of the recent past’ may all too chillingly reappear once again in the region.³ It is important to appreciate why there is concern about a resurgence of ‘intensive’ US backed support for the Turkish state’s ‘War on Terror’. Chomsky observes that the last time such support was provided – during the 1990’s – “there was no ‘looking away’ in the case of Turkey and the Kurds: Washington ‘looked right there’, as did its allies, saw what was happening, and acted decisively to intensify the atrocities’ against Kurds, “particularly during the Clinton years. The US did not ‘fail to protect the Kurds’ or ‘tolerate’ the abuses they suffered” during the Turkish state’s ‘War on Terror’ “anymore than Russia ‘fails to protect’ the people of Grozny or ‘tolerates’ their suffering. The new generation” of ‘humanitarian’ western leaders “drew the line by consciously putting as many guns as possible into the hands of the killers and torturers – not just guns, but jet planes, tanks, helicopter gunships, all the most advanced instruments of terror – sometimes in secret, because arms were sent in violation of congressional legislation. At no point was there any defensive purpose, nor any relation to the Cold War … In the case of the Kurds’ in Turkey, “helping them would interfere with US power interests. Accordingly, we cannot help them but must rather join in perpetrating atrocities against them”.⁴

The US Backed ‘Counter-Terrorism/Counter-Guerrilla’ Offensive of the 1990’s.

During this major US backed Turkish ‘counter-terrorism/counter-guerrilla’ offensive, supposedly directed only against ‘the terrorist PKK organisation’ and its ‘militant members’, thousands of Kurdish civilians were tortured and extra-judicially executed by state linked paramilitary forces. Many women were subjected to rape by Turkish state linked forces. “Turkish counter-guerrillas would commit


² The PKK and its successor, or affiliated, organisations (including the Kurdistan People’s Congress - Kongra-Gel and The Congress for Freedom and Democracy in Kurdistan - KADEK) have been listed by the UK, Turkish and US governments as ‘terrorist’ organisations. According to a 25th August 2006 Today.Az report, the “British parliament has passed a bill that bans activity of PKK, Kongra-Gel and KADEK terrorist organizations in the country… According to the new bill, every kind of property belonging to PKK, Kongra-Gel and KADEK will be confiscated … The bill considers it a crime to become a PKK member or support it” (‘British parliament considers PKK, Kongra-Gel and KADEK as terrorist organizations’, Today.Az, Accessed at: http://www.today.az/news/politics/29794.html). The PKK, in recent years, has agreed to a number of unilateral ceasefires - for example, in 1993, 1995, and 1998. After the abduction of its President in 1999, the “movement” stated that it had “abandoned the armed struggle strategy”. It has explained its recent armed activities in the following manner: “On 1 June 2004, the period of self-defence was forced on us. In our new struggle strategy, the HPG (People’s Self-Defence Forces) is not a force pursuing struggle as an armed struggle, but is engaged in armed self-defence against armed attacks on our people. In the face of attacks launched on us, the new period began with the retaliatory actions of the HPG. On 10 August 2005, our movement began a one month ‘no action’ period as a friendly gesture to Prime Minister Erdogan’s speech in Diyarbakir and in response to peace efforts of a group of intellectuals to give a chance to peace and democratic solution. In reply, however, the Turkish military increased its attacks and, as a result, during the one month ‘no action’ period, the HPG forces losses multiplied fourfold”. Since then, the movement has explained that it has had to engage in ‘self-defence’, but is supportive of ceasefire initiatives (Source: Kurdistan Democratic Confederalism [KKK] Executive Council, ‘Declaration for the Democratic Resolution of the Kurdish question’, August 20, 2006. Accessed at: http://www.kurdmedia.com/articles.asp?id=13093). An ANF - Firat News Agency report, dated 30th August 2006, also stated that a “written statement of Kongra Gel indicated that ‘Koma Komalen Kurdistan (KKK, Confederalism of Kurdistan, Kongra Gel is the Assembly) made a peace declaration declared on 23 August, 2006, and they supported this. They also indicated that they were in search of a peaceful solution without violence for the resolution of the Kurdish question and they are expecting a response” from the Turkish state “on this regard” (‘Kongra Gel condemns bomb attacks’, ANF - Firat News Agency, Accessed at: http://www.kurdmedia.com/news.asp?id=13123).


crimes and blame them on opposition [i.e. ‘terrorist’] groups” in what are known as ‘false flag’ operations. “Often, they disguised themselves as PKK guerrillas and went to villages to torment and kill people, burning houses, crops and animals, then blaming it on the PKK.” These ‘false flag’ ‘operations’, one should note, were all in keeping with the type of advice that had been imparted from US ‘training manuals’ that the Turkish state had been provided with for years: “Among the instruction manuals was also the notorious classified Field Manual 30-31 together with its appendices FM30-31A and FM30-31B written by US terrorism experts of the Pentagon secret service Defence Intelligence Agency (DIA) … On some 140 pages the manual offers, in non-euphemistic clear-cut language, advice for activities in the fields of sabotage, bombing, killing, torture, terror and fake elections. As maybe its most sensitive advice, FM 30-31 instructs … secret soldiers to carry out acts of violence in times of peace and then blame them on the Communist enemy in order to create a situation of fear and alertness”.7

Reports in The Turkish Daily News (13 July 1994), furthermore, have confirmed that Turkish military officials, commanders and Chiefs of Staff continued to be briefed, advised and even awarded ‘Legion of Merit’ medals by US Pentagon staff,8 high ranking members of the US armed forces and psychological warfare organisations including the US Army ‘Special Operations Command’ (Concerning the ‘Legion of Merit’ medal, this is, indeed, an ‘honour’ of sorts – Colonel George S. Patton III and notorious de facto psychological warfare operational death squad leaders such as General Alvarez of Honduras have also been bestowed with such ‘illustrious’ medals).9 Between 3-5 million Kurds were forcibly displaced, Kurdish forests were deliberately set alight and between 3,500-4,000 villages and hamlets were evacuated and bombed, and wholly or partially destroyed in the Kurdish ‘south east’ by Turkish state forces, creating devastation on a horrific scale. Atrocities were also committed by the Turkish state against Kurdish civilians during ‘anti-terrorism, anti-PKK inspired incursions’ into the US-UK ‘protected safe haven’ in northern Iraq during this period, without formal complaints being issued by the US-UK governments (Indeed, President Clinton is known to have given permission for a major Turkish incursion into northern Iraq in 1995). Hartung confirms that, with Clinton’s ‘clearance’ of the 1995 incursion, “Turkish troops did plenty of things in Northern Iraq, including a number of documented cases of killings and displacement of Kurdish civilians”.10 As John Deere noted with concern in 2000: “Were this Kosovo, we would be hearing words like ‘genocide’ and ‘ethnic cleansing’. You see, to kill Kurds”, in his opinion, in Turkey and northern Iraq, “all you need is the proper hunting license. In this case that license is a perk of NATO membership”.11

According to Chalmers Johnson, we need to be aware that, “in 1991, Congress … passed a law … authorising something called the Joint Combined Exchange Training (JCET) program. This allowed the Department of Defence to send [US] special operations forces on overseas exercises with military units of other countries … The various [US] special forces … interpreted this law as an informal invitation to train foreign military forces in numerous lethal skills … Stripped of its euphemistic
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10 The Turkish Daily News (13 July 1994 edition) reported that “Karadayi, Commander of the Turkish land forces [who was to become Turkey’s Chief of Staff] was officially invited to receive the US Legion of Merit medal at a ceremony held at the Pentagon”.
8 The Turkish Daily News (13 July 1994 edition) reported that “Karadayi, Commander of the Turkish land forces [who was to become Turkey’s Chief of Staff] was officially invited to receive the US Legion of Merit medal at a ceremony held at the Pentagon”.
language”, this ‘Foreign Internal Defence’ (FID) programme “amount[ed] to little more than instruction in state terrorism”. Ted Galen Carpenter has revealed that, “in 1997, the US European Command’s special operations branch”, as part of this programme, “conducted joint training exercises with Turkey’s Mountain Commandos, a unit whose principal mission is to eliminate Kurdish guerrillas. That unit” had, however, in its ‘War on Terror’, actually “been responsible for atrocities against Kurdish civilians and the razing of Kurdish villages”. Ward Churchill has concluded that “both US and British pilots” were even “assigned to provide air support to Turkish military forces conducting a large scale counterinsurgency campaign in northern Iraq against Kurdish guerrillas seeking to establish an independent state … With regard to air support missions flown in support of the Turks, violations of the 1923 Hague Rules of Aerial Combat, the 1949 Geneva Convention IV and Additional Protocol 1, UNGA Res. 2444, and the 1978 Red Cross Fundamental Rules of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts are apparent. In view of the non-self-governing status accorded the Kurds by both Turkey and Iraq, violation of UNGA Res. 1514 (XV) – the 1960 Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples – is also at issue”. The US administration and intelligence agencies were also actively involved in facilitating the illegal capture and abduction of Abdullah Ocalan (the Chairman of the PKK) in Kenya in 1999. It has also been established that Huseyin Kocadag, Chief of the Special Forces in Hakkari and Deputy Chief of Police in Diyarbakir, who has been identified as “one of the most bloody enemies of the people who organised the units of the ‘head-hunters’ in Kurdistan … was trained at a CIA school in the US”. The Human Rights Watch Arms Project has additionally exposed the way in which “US troops, aircraft and intelligence personnel … remained at their posts throughout Turkey, mingling with Turkish counterinsurgency troops and aircrews in southeastern bases such as Incirlik and Diyarbakir … throughout Turkey’s wide-ranging scorched earth campaign” against Kurdish civilian settlements and PKK hideouts/encampments. This ‘campaign’, indeed, in many peoples and organisations’ view, clearly was ‘genocidal’ in nature: Article 19, in 1997, stated that it believed there was “ample evidence to indict the Turkish government of gross violations of human rights which constitute infringements of … the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide, among other treaties to which Turkey is a party”. The UK Parliamentary Human Rights Group, after field visits to the region and detailed analyses, also concluded that “the depopulation of the Kurdish region is, we believe, part of a deliberate strategy aimed not merely at eliminating a few thousand [PKK] guerrillas, but to extinguish the separate identity of the Kurdish people” … In Britain, as elsewhere, the question of Turkish Kurdistan is often presented” – for instance, by the US-UK governments and the mainstream press – “as one of a reasonably democratic government seeking to cope with an intractable problem of terrorism. We believe that the reality is one of military terrorists aiming to extinguish the identity of a people, and we were much alarmed by the parallel drawn with the Armenian holocaust of 1915-1916. The PKK, like some Armenians during the First World War, took to arms because they could see no prospect of gaining their legitimate political objectives by peaceful means. The response of the Turkish state, as in 1915 and earlier with the Armenians, was to use conciliatory language for external

consumption, while unleashing huge military force against the virtually defenceless civilian population … To characterise the revolt of a subject people against their oppressors as ‘terrorism’ is a woeful misunderstanding which could only arise from ignorance of facts and history”. 20

To Fevzi Veznedaroglu, chairperson of the Turkish Human Rights Association (IHD) in Diyarbakir, “especially since 1991, the counter-insurgency forces targeted the leaders of the democratic struggle … The aim” was to also “target a wider group of people … It [was] not only Kurdish intellectuals and leaders” who were “targeted, but villagers, women and students have been murdered … These human rights violations” were “not just aimed at fundamental rights, at the right to life”, but were “aimed at reducing the Kurdish people to refugees in their country … The torture chambers” were “kept busy” even as the state, intentionally, waged “a dirty war against the whole [Kurdish] population”. 21 A disturbing testimony from a death squad killer named Murat Ipek, if true, further suggests that US forces were directly implicated in the training and co-ordination of the genocidal death squads: “An American … controlled and instructed the contra-teams”. 22

The Nature of the US Backed ‘War on Terror’ in Turkey, Post-9/11 – A Cause for Concern?

Despite the problematic nature of this type of past US ‘psychological warfare assistance’ to the Turkish state (which has not been meaningfully addressed in any international court of law or, apparently, in any formal EU-Turkey accession discussion documents or negotiations), what is equally of concern is that there has been no attempt by the US government to meaningfully take responsibility for its past actions or to even guarantee the Kurdish/Turkish or even its own public that there will be no repeat of such criminal and deeply unethical behaviour again. Indeed, there are now suggestions that the US government, in the name of the ongoing post-9/11 linked ‘War on Terror’, is increasingly supporting the Turkish state once again in its highly questionable ‘anti-terrorism’ offensive against Kurdish civilians, human rights activists, peace campaigners and ‘PKK militants’ in the region.

US ‘special forces’ and intelligence agencies, it needs to be recognised, are, even at this moment in time, extensively liaising with their Turkish counterparts in publicly unaccountable ‘anti-PKK targeting’ and ‘internal defence’ actions that deploy ‘irregular’, covert ‘psychological warfare methods’. The Turkish state, moreover, in recent months, once again appears to have been issued with the appropriate US government ‘hunting licence’ that seemingly enables it to intensify its violence against ‘suspected’ Kurdish ‘terrorists’ and targeted civilian communities in northern Iraq (south Kurdistan) and the south-east of Turkey (north west Kurdistan), now that the PKK and Ocalan have been officially likened by US administration officials to the arch ‘evil doers’ and enemies ‘Osama Bin Laden’ and ‘al-Qaeda’.

Within the context of the post-9/11 ‘global War on Terror’, US administration officials in September 2005 absurdly stated that they viewed the ‘PKK threat’ as gravely as the ‘al Qaeda one’: “Nancy McEldowley, representing the US embassy at an 11th September [2005] commemoration service in Ankara, said in a speech that there was no difference between al Qaeda and the PKK or between Abdullah Ocalan and Osama Bin Laden. ‘Turkey and the United States’ joint battle will continue. There will be no areas for them to retreat where Turkey and the US cannot go. Together we shall hunt the terrorists and destroy them’”. 23 Such a statement was in keeping with the stance which has been taken by the Bush administration ever since 9/11: “US President George W. Bush and Vice-President Dick Cheney have been very clear, repeatedly proclaiming that America and its friends must ‘wage war on terrorism’, that they must ‘hunt down the terrorists’ and destroy them. In his State of the Union speech in January 2002, Bush summoned all nations to ‘eliminate the terrorist parasites who threaten their countries and our own’. After the bombings in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, in May 2003, Cheney

---

22 As interviewed by Temel Demirer in ‘Impression’, Kurdistan Report, No. 25, p. 11.
advised an audience in Washington ‘to recognise the fact that the only way to deal with this threat ultimately is to destroy it. There’s no treaty can solve this problem, there’s no peace agreement, no policy of containment ... [W]e have to go find the terrorists’’ and destroy them!’ ‘The idea is that evil must be physically eliminated. As Bush put it, ‘our responsibility to history is already clear: to answer these attacks and rid the world of evil’’.”

But as the Socialist Party of Kurdistan has noted with alarm, in the post-9/11 period as much as during the period before that, “what is clear is that Turkish politicians and the Turkish media don’t just mean the PKK when they speak of ‘terrorists’ but all Kurdish organisations, Kurdish associations and even the Kurds themselves.” Kurdish organisations, Kurdish associations and even the Kurds themselves and their ‘pro-Kurdish human rights supporters’, to many within the Turkish ‘deep state’, are the ‘terrorist parasites’ who are to be targeted in the name of this US backed ‘War on Terror’. With US state linked comparisons to Bin Laden and al-Qaeda that conveniently place ‘the PKK’ and its ‘supporters’ and ‘members’ at the ‘ultimate threat’ and ‘enemy’ level that can be imagined, it is evident that any and every type of method of targeting this ‘abhorrent, illogical other’ will now be legitimated in the US backed ‘joint hunt’ to destroy ‘the terrorists’. The following examples of ‘who’ the ‘terrorists’ are and how they are being ‘targeted’ in the US backed ‘War on Terror’ makes for disquieting reading:

• At Adana, on May 28th 2004, “Siyar Perincek … who is the Human Rights Association’s (IHD’s) representative for eastern and southeastern Anatolia, was killed … in front of the IHD building … According to witnesses, a grey-coloured civilian car went after Perincek and his friend Mehmet Nurettin Basci, who was driving the motorcycle. The car approached the motorcycle and the men in the car opened the car’s doors, hitting the motorcycle and causing the two youngsters to fall on the ground. Witnesses added that Basci got up immediately and ran away. A man, who got out of the car put his gun against Perincek who was still lying on the ground and fired it ... Witness testimonies” state “that Perincek was shot as he was lying on the ground by a police officer”.” According to the BIA News Centre, “the IHD announced that the police in Adana murdered Siyar Perincek ... During a press conference in the IHD Istanbul office, it was announced that police fired at Siyar Perincek ... as he was driving a motorcycle in Adana. Police then stepped on his back when he fell off from the motorcycle and killed him with a bullet to his back. IHD said there were witnesses who saw the incident. ‘Executions without trials are continuing ... The murderers are free among us,’ said the IHD press statement.”

• Twelve year old Kurdish “Ugur Kaymaz and his father, Ahmet, were killed” in November 2005 “in the south-eastern town of Kiziltepe … in what [Turkish] officials said was an operation against ‘armed terrorists’. Preliminary investigations, including one by parliament’s human rights committee, concluded that the two were unarmesed and may have been innocent civilians ...[A] group of intellectuals rejected the official account of the incident – that the police suspected the two were armed and preparing a terrorist operation, and that identification was difficult in the dark. Media reported that Ugur Kaymaz was hit by 13 bullets, and that his family said he was helping his father, a truck driver, to prepare for a trip to Iraq. ‘A 12-year-old boy who had been playing with his friends two hours earlier did not represent a clear and present danger’ to the security of Turkey, the intellectuals said. ‘Are we living in a country where everyone [i.e. every Kurd who goes about] in the dark gets shot?’ or, indeed, gets accused of being an ‘armed PKK terrorist?’”

• In terms of proposed anti-terrorist actions, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan declared that the Turkish “security forces will intervene against the [Kurdish] pawns of terrorism, even if they are children or women.” General Ya_ar Büyükanıt, who officially took over as the new Turkish chief of general staff on August 28, 2006, also provided the following warning: “The military was not like a small fire that could be extinguished by wind but was rather a huge blaze that became even bigger ... No one can hide behind human rights or democracy to attack this country or its regime”.  

• Concerning “a bombing allegedly carried out by Turkish security forces against a bookstore” in Semdinli “patronized by Kurdish nationalists, … allegations that rogue [?] elements in the security forces were involved in the bombing emerged November 9th 2005, after angry residents of Semdinli chased down … three men suspected of planting the bomb that killed two people and wounded more than a dozen. The suspects turned out to be intelligence agents of the gendarmerie, or paramilitary police”. “Esat Canan, an opposition deputy from Hakkari province, where Semdinli is located, who travelled to the town within hours of the bombing, said the car” belonging to the bombers “also contained a [death] list of names of 105 'potential targets' that included ... the owner of the bookshop. ‘I saw the list and my name had a red X drawn through it,’ Yilmaz told the daily Radikal”. Others included in the ‘list’ included City Council member Emin Sarı and [pro-Kurdish] DEHAP Province [Party] President Emrullah Öztürk”.

Human Rights Association Chairman Yusuf Alatas noted with concern that “some illegal criminal organizations within the state [apparatus] acting in the name of ‘counter-terrorism’” and the ‘War on Terror’ “are active in Turkey. He said: ‘The Semdinli case was the last link of this chain. We, the people are aware that the Semdinli case was not an isolated incident ... These events should be questioned; otherwise Turkey will not see democracy’”. However, when these ‘events’ were seriously questioned and investigated by two key individuals – Sabri Uzun (Director of the Police Security Intelligence Bureau) and Ferhat Sankaya (prosecutor in the Semdinli bombing case) – they were removed from their posts under highly questionable circumstances that suggested that a major cover-up was underway. Their findings, however, are worth reflecting upon: “Sabri Uzun … raised concern about possible military involvement in the bombings in Semdinli when he was questioned by a parliamentary commission. He indicated in coded but quite clear terms that the [Semdinli] explosion had possibly been the work of people within the security forces, and expressed doubt that the gendarmes indicted for the bookshop attack could have been in Semdinli without the knowledge of higher ranking officials, as claimed. Within a month, Sabri Uzun was removed from his post … [Prosecutor] Sarıkaya, issued an indictment in which he … suggested that a motive for the original killing may have been ‘[t]o bring the local [Kurdish] population to a state where it can be lured with ease into action … then exaggerating this threat beyond its true level’ in the ‘War on Terror’, ‘in order to prepare the way for violent measures by the state’ to be undertaken against them “and to permit emergency rule to” once again – as during the genocidal period of the 1990’s – “take precedence over the administrative system in the region, … permitting security chaos in the region to be used to apply pressure on the political authority, and thereby … to frustrate Turkey’s fundamental political [democratising] directions … and to protect the power and place of the core political/bureaucratic governing elite’”. The indictment also referred by name to a general who had reportedly described one of the alleged [military] perpetrators as ‘a good officer’. On March 20, the Office of the Chief of General Staff issued a statement that the indictment was ‘political … aiming to undermine the Turkish Armed Forces and the fight [i.e. ‘war’] against terror’, and made a complaint against the prosecutor. By April 21, the High Council of Judges and Prosecutors”, in seeking to smooth the path and
objectives of the US backed ‘War on Terror’, “had taken Prosecutor Sarıkaya off the case, removed him from his job, and stripped him of his status as a lawyer for ‘abuse of his duty and exceeding his authority’”.

• Even as “Turkish authorities” immediately “blamed the bombing” that took place in Diyarbakir on 12th September 2006 “on [the] PKK”, “the notorious Turkish ultra-nationalist terrorist group ‘Turkish Revenge Brigade’ (TIT)”, with extensive connections with the Turkish ‘deep state’ and the security forces, “on their homepage” accepted “responsibility for the bomb attack … A set of pictures” was “added to the homepage, showing the preparation of the bomb that was used in the attack. The bomb consisted of a 12-litre blue thermos container, a walkie-talkie relay detonator, an activator, the top of a metal gas container as a balancing weight that was placed in the bottom of the thermos and a case believed to contain C-4 plastic explosive. DozaMe.org identified the walkie-talkie as the cheap, high quality … ‘Aselsan MT-725 Cobra’ with a maximum reach of 3 km … The walkie-talkie is manufactured by Aselsan, a Turkish company owned by the ‘Turkish Armed Forces Foundation’ … The blast killed seven Kurdish children and three adults, … wounded … another 13 people, … ripping through a crowd consisting of Kurdish families … ‘For every Turk that [the] PKK kills … we will kill 10 Kurds in Diyarbakır’” as part of the ‘war’ on ‘PKK terror’, “the[ir] statement read. It ends with the slogan, ‘A good Kurd is a dead Kurd’”. TIT members, Dozme.org News points out, were “integrated with the Turkish military intelligence agency JITEM and used in black operations against Kurdish political and cultural figures during the Kurdish insurgency in the mid-80’s and throughout the 90’s.”

• “The government has launched its new practice of burying dead [Kurdish ‘terrorist’] suspects where they are killed without bringing them back home for a proper autopsy. The first example of the policy change was witnessed recently in the [Kurdish] Southeast province of Sırnak although it was decided upon during a Counter-Terrorism Supreme Commission meeting earlier [in April 2006] … Professor … Fincancı, who previously headed the Istanbul University Forensic Medicine Department”, stated that this ‘War on Terror’ related “practice itself was a violation of international human rights and that Turkey could be convicted at the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) for it … Fincanci told Bianet that in each and every death resulting from clashes, a formal autopsy needed to be conducted and that only this could reveal the true reason of death. ‘Only an autopsy can answer questions such as whether a person was killed in a clash, or … killed while running away, or [as a] result of torture after being captured’ … She referred to the international Minnesota Autopsy Protocol covering the effective investigation of extra-judicial killings saying, ‘The conditions of an autopsy are clearly stated in this protocol, accepted by the United Nations. Because these conditions are not being met’ in the US backed ‘joint’ Turkish ‘War on Terrorism’, ‘Turkey could be sentenced at the ECHR for failing to conduct an effective investigation’”.

Just as troublingly, “Turkish Human Rights Chairman Alatas recalled on his part that there were [now] numerous allegations related to the killing of PKK militants in the recent months … ‘There are claims that the bodies are being mutilated, that their organs are being cut off, that even if they are caught alive, they are tortured and killed as well as allegations that chemical weapons are being used. How are these going to be [meaningfully] investigated [in these circumstances]? ’ he asked”. “This comes to the same meaning as the state saying, ‘I have the right to kill you without being monitored’ … The IHD Chairman argued that the practice also meant punishing those relatives and families that


had a right to the bodies and noted, ‘This is something that does not even happen in [‘regular’] wars … What happens to the body is an issue that concerns the family’. Pointing out that this … practice effectively meant violation of Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which governs respect towards family and private life, Alatas concluded: ‘In essence, this is a practice to punish the Kurdish people. It is a practice that provokes enmity and hatred’.

It needs to be understood that in this US backed ‘War on Terror’, schoolchildren, students, poets, musicians, writers, publishers, human rights campaigners, academics, lawyers and artists are all being targeted in a manner that surely must be questioned and opposed. Huseyin Kizilocak, for example, has detailed the following situation that highlights just how ‘pro-Kurdish’ people in this post-9/11 US backed ‘War on Terror’ period, are being scandalously ‘targeted’ as ‘PKK linked terrorists’ in Turkey. The US government’s commitment to ‘jointly’ assist and substantially back the Turkish state in this ‘War on Terror’ that is aimed at ‘hunting’ down and eradicating ‘the PKK terrorist threat’ in Turkey needs to be analysed in this wider context in which a whole range of people come to be defined as ‘PKK linked terrorist threats’:

I want to give some examples from the Turkish newspaper Radikal’s news from the 9th of June this year (2003), which shows the current situation:
- Because of a calendar with the month written in English, Turkish and Kurdish, the publishers were put on trial for separatism and terror.
- A group of students from Nigde university are on trial with the same accusations, because they watched Kurdish television and listened to Kurdish music.

Moreover, “according to a report in the Turkish newspaper Hürriyet a case has begun before the state security court in Diyarbakir against 27 children aged between 11-18, because they had demanded the right to native [Kurdish] language tuition … The state prosecutor … accused the children and adolescents of ‘aiding [i.e. ‘sponsoring’] a terrorist organisation’ [sic] through their demands, and has called for prison terms of 3 years and 9 months”: 4 In 2002, students’ petitions calling for the right to merely receive some optional instruction in the Kurdish language, were incriminated “on grounds of being instrumental to the [‘terrorist’] PKK’s efforts to establish itself as a political organisation. State Prosecutors were briefed by the Ministry of the Interior in January, 2002, to bring charges of ‘membership in a terrorist organisation’ punishable with 12 years imprisonment against any students or parents who lodge[d] petitions demanding optional Kurdish lessons. By 23rd January 2002, a total of 85 students and more than 30 parents ha[d] been imprisoned and over 1,000 people (among them some juveniles) detained “for merely ‘having demanded optional first language education in Kurdish’.” 45

In addition to this, a “case against the members of KESK Music Group … who were charged with having sung in Kurdish during a festival organised by teachers’ union Egitim-Sen in Diyarbakir in 2002, was restarted on 2nd April (2004)”. 46 In a European Commission 2004 report, it was confirmed that “in March 2004 … RTUK ordered the closure for 30 days of ART TV, a local television channel broadcasting from Diyarbakir, on the grounds that it had violated ‘the principle of the indivisibility of
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the state when, in August 2003, it broadcast two Kurdish love songs. Jon Rud notes that “RTUK issued a warning to one TV channel which had shown a music programme with songs in Kurdish. This was based on a provision which prohibits programmes that are ‘in breach of the general principles of the Constitution … national security…’ etc”.

In the US backed ‘war’ against ‘PKK terrorists’, it has become apparent that “one line of reasoning” currently used “in Turkish legal practice is”, indeed, “guilt by association. One example:

1. The terrorist organisation the PKK is making propaganda for the right to use the Kurdish language, including in education.
2. Consequently, anyone who advocates the right to use the Kurdish language is guilty of supporting (‘aiding and abetting’, Article 169 of the Turkish Penal Code) a terrorist organisation.⁴⁹

And this, at a time when the Turkish government is still guilty, according to the academic Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and other respected analysts, of ‘linguistic genocide’ against Kurds and of additionally being in breach of two articles of the United Nations’ Genocide Convention: “In fact, education of Kurds in Turkey, both today and after the [proposed ‘reform’] law package is being implemented, is genocidal. It still fits two of the definitions of genocide in the UN International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (E793, 1948) … Turkey tries to forcibly make Turks of Kurdish children through education, i.e. Turkey tries to transfer the children linguistically and culturally to another group. This is genocide, according to the UN definition. Turkey prevents the children from learning their own language and from learning in general and from doing as well in school as the children's innate potential would allow them to do ... In addition, Turkey is of course also committing linguistic genocide according to the specific definition on linguistic genocide⁵⁰ … Even if many other countries participate in linguistic and cultural genocide in relation to minorities, Turkey is unfortunately one of the worst offenders in the world, in several ways THE worst”.⁵¹

Even today, for instance, as Turkey is engaged in the EU ‘accession process’, “programmes in Kurdish for children on radio or TV” remain “prohibited”. To merely peacefully and non-violently protest against the state’s ongoing genocidal policies, or to advocate the basic cultural right of Kurds (who represent between 20-25% of the population in Turkey, according to a number of sources) to be educated in their ‘mother tongue’ is to, therefore, in the eyes of the Turkish state, act in support of ‘PKK terrorism’. It is instructive to note that an Associated Press article confirmed in 2000 that “the all-powerful (Turkish) army still regards [merely] speaking Kurdish as a sign of Kurdish nationalism and a threat to state unity” – i.e. a ‘terrorist threat’ that needs to be ‘acted upon’.

To add to this, “another problem frequently seen in the prosecutors’ indictments is the failure to distinguish between the non violent expression of political views, and cases of manifest violence or incitement to violence. For example, a charge of ‘aiding and abetting an illegal organisation’ – i.e. a ‘terrorist organisation’ – ‘does not need to be supported by concrete evidence of any linkage with the organisation. A third case in point is the use of taboo words’ that might lead one to being considered ‘a terrorist’ or ‘supportive of terrorism’. “Some of the prominent taboo words are:

• “‘Kurdish people’, or worse, ‘the Kurdish people’, or even worse ‘the Kurdish nation’ or [the geographical term] ‘Kurdistan’ (being seen as encouragement to ‘separatism’ or ‘incitement to hatred’);

• “‘Turks and Kurds’, or worse ‘the Turkish and Kurdish people’ (suggesting that they are two distinct peoples);

• “‘Mr’ Ocalan (the combination of these two words constituting ‘aid and assistance to an illegal organisation’; in 2003 there were 58 sentences on this basis).”

We also need to be aware of a wider destructive plan around which the US backed Turkish state’s ‘War on Terror’ is taking place: In September 2002, the Socialist Party of Kurdistan (PSK) drew attention to a “Secret Plan of Action”, masterminded by members of the Turkish ‘deep state’. According to the PSK: “The main aim of this plan is to make Kurdistan Kurd-free, to eradicate the Kurdish language and culture and thereby dispose of the Kurdish question. Dam projects which will flood historical towns of Kurdistan, flood the fertile agricultural land of the region and flood the valleys of incomparable natural beauty are part of this plan”.

Whilst a local Kurdish, national and international initiative aimed at halting one such dam in the area – Ilisu – succeeded in halting one consortium seems to have kept its place and been supported by the Turkish government. Despite substantive local Kurdish and national/international opposition to the project, the Turkish prime minister, on August 5th 2006, provocatively laid the foundational stone for this vast dam, thereby furthering the aims – consciously or otherwise – of this ‘Secret Plan of Action’.

Maggie Ronayne’s findings are worth reflecting upon at this point: “The US-led war against the world is not only waged by military means … but [also] by development projects”, amongst other means. (Indeed, as is the case in the Kurdish south-east of Turkey, such ‘development’ projects are not only ‘unsustainable’ in nature, they also integrally form part of the Turkish state’s genocidal ‘counter-insurgency’ strategy for the region). “These very profitable projects [can] displace large numbers of people and have devastating cultural and environmental impacts … The GAP development project [in south-eastern Turkey, which includes Ilisu amongst several other dams in its portfolio], in which US and European companies and governments (and it seems Israeli companies also) are involved is a prime example of all this … The action of the Prime Minister” in laying the foundational stone of the Ilisu dam “appears designed to put pressure on the affected [Kurdish] communities and on European governments … The project … would flood over 300 square kilometres in the Kurdish region, … displacing up to 78,000 [primarily Kurdish] villagers. Local people would receive little or no benefit from the project. On the contrary, impacts of the dam would include more severe poverty, health problems, break-up of families and communities, environmental pollution … and wide-ranging cultural destruction … As an archaeologist, I have investigated the new updated [consortium’s]

Environmental Impact Assessment, and in a review drawn up in consultation with affected women villagers and the international grassroots women’s network, Global Women’s Strike, I have shown that it is no basis for any [meaningful] project. It is not really [even] an assessment at all … My review shows how the dam [actually] threatens to destroy thousands of years of cultural heritage and its survival into the future — first of all by targeting women and all in their care. It highlights women’s opposition to cultural destruction [of this kind] by dams and war … Targeting women like this threatens the cultural destruction of the entire community. [Proposed] ethnographic and ethn-archaeological proposals to ‘salvage’ this culture are demeaning to the rural [primarily Kurdish] communities concerned, according to this review, and cannot possibly save culture … Indeed, the very area where [the] Prime Minister … laid the foundation stone has not been surveyed at all, and it is therefore a breach of international law, including European Union directives, to proceed with any construction in the absence of archaeological survey and testing … Moreover, work I’ve done over several years has indicated to me that graves, including mass graves of Kurdish people who were ‘disappeared’ during the fighting” — i.e. the Turkish state’s ‘War on Terror’ during the 1990’s — “may well lie in the reservoir area. But restrictions” intentionally “imposed by the state” during its current US backed ‘War on Terror’ “make it impossible to investigate the graves professionally and independently. In an open letter to the Turkish Prime Minister, I ask: ‘How can you proceed with the [Ilisu] dam while all these cultural impacts remain uninvestigated, and when professional opinion thinks that it is not possible to do so? In particular, it is not possible to investigate the impacts while you are prosecuting a war in the Kurdish region. Will not you and the other funders and backers of the dam be jointly guilty of [also] covering up evidence of crimes committed in that war” — which many hold to be ‘genocidal’ in scope and nature — “and guilty of involvement in further serious cultural destruction?” … When the last consortium tried to build the Ilisu Dam, the World Archaeological Congress said that to go ahead would amount to ‘ethnic cleansing’. There is no reason to change that opinion today”.59

The Targeting of School Teachers, Parents, Schoolchildren, Students, Political Prisoners And Academics in the US Backed ‘War on Terror’.

Within the context of this type of US – and, indeed, UK state — supported ‘post-9/11 War on Terror’, ‘pro-Kurdish’ teachers who have sought to simply ‘learn the Kurdish language’ in preparation for a time when they might be allowed to teach it in schools, have also been targeted by the ‘Anti-Terror Police’ and tortured by them for their seemingly ‘terrorist inspired’ activities: “12 people, of whom 11 were teachers”, we are told, for instance, “were allegedly tortured while being detained by police after having been arrested in Kiziltepe for learning Kurdish together. The 12 people, 11 of whom were members of the teachers trade union Egitim-Sen, were arrested in an apartment … in Mardin on May 7th. A magistrate had issued warrants for their arrest. The Mardin branch of Egitim-Sen said in a written statement that: ‘Our colleagues were subjected to various methods of torture; they were sprayed with high-pressure water, they had plastic bags pulled over their heads, they were forced to sing marching songs and to do the goose-step, they were brutally beaten, left for 3 days without food or water, they were stripped naked, had their testicles crushed and were verbally abused’. One of the teachers … was not spared the torture despite being pregnant. Because of her poor condition she was taken to Diyarbakir’s Medical Faculty on the evening of her detention. According to the statement, her condition remain[ed] serious. Egitim-Sen … pointed out that there was a complete disregard for legal procedures following the arrests. Despite complaints from their lawyers, between 25-30 police were involved in the questioning”.60 As another report on the affair confirmed: “In a private apartment in the district of Kiziltepe, 11 teachers and an agricultural engineer were arrested for breaching anti-terror laws (sic) and then detained, following 6 hours of questioning … According to their lawyer, … ‘There were lawful publications in the flat from the Kurdish Institute. [Yet] the teacher [‘A’] was taken to hospital when she miscarried after having been tortured.’ (Source: Radikal, 12.05.2002) …

Parents who have simply, as a basic human right, attempted to legally name their children using Kurdish names, have come under suspicion as potential terrorist threats who deserve to be placed under surveillance and appropriately ‘targeted’: “In 2003, a new law was passed allowing Kurds to”, theoretically, “use their Kurdish names”. But “it is indicative of the attitudes of the authorities that the Commander of the Gendarmerie” – at the forefront of waging the US-UK backed ‘War on Terror’ in the country – chillingly “requested from the Attorney General the full list of people who had applied to use Kurdish names” for their children. “He considered such persons as ‘potential threats to the social order’.” Other ‘parents’ have been murdered in the ‘War on Terror’ simply because their children have been involved in legal ‘pro-Kurdish’ cultural and political activities overseas. As Derwich Ferho, the chairman of the Kurdish Institute in Brussels has noted, his parents – who were in their eighties – were murdered in grisly fashion by state-linked contra-guerrilla death squads in south-eastern Turkey in March 2006 because of his work and that of his brother (who works for the Kurdish satellite Roj TV station, also in Belgium): “They were killed in a horrible way in their village … Earlier they were threatened, because of the activities of my brother and me in Belgium … My father was sick and bedridden … He was killed in his bed and his ribs were broken. My mother must have resisted, because her throat was cut and she had many wounds inflicted by stabbing … My parents were threatened several times last month … People were saying: your sons must be wiser.”

“According to Derwich, there is no doubt that the Turkish state is behind the murder: ‘… The contra-guerrilla is operating … These are the same death squads, which committed a lot of assassinations in the nineties … Now it looks like the hunt is opened again, also on aged people’ uninvolved in any war.”

The Human Rights Agenda Association has also detailed the manner in which attacks are being made on human rights activists, academics and observers. “During a promotional press conference in Istanbul” for the Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation’s (TESEV) new book on enforced Kurdish ‘internal migration’, it noted with concern that one such attack had been made. And who was it directed by?: “In their condemnation of the attack, both IHD and the Foundation for Human Rights and Solidarity with the Oppressed (MAZLUMDER) stressed that those behind it … were being protected. ‘It is now very evident’ said the IHD, ‘that this group has now targeted civilian institutions’. The association stressed that an ‘extreme tolerance’ shown to this group by” ‘War on Terror’ linked “security forces, despite their actions, needed to be taken into account and added, ‘The increase of attacks and harassment of these groups, … we believe are being organised and financed by circles of power’.” Equally troublingly, Amnesty International has ascertained that “the Turkish Government tries to discredit it’s critics at home and abroad by suggesting that they sympathize or collude with the PKK”, which remains the designated ‘enemy’ in the US-UK backed ‘War on Terror’.

Charges are also being levelled at peace campaigners in the name of the ‘War on Terror’: Most recently, in June 2006, for instance, “three Kurdish activists” were placed on trial “on anti-terrorism charges after they attempted to stage a peaceful protest near the Iraq border … They were arrested on May 2” as they prepared to walk to the border of Iraq to peacefully protest the recent killings of civilians by security forces in south-eastern Turkey and express their concern about tensions between the Turkish government and the Kurdish-led administration in northern Iraq … All three are officials of Kurt-Der, a Kurdish association that Turkish authorities closed last month for” the crime of  
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“conducting its internal business in the Kurdish language”.  

A report by Sevend J. Robinson on behalf of the Commission for Democracy, Human Rights and Humanitarian Issues, which was accepted by the annual OSCE Assembly in July 2002, additionally confirmed that, “in Turkey, HADEP [‘pro-Kurdish’ party] mayors are continually” being “persecuted. For example, the mayor of Hakkari was prosecuted for issuing a calendar in the Kurdish and English languages – because it was a risk to the state ... The Kurdish language continues to be banned in education and in the media ... In Van, security forces have detained 500 students because of a petition in which they requested the right to Kurdish language tuition”. A collective of journalists and researchers on behalf of Aram Publishers in Istanbul, also observed the way in which, “on 14th January, 2002, the Turkish Security Forces issued a statement” which absurdly clarified that “any initiatives taken with regard to the right to have optional Kurdish lessons in school or university were”, automatically, deemed to have been “orchestrated” and sponsored “by ‘the terrorist organisation PKK’ and were, far from being ‘an innocent claim for cultural rights’, part and parcel of ‘the plan to split Turkey’ [sic]. Once one claimed that Kurds should have the right to education in Kurdish ‘just because they are Kurds’, the statement continue[d], the reasoning that ‘Kurds should learn Kurdish history and geography on every level of their educational careers, that Kurdish businessmen should associate or a Kurdish Bar Association should be established’ cannot be far away. This then, it goes without saying, would create division and separation that would ‘reflect upon society’. That would amount to terrorism.

“What, then, should the Kurds do to prove” to the ‘deep state’ and to the Turkish security forces waging their US-UK backed ‘War on Terror’ “that they do not harbour the [‘terrorist’] intention to rip off the chunks of land east of the Taurus mountains? All Kurdish ‘organisations operating abroad have to omit the word Kurdistan from their names”; the news broadcast on the satellite [arts, culture and politics] channel Medya TV from Belgian exile has to ‘refrain from referring to our [i.e. the security forces’] Southeast and East Anatolian areas as the Kurdish provinces in items broadcast in Turkish and the two dialects of Kurdish”; the same TV channel has to stop ‘showing exclusively the meteorological situation of our above mentioned areas in its weather forecast’; the ‘[exiled] Kurdish National Congress has to be disbanded’; projects as devious as ‘an institute of Kurdish philology, ... a Kurdish encyclopaedia and a Kurdish economic congress have to be abandoned’; and finally, ‘no support should be given to Armenian and Syriac groups campaigning against Turkey on an international level [on issues relating to an acknowledgement of the Armenian, Assyrian or Pontic Greek genocides, for instance], and all members of the terrorist organisation have to lay down their arms and surrender to the security forces’. Anything short of that is, the tone of the statement implies, a casus belli”. One in which they will be ‘hunted down’ and appropriately targeted …

Kerim Yildiz (Executive Director of the Kurdish Human Rights Project) and Mark Muller (as barrister and Vice President of the UK Bar Human Rights Committee), in 2005, observed – with concern – that Turkey was, indeed, refusing “even to concede that the armed conflict in the [Kurdish] South-east is symptomatic of the broader issue of her subjugation of the Kurds, defining the situation purely in terms of security and/or terrorism and refusing to become involved in bilateral negotiations with the Kurds”. On 25th August 2006, for example, “Turkish officials … dismissed” yet another “offer from
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the terrorist PKK … for a … conditional cease-fire … The PKK’s second in command, Murat Karayilan, proposed a … conditional cease-fire to the Turkish government, saying, ‘We are ready to observe a cease-fire on September 1st, coinciding with World Peace Day, and opt for a peaceful and democratic settlement to the Kurdish issue in Turkey’. He requested Turkey put forward a ‘political project’ that will meet their demands … Karayilan also made a similar offer last June, saying, ‘We appeal to the Turkish government, asking it to end military operations in order to open the path for dialogue, and we are ready, on our side, to declare a cease-fire’”.71 “Kongra-Gel” had also “appealed its armed forces to take a [unilateral] decision of ‘No Action’ between 20th August and 20th September 2005”,72 Mustafa Karahan, the head of DEHAP – the pro-Kurdish Democratic People’s Party – in Diyarbakir, described the way in which his party was even being restricted in its dialogue with the press, let alone the ‘deep state’: “The pressure faced by DEHAP is very obvious. When we want to say something to the press, our members get arrested. Many members of DEHAP are now arrested and in prison”.73 The Turkish state, during this time, has refused to negotiate with any ‘terrorists’.

Meanwhile, “the official view of the Kurds in Turkey”, in writer Mehmed Uzun’s opinion, remains “one of deep hatred. The phobia of Kurds is evident; ultra Turkish nationalism is nurtured by their abhorrence of Kurds”.74 Mark Thomas, in April 2006, observed the marked “failure of the Turkish state to work with the Kurds to take advantage of the PKK ceasefire. Ankara has refused to negotiate. ‘We will not talk to terrorists,’ the Prime Minister, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, declares. And he has done so with the backing of the EU. Instead of urging dialogue, the EU has followed the UK and the United States in proscribing the PKK, even though it announced a ceasefire and formally renounced violence. Just about every attempt by grass-roots Kurdish groups to form inclusive democratic movements has been regarded by the EU and the UK as merely another group to add to the list of terrorist organisations”.75

Even as the Blair government and Bush administration have continued, post-9/11, to vigorously endorse the initiatives of the Turkish state in its ‘War on Terror’, Behic Asci, a member of the Turkish Association of Progressive Lawyers76 has sought to alert people to the repercussions of these highly questionable types of activities, which are never mentioned by Bush’s or Blair’s aides publicly: “The Turkish legal system provides no protection for … political prisoners [many of whom have been questionably charged with ‘terrorist offences’] held in isolation. In one instance, when a guard demanded one of Asci’s clients stand up for a prisoner count, she responded that given [that] she was in an isolation cell, there was no need for her to stand to be counted. Enraged at this small show of defiance, the guard attacked the prisoner, crushing her skull against the cell wall. When Asci appealed to the court to protest his client’s mistreatment, his suit was rejected as part of a ‘terrorist campaign’ against F-type isolation prisons. The court concluded that the prisoner must have crushed her own skull … Many of the prisoners Asci represented have [also] had their feet taped together and their hands taped behind their backs. Left alone, immobilised, for hours or days at a time and unable to avail themselves of toilet facilities, they are forced to endure the indignity of repeatedly soiling

75 Thomas, M. (2006) ‘There is one EU problem that is resolutely not going away and will only get worse: that is, Turkey’s membership’, The New Statesman, 24 April 2006 [http://www.newstatesman.com/2006/04/24014].
76 According to Simon Cooper and Ruth Riordan, “’Asci began the death fast on International Lawyer's Day, April 5, because, he says, he could no longer sit back and watch his clients die’ (‘On the death fast of Lawyer Behic Asci’, Green Left Weekly, 16 August 2006, as reproduced in Info Turk, No. 336 [http://www.info-turk.be/336.htm#Istanbul].
themselves. Many of Asci’s clients, both men and women, had been raped while in custody, often by prison guards using batons. Asci related another experience of one client during a court hearing who had been held in isolation and who had to halt midway through reading a statement to the court. He had lost his hearing” through mistreatment “and could no longer hear his own voice. Prisoners in the F-type prisons typically suffer from a range of psychological illnesses including stress, anxiety and depression. The authorities also routinely deny [‘terrorist’] prisoners medical assistance and access to legal representation. According to Asci, prisoners are arbitrarily refused visits from family members that they are legally entitled to. Their books, newspapers and other reading material are confiscated. The letters sent to their families are heavily censored – if they ever arrive at all”.  

The Nature of US ‘Psychological Warfare Assistance’ in the ‘War on Terror’.

In this context in which the Bush administration has agreed to jointly act to ‘hunt’ down and ‘destroy’ the ‘PKK terrorists’ and to vigorously support the Turkish state’s ‘War on Terror’, we need to recognise and confront the fact that there does not appear to be any effective public oversight into the nature of accountability of these ‘deep political’ US-Turkish ‘arrangements’ and ‘operations’. Such joint ‘US-Turkish’ arrangements are of deep concern to many individuals, human rights and community based organisations and communities living in the Iraqi ‘south-east’ in particular. Key questions arise: Will US special forces continue to provide JCET ‘training’ or any other types of ‘special forces’ linked assistance to Turkey’s notorious mountain commandos? As Chalmers Johnson has noted: “Republican representative Christopher Smith, chairman of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, says: ‘Our joint exercises and training of military units – that have been charged over and over again with the gravest kind of crimes against humanity, including torture and murder – cry out for explanation’. But the US Secretary of Defence seems to be unconcerned”.  

There is certainly concern that the US state will, intentionally, choose to keep collaborating with Turkey’s notorious mountain commando brigades and other ‘special military/paramilitary/police forces’ that are at the forefront of the counter-insurgency struggle against the ‘PKK terrorists’, thereby providing a US-linked ‘legitimacy’ to their often murderous activities. Already in recent months, it has been announced that, “after completing a six-month intensive training course, 242 [Turkish] Special Forces personnel have been appointed to posts in the [Kurdish] east and southeast [of Turkey]. Reports say that with the newly appointed personnel, there are now 3,500 members of the Special Forces in Hakkari, Sirnak, Tunceli and Bingol”. An April 2006 report in The Turkish Weekly suggests that Turkish ‘special forces’ have, indeed, been given ‘the green light’ by the US to intensify the basis of their ‘offensive psychological warfare operations’ against the ‘PKK threat’ in northern Iraq: “Reports have been confirmed that it was actions taken by Turkish troops this past Saturday which were the spark for specific complaints from Baghdad about increased Turkish military presence and action along the Northern Iraqi border. According to these reports, Turkish armed forces, using infra-red cameras, spotted PKK terrorists crossing the border near Cukurca town, after which a special force team of around 100 soldiers proceeded to cross the border into Iraqi territory. The go-ahead to send in the special forces team was reportedly given from Ankara over the weekend. Recent meetings between Turkish and US officials have indicated that the US has given the nod to Turkish action on this front”.  

US psychological warfare operational support to target PKK ‘leaders’ in northern Iraq – as recently as July 2005 – has been, apparently, also confirmed from a leading Turkish military source: “The Turkish army said Tuesday the United States had ordered the capture of commanders of the rebel Kurdistan
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Workers’ Party in Iraq … The United States ‘have issued a direct order for the capture of the leaders’ of the PKK, General Ilker Basbug, the army number two, told a group of journalists’. According to a 21st April 2006 report by the Cihan News Agency, ‘The Turkish NTV news channel report[ed] … that the US has been providing intelligence to Turkish security forces carrying out anti-terror operations in southeast Turkey near the Iraqi border. NTV claims that the CIA and US army intelligence have tipped off the Turkish security forces during operations in which a total of 31 PKK terrorists were killed in two separate areas. ‘US satellites monitoring the Middle East screened southeast Turkey and spotted the PKK terrorists,’ the report claims, stating that the US is also tapping communications among the PKK authorities. Turkey and the USA have already been cooperating to curb the financial resources of the PKK, designated as a terror organization by the USA and EU’.

According to an April 2006 Zaman.com report: “The Turkish armed forces have launched [a] … military operation along the Iraqi border where Turkish troops have concentrated for days. The Northern Iraqi cities of Amedi and Zaho, sheltering PKK militants, were hit with mortar attacks in ‘Operation Crescent’. First reports say that locations where militants were lodged in the regions of Geliye, Pisaxa, Pirbela, Sheshdara, Sharanish and Elanish were demolished. The ‘Burgundy Beret’ units’, a Turkish special forces team which reportedly had been involved in the US state linked capture and illegal abduction of PKK leader Abdullah Ocalan in Kenya, “performed a reconnaissance mission in the area a while ago as part of the Special Forces Command. Troop deployment to the region from different parts of the country continues. Along with the transfer of commandos, heavy construction equipment” was “also being brought to the border for use during a possible cross-border operation”.

We also know that US International Military Education Training (IMET) courses were conducted with Turkish forces in 2001, 2002 and were requested for 2003. “Created by Congress in 1976, IMET grew out of the Vietnam-era Nixon Doctrine that aimed to avoid U.S. casualties by preparing ‘Asian boys to fight Asian wars’. This programme has been “harshly criticized in Congress for having [previously] trained soldiers in Colombia and Indonesia who went on to commit human rights violations”. We also know that the US Congress approved IMET training with Turkish forces for 2005 and President Bush requested further IMET funding for the financial year 2006. It is also known that Turkey was the recipient of a US Foreign Military Financing (FMF) programme in 2005, and President Bush, again, requested further FMF for Turkey in 2006. FMF, it needs to be appreciated, “provides grants for foreign militaries to buy US weapons, services, and training … Although the majority of these funds are used to buy weapons, mobile training teams are often deployed as a facet of weapons sales packages to train the foreign country’s forces in the operation and maintenance of the weapon system(s). In other cases, aid recipients use this money to buy training for their soldiers in specific skill areas. In such cases, U.S. mobile training teams, usually made up of Special Operations Forces, are sent to the host country for up to six months”.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) have also provided ‘assistance’ to Turkish forces involved in their ‘War on Terror’: “The … FBI … is … involved in training foreign police and paramilitary forces. This training is [ostensibly] justified primarily as part of its efforts to counter drug trafficking, terrorism, and organized crime … No annual report”, however, “provides public information on FBI foreign training programs … The DEA, also part of the Justice Department, conducts international police training as well … The international police training programs of the FBI and the DEA are funded at least in part out of the annual appropriation for Justice Department operations and are, therefore, technically exempt from the Leahy Law vetting requirements (which currently cover only programs funded by the foreign aid and Defence Department appropriations)”.

According to one report: “The FBI is committed to cooperating with Turkey in its fight against armed rebels of the outlawed Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK). FBI director Robert Mueller said, ‘We are working with our counterparts elsewhere in Europe and in Turkey to address the PKK and work cooperatively, to find and cut off financing to terrorist groups, be it PKK, al-Qaeda’, or others … ‘There have been concrete results and there will continue to be concrete results around the world, in Europe and elsewhere’, he added. Mueller spoke after a day of talks with senior Turkish police and national intelligence officials, which he said served to strengthen bilateral ties and enable the two countries to cooperate in facing terrorist threats’.” Another report has also clarified that, “at the FBI, the Office of International Operations oversees the Legal Attaché Program operating at 46 locations around the world. The operation maintains contact with … other US federal agencies such as the CIA and military agencies such as the Defence Intelligence Agency (DIA), and foreign police and security officers…It coordinates its activities with all US and foreign intelligence operations. In 2000, it opened offices in Ankara, Turkey”.

That the DEA and FBI are providing extensive and ongoing ‘anti-terrorist’ and ‘anti-narcotics’ assistance to the Turkish ‘secular state’, its embassies, security, military and paramilitary forces is rather ironic, given that ‘deep political’ circles in these very Turkish sectors apparently are – and have been – heavily involved in the organised crime, state terrorism and drugs trade. In debating the issue of public accountability, we also need to be aware that valid concerns have been raised over the highly questionable and disturbing ways in which the FBI and DEA have been allowed to operate overseas (let alone within the United States) without adequate oversight mechanisms being put into place.

Confirmation that the FBI and CIA were co-ordinating their ‘anti-PKK’ initiatives with the Turkish state came in a December 2005 Hurriyet report: “Following the visit of FBI director Robert Mueller to Turkey on Saturday, CIA chief Porter Goss followed in Mueller's footsteps and paid a visit to Ankara for talks with officials from the Turkish General Staff and the intelligence service MIT ... The two visits took place soon after US Ambassador Ross Wilson announced that there were some secret aspects to the visit over cooperating in the fight against PKK. The visits have triggered speculations that the US might start a [major] serious initiative for the neutralization of PKK after the Iraqi elections. The talks between Goss and Turkish officials will focus on al Qaeda, and on developments in Iraq, Iran and Syria. The Turkish side will submit to Goss a file containing intelligence information about top-level PKK militants in Northern Iraq. Turkey will also convey to Goss its concerns about developments that might pave the way for the founding of a Kurdish state in Northern Iraq … Turkish Land Forces Commander General Yasar Büyükanit was [also] currently in the US for talks with US
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officials” over these matters. Columnist Semih Idiz, from the Turkish *Milliyet*, interestingly also revealed the following information in an article dated 12th December 2005:

I checked with the US side about CIA Director Porter Gross’ visit, but they were tight-lipped. However, they underlined one point: They said that this visit wasn’t a sudden one, but the final link in a chain which began with US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice’s visit to Ankara in February and which covers a great many high-level mutual military and civilian visits. They said that this situation was putting the lie to claims that relations were facing hard times and was moreover a concrete indication of the cooperation which is ‘gradually deepening’. As for the issues to be discussed by Gross in Ankara and Buyukanit in Washington, they are known. The Turkish side confirmed this as well. These issues can be listed as follows: the general situation in Iraq and the presence of the terrorist PKK in northern Iraq, Iraqi President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad’s controversial remarks that threaten instability in the region, and the Syrian issue vis-a-vis Iraq and Lebanon.

Meanwhile, new US Ambassador Ross Wilson finally came to Turkey, and President Ahmet Necdet Sezer didn’t make him wait to present his letter of credentials. This should be considered an extension of this coordination. In sum, the situation points to important developments which require the ambassador’s presence in Ankara. Otherwise, he would have come after Christmas. Certainly, these developments are first and foremost about Iraq. Meanwhile, the [specifics concerning the] future of cooperation against the PKK is still uncertain. The US side says to expect developments on this issue... The US has started to listen to Turkey considering the [PKK presence in] Iraq issue more and now perhaps the US understands this better today.

A report from *Winds of Change* further observes that “the most interesting details of the [December 2005] meeting seem to have appeared in *Cumhuriyet*, which states the following”:

During his recent visit to Ankara, CIA Director Porter Goss reportedly brought three dossiers on Iran to Ankara. Goss is said to have asked for Turkey’s support for Washington’s policy against Iran’s nuclear activities, charging that Tehran had supported [PKK and other] terrorism and taken part in activities against Turkey. *Goss also asked Ankara to be ready for a possible US air operation against Iran and Syria* ...Diplomatic sources say that Washington wants Turkey to coordinate with its Iran policies. The second dossier is about Iran’s stance on terrorism. The CIA argued that Iran was supporting terrorism, the PKK and al-Qaeda. The third had to do with Iran’s alleged stance against Ankara.

“The implication here is that the US believes that it’ll be using [the Turkish] Incirlik [airbase] in any aerial operations against Iran and wants to secure Turkish cooperation on that score – the visit of Turkish Chief of Staff General Yasar Buyukanit to DC is likely related here. I would also note that the issue of Iranian support for the PKK has long been the official position of both the US and Turkish governments”. The Bush administration’s need to secure Turkey’s assistance in its joint plans with
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96 Darling, D. (2005) ‘Tidbits from Turkey on Iran’, *Winds of Change*, December 21, 2005 [http://www.windsofchange.net/archives/tidbits_from_turkey_on_iran-print.php]. Sensing a possible attack by US backed forces and, perhaps, in an endeavour to ‘dissuade’ Turkey from joining in the US plans for an assault of some kind on Iran, it is instructive to note that
the Israeli state to restructure the Middle East [in particular, in southern Lebanon, Syria and Iran] has probably also meant that it will, in return, have had to commit itself towards, once again, *aggressively supporting the Turkish state’s ‘war against PKK terrorists’* [i.e. ‘Turkish Kurds’, as many see it], irrespective of any ethical concerns that others may have over the matter. Such aggressive military assistance will, initially, probably be provided in a more covert manner, however, as it is probably not keen to be seen to be publicly providing the ‘green light’ to both Israel and Turkey at the same time to devastate both regions that they are keen to enter into.\(^1\) In these circumstances, the strategy will probably, for the next few weeks at least, be restricted towards provision of *substantive* covert US military and CIA/FBI/DEA/DIA support to Turkey’s ‘anti-terrorism forces’, even as the US will exert its influence over KDP and PUK Kurdish leaders in northern Iraq, other Iraqi politicians and *Israeli leaders* to exert as much ‘anti-terrorist, anti-PKK support’ that *they* can offer to Turkey in the coming months.\(^1\)

This *may*, indeed, explain why an Israeli army chief visited Turkey’s military leaders so soon after the FBI and CIA Directors’ visits to the country. It *may* also explain why the same Israeli army chief reportedly requested that Israeli special forces commandos could soon ‘train’ in the very mountainous areas in which Turkey’s notorious ‘anti-PKK’ mountain commandos also just so happen to be training and operating in, and why former Israeli commandos were also intensively training Kurdish security forces in northern Iraq who were ostensibly committed towards combating the PKK: “The CIA and FBI visits were followed by the Israelis. Israeli Army Chief Lt. Gen. Dan Halutz arrived in Turkey in a week. According to the Israeli officials the reason for the visit is to develop the dialogue and cooperation between Turkey and Israel. However the questions were similar to those of Americans. Iran, Syria and Iraq were the foremost priorities. The Israeli Army Chief further asked permission for training the Israeli commandos in Turkey’s Bolu and Hakkari mountains. Halutz said ‘our commandos cannot see snow, the weather in Israel is quite hot. If they can be trained in Turkey, they would be ready for the winter conditions’ … The problem is why Israel wants to be ready for the mountain and winter circumstances? There is no cold neighbouring country around Israel. The only places Israeli commandos could use their training are Turkey, Iran and Northern Iraq [all areas where Kurdish PKK

\(^*\) there has been recent intensified co-operation between Iran and Turkey on the issue of ‘joint operations’ against the PKK and PKK-linked forces.

\(^9\) Where Turkey has offered to contribute some ‘peacekeeping troops’, after Israel’s destruction of much of the infrastructure of the region during its recent 2006 offensive there. The US also, importantly, relies on Turkey to provide troops at key moments in its Afghanistan NATO linked ‘War on Terror’ campaign. Chossudovsky also argues that: “There is another dimension which directly relates to the war on Lebanon … Israel is slated to play a major strategic role in ‘protecting’ the Eastern Mediterranean transport and pipeline corridors out of [the Turkish linked] Ceyhan [BTC Project] … The bombing of Lebanon is part of a carefully planned and coordinated military road map. The extension of the war into Syria and Iran has already been contemplated by US and Israeli military planners. This broader military agenda is intimately related to strategic oil and oil pipelines. It is supported by the Western oil giants which control the pipeline corridors. In the context of the war on Lebanon, it seeks Israeli territorial control over the East Mediterranean coastline … Prior to the bombing of Lebanon, Israel and Turkey had announced … underwater pipeline routes, which bypassed Syria and Lebanon … On the other hand, the development of alternative land based corridors (for oil and water) through Lebanon and Syria would require Israeli–Turkish territorial control over the Eastern Mediterranean coastline through Lebanon and Syria. The implementation of a land-based corridor, as opposed to the underwater pipeline project, would require the militarisation of the East Mediterranean coastline … Is this not one of the hidden objectives of the war on Lebanon?” - Chossudovsky, M. (2006) ‘The War on Lebanon and the Battle for Oil’, 26 July 2006. [http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=CHO20060726&articleId=2824].

\(^0\) In the short term, it may also be politically inconvenient to endorse an all out Turkish invasion of northern Iraq. The US is critically dependent, for the moment, upon KDP-PUK ‘Iraqi’ Kurdish support in its ‘Iraqi Imperialist Programme’. Consequently, as long as the PUK-KDP agree to assist the Turkish state with its ‘anti-PKK’ offensive, it is likely that it will ask Turkish forces to desist from overt incursions into the area. It seems likely, though, that several cross-border covert operations will continue to be approved, even as the US may seek to encourage the Israeli state and the PUK-KDP to collaborate with each other in Turkish approved covert operations aimed at further targeting the PKK.

\(^1\) A Xinhua News Agency September 2006 report, for instance, reports upon the following, hardly coincidental, recent ‘development’: “Visiting Iraqi Defence Minister Abd al-Qadir Muhammad al-Ubaydi called … for NATO member Turkey’s assistance in soldiers training. Speaking to reporters prior to his meeting with his Turkish counterpart Vecdi Gonul, al-Ubaydi said that ‘military training in Turkey is excellent. Thus, we want to send [our] Iraqi soldiers to Turkey for their training’. He said, ‘I am in Turkey to further develop relations with the Israelis. I want to inform al-Ubaydi about Turkey’s assistance and the steps that must be taken by the Iraqi government against PKK’, he added” (‘Iraq calls for Turkey’s assistance in soldiers training’, *Xinhua*, 8 September 2006).

\(^10\) At this point, it should be noted that there has also been *extensive* past US backed Israeli state linked covert ‘anti-PKK’ support that has been extended to the Turkish state.
forces also happen to coincidentally be based]102 ... Three weeks ago Israeli Yedioth Aharonot reported that dozens of former Israeli commandos have [also] been training Kurdish security forces [i.e. presumably the very KDP and PUK linked forces that have committed themselves to jointly working with Turkey to target and eradicate the ‘PKK terrorist threat’] in northern Iraq, supplying them with equipment worth millions of dollars. And now the Israelis want to come to the other side of the border. The Hakkari Mountains are on Turkey-Iraq and Turkey-Iran borders and the surrounding region is sensitive Kurdish populated areas.” 103

John Stanton’s analysis is also worth reflecting upon:

Rumsfeld and Cheney – the two crusty Nixon Administration buddies – and perhaps the most ruthless and dangerous Americans ever to hold office in the corporate/government world ... and their disciples share the view that ‘conduct unbecoming’ does not exist. No law, no boundary, no moral code, no amount of lives or outdated parchments like the US Constitution and Bill of Rights will be a barrier as they push forward their foreign and domestic agenda for some of the US population, Turkey and Israel. They hide behind the veil of ‘the national security of the United States of America’ and label ‘Top Secret/Special Compartmentalized Information’ the data that would implicate them ... [Concerning] Rumsfeld’s Death Star in Arlington, Virginia – the Pentagon – and [from] there into the offices of the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy. Known simply as The Policy Organization, it is the former home of the notorious neo-con Douglas Feith. But that’s not the interesting part. Under organizational titles like Policy, International Security, Homeland Defense, and Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, exist operational elements like Counternarcotics, Detainees, Combating Terrorism, Homeland Security Integration, Stability Operations and the Defence Policy Board. Its leaderships boast Kissingser and Cheney protégés, stridently pro-Israel and Turkey supporters, and a former US Phoenix Project [i.e. a death-squad US state ‘inspired’ mass murder project that was activated in Vietnam during the 1960’s] operative. And this is where the guidelines for the [current and upcoming] Wars on Terror, Drugs, and Weapons of Mass Destruction are developed and implemented in the field ... The Policy Organization has no problem dealing with psychopathic killers, buying and selling drugs, dropping white phosphorous on women and children, using the global black-market to help a ‘critical’ country upgrade its nuclear capability, or selling out the American people for the sake of profit. The lives of 12 or 1.2 million human beings are inconsequential – nothing more than expendable extras in the big show. ‘Sensitive’ matters must be classified or not discussed at all.

Undersecretary of Defence Eric Edelman (Cheney’s pick) runs The Policy Organization. Not surprisingly, he’s the former Ambassador to Turkey. ‘Turkey’s long term commitment to the principles of democracy and their commitment to undertaking the reforms Europe demanded before even the first round of accession negotiations – have produced economic opportunity, stable political institutions, and the peaceful rule of law [sic]. ‘Turkey is proof that our strategy of spreading democracy in the Islamic world can work’, said Edelman. Lofty and duplicitous words that are not to be believed ... [Also, distressingly], if Turkey and Israel are [perceived by these people and deep political circles to be] so “damn” critical to the USA’s interests, then [it seems likely that] they can operate around the globe [and, by implication, in Lebanon, the Occupied Territories and south-east Turkey/north-west Kurdistan and northern Iraq/southern Kurdistan against their ‘terrorist enemies’] with impunity, protected by names like Rumsfeld, Cheney, Hastert, Scowcroft, Edelman, Bush and, once upon a time, Doug Feith. Meanwhile, [what becomes apparent is that], back in Turkey, … Turkey’s atrocityic treatment of its Kurdish population and it’s threat to invade Kurdistan – now [sorely] located in Northern Iraq [as it is still not considered to ‘exist’ officially in Turkey], go [publicly]

102 Israeli training may also be related to possible joint US-Israeli state plans for the destabilisation and/or targeting of Iran in coming months.
103 Gulcan, N. (2005) ‘Targets are Iran and Syria’, Journal of Turkish Weekly, 27 December 2005 [http://www.vredessite.nl/andernieuws/2006/week02/12-27_targets.html]. Training of this kind, apart from potentially being geared for offensive operations against the PKK, are also likely to have been geared towards ‘potential’ offensive operations against the Iranian regime.
unnounced in the US. [This, even as] Turkey has purchased 30 “Cobra-type” armoured vehicles from Otokor, a unit of Koc Holdings to bolster its [‘anti-terrorist’] fight against a growing domestic Kurdish insurgency. And the Turkish military-industrial complex has expanded by 30 percent since 2004.\footnote{Stanton, J. (2005) ‘Brent Scowcroft Talks Turkey: Sibel Edmonds Fights Fascism’, November 19, 2005 \url{http://www.waynemadsenreport.com/stanton/stanton_turkey.php}.}

Given the nature of this type of US support for Turkey’s ‘War on Terror’, it seems reasonable to conclude that a ‘new intensified phase’ of ‘joint’ US-Turkey psychological warfare operations is underway. The Embassy of the US in Ankara, for instance, recently confirmed that “General Joseph W. Ralston (USAF, retired) has been appointed as Special Envoy for Countering the PKK. General Ralston will have responsibility for coordinating US engagement with the Government of Turkey and the Government of Iraq to eliminate the terrorist threat of the PKK and other terrorist groups operating in northern Iraq and across the Turkey-Iraq border. This appointment underscores the commitment of the United States to work with Turkey and Iraq to eliminate terrorism in all its forms.”\footnote{Embassy of the US, Ankara (2006) Press Releases ‘US Department of State Statement by Sean McCormack, Spokesman: Special Envoy for Countering the PKK’, Press Release, Washington, DC, 28 August 2006 \url{http://ankara.usembassy.gov/pr_08282006.html}.} – apart from, of course, those ‘forms’ of terrorism that are promoted by the US-Turkish-Israeli and US backed Iraqi states. Local news sources in northern Iraq (south Kurdistan), for instance, reported on 14th August 2006 that “over 100 Turkish MIT (National Intelligence Agency) agents” had been permitted to cross over into the region “together with members of the Turkish Special Forces”.\footnote{DozaMe.org (2006) ‘Newsdesk Report’, \url{dozame.org}, 14 August 2006 \url{http://dozame.org/blog/2006/08/14/increased-turkish-military-and-intelligence-activity-in-southern-kurdistan-and-iraq/}.} These cross-border military incursions into the “US protectorate of Iraq”\footnote{Jacobs, R. (2004) ‘Nukes in the US Protectorate of Iraq? Iran Looks to Its West and Says: I Don’t Think So’, Counterpunch, 22 June 2004 \url{http://www.counterpunch.org/jacobs06222004.html}.} are unlikely to have taken place without a ‘green light’ having been provided by the US government. In all of this, there does not appear to have been any adequate public oversight into the nature of these ‘approved’ incursions and US-Turkey ‘anti-terrorism’ collaborative ‘special operations’ that have taken the lives of so many ‘suspected’ PKK ‘terrorists’. On 13th September 2006, we are also informed that “after a meeting with [the] Turkish Prime Minister”, Ralston clarified that “the United States would take tangible measures on the PKK, … adding that all measures would be taken for an influential fighting … He ruled out the possibility of meeting with [the] PKK … ‘Meeting with the PKK is out of the question for me. I never meet a terrorist organization. We want to get rid of them. I am intended to meet Turkish, Iraqi and U.S. governments and thus get rid of the PKK organization,’ he said … [He also] met with Turkish Foreign Ministry Undersecretary Ali Tuygan and retired General Edip Baser, who was appointed as Turkey’s anti-PKK coordinator. Ralston said that he would travel to Baghdad from Ankara for talks with Iraqi officials”\footnote{Xinhua (2006) News bulletin, \textit{Xinhua}, 14 September 2006.} to take matters further.

If, as we are now informed, the Bush administration, in its wisdom, is committed to jointly ‘hunting down’ and ‘destroying’ the ‘PKK terrorists’ using the full might of its military and intelligence agencies, additional questions arise. Will there be, as many Kurdish and human rights analysts contend, a resurgence of US-Turkish state inspired ‘false flag’ operations that will blame the ‘PKK’ for massacres and disappearances of Kurdish civilians that were perpetrated by state inspired forces? Will initiatives that seek to resolve the ‘Kurdish question’ through ‘military/paramilitary means’ rather than through peaceful dialogue, be intensified even as public interest organisations, peace groups and human rights organisations oppose such measures? Will there be a resurgence of US-Turkish state
‘inspired’ anti-terrorist ‘abductions’, ‘disappearances’, massacres, and torture sessions for Kurdish civilians, intellectuals, schoolchildren, students, journalists, politicians, lawyers and other perceived ‘pro-Kurdish’ supporters in Turkey and northern Iraq (south Kurdistan)?

Other concerns also arise: In jointly targeting, tracking and ‘hunting’ down and capturing the ‘terrorists’, how will these ‘terrorists’ – ‘civilian’ and/or ‘combatants’ – be treated? Given that the PKK has officially been described by US administration staffers as being ‘no different’ to al-Qaeda, are PKK members or ‘suspected PKK’ members likely to be treated during ‘interrogation’, ‘targeting’ and ‘incarceration’ in the same way that al-Qaeda suspects or members have been treated? If so, there is certainly cause for concern.109

Concerns Over The New ‘Anti-Terrorism Law’.

We also need to ask ourselves whether the Bush administration will keep accepting the ‘definition’ of ‘PKK terrorists’ and ‘terrorism’ that will have been provided to it by its ‘deep political’ Turkish hypernationalist and military/paramilitary/special forces’ linked ‘allies’. Certainly, Condoleeza Rice, during her most recent visit to Turkey, did not publicly express any concern over such definitions when she provided assurances that the Bush administration was fully supportive of Turkey’s ‘War on Terror’. The Bush administration appears to be ‘minded’ to accept the absurd and dangerous ‘definitions’ that are being provided and used under the new Turkish ‘Anti-Terrorism Law’ and by Turkish military officials to criminalise people and organisations. These definitions, specifically created to facilitate the ‘War on Terror’, have the capacity to criminalise the non-violent activities of many Kurdish and non-Kurdish people.

Concerns over this matter were even recently expressed by the UN Special Rapporteur: “[A] letter, sent on May 21 [2006] to the Parliament Justice Committee by Martin Scheinin, UN Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms while Countering Terrorism, informed Turkey that the new [proposed anti-terrorism] law fails to meet the requirement of proportionality in the use of force by security forces, introduces improper restrictions on freedom of expression and reflects the danger of punishing civilians not involved in violence. ‘This danger is exacerbated by the very broad definition of terrorism’” that is being used “‘and the very long and wide list of terrorist offences’ … Scheinin’s letter assessed the draft” – which is now law - “according to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and also with reference to certain provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights. He said the very definition of ‘terrorism’ and ‘terrorist offences’ in the draft were contrary to the spirit of his comments and recommendations after his country visit to Turkey on 16-23 February 2006 as UN Special Rapporteur, adding that ‘such indiscriminate use of the terms terrorism and terrorist’, raised concerns about, “the principle of legality”,110 as well as other issues.

This new ‘Anti-Terrorism’ law, as the Bush administration well knows, has also been criticised from several other quarters for dangerously enabling ‘deep political’ circles in Turkey to potentially target and criminalise anyone they do not like as a ‘terrorist’. Ayhan Bilgen, the Deputy Chairman of MAZLUMDER, for example, forcefully argues that “we need to see from today that this [law] will target every section of the society. In the past, they said only leftists would be put on trial under Article 312, that the State Security Courts would be involved in the struggle against separatism. But none of these happened. They should not think they can get away with it, saying that it will specifically effect [only] religious groups, the PKK and left-wing organisations … This framework” suggested by the draft bill – which is now law in Turkey – is such that, in “using human rights advocacy, you will be” targeted and defined as a terrorist, for “‘defending terror or something else [like that]’, and because of this, it will incriminate” even those who are “defending human rights, allow[ing] for the[ir…


conviction” as terrorists. Human Rights Association Chairman Yusuf Alatas has “argued that the bill is incompatible with human rights” and said it intended to bring back all of the country’s past suppression laws and create a silent society... He said, ‘Not even Parliamentarians are free. Everyone standing up against the law will be accused of supporting terrorism and standing up against the regime’

Info Turk confirms that even “Turkish media criticized the government’s proposal... saying the draft defined too many actions as terror and could easily be misused... The Cumhuriyet newspaper devoted its front page to criticizing the proposed law: ‘The reforms passed in the European Union process will be erased by a definition of terror that encompasses all crimes... There is nothing left out in the definition’... According to Izmir Bar Association Prevention of Torture Group (IOG) lawyer Nalan Erkem, ‘‘The arrangements that the draft makes with regard to access to an attorney takes away all of the rights of the defendant... While it opens the way for torture and mistreatment, the draft also aims to prevent lawyers from proving their existence’. Erkem argued that the draft was in the nature of an insult to lawyers in Turkey, stripping away the defence rights that were brought forth under Turkey’s accession plans with the EU... “Representatives of... 17 non-government organisations (NGOs)... have also “read a press statement in front of Istanbul’s Sultanahmet Justice Hall... where an appeal was made to... reject it. The move came after similar appeals from leading Turkish human rights groups including IHD and MAZLUMDER... The country's Human Rights Foundation (TIHV) joined in the criticism and said the law would not only shift Turkey from its previous EU projections but also meant a turn to a ‘tolerance policy towards torture’...

CONCLUSION.

In reflecting upon the current situation, it is also worth noting that the Bush administration has set in place a series of arrangements that are aimed at securing immunity from prosecution of all US, Turkish and Israeli forces who may be charged with ‘war crimes’ or ‘genocidal crimes’ for any questionable actions that they may have been found to be undertaking. The US government, it seems, has not only been seeking to unethically provide immunity from prosecution to its government, military forces and citizens at the International Criminal Court (ICC), but also those of its ‘client’ and ‘favoured’ states – Israel and Turkey in particular: “Senior (US) officials have stated repeatedly and quite categorically that they will continue to reject any jurisdictional arrangement allowing international prosecution of its own civilian authorities or military personnel for war crimes as ‘an infringement upon US national sovereignty’ (thereby recapitulating the previously noted premise of the Third Reich). Objections have also been raised with regard to any curtailment of self-assigned US prerogatives to shield its clients – usually referred to as ‘friends’ – from prosecution for crimes committed under its sponsorship – e.g. ... Turkish officials presiding over the ongoing ‘pacification’ of Kurdistan”.

The information gathered in this article does, unfortunately, disturbingly suggest that “an important part of the political function of the ‘War on Terror’ has been the way it legitimises political intimidation by a range of allies beyond the Bush/Blair/Aznar axis. In effect, the ‘War on Terror’ has

given a licence to internal repression in countries supporting this war’”117 – such as Turkey. “As in many civil wars, demonising one party” – the ‘terrorist PKK’, in this instance – “has created space for the [hidden] abuses of others. As Michael Mann observes, labelling opponents as ‘al-Qaeda’” – or, indeed, as being no different to ‘al-Qaeda’ – “allows repressive governments””, such as Turkey, “’to do what they want with limited international criticism’”.”118 Not only has the US governmental stance dangerously allowed the Turkish government to repressively ‘do’ what it wants with regard to the ‘Kurdish question’, it has actively endeavoured to actively ‘assist it’, as it did throughout the genocidal period of the 1990’s, with its highly questionable ‘anti-terrorism initiatives’. We need to seriously reflect upon these issues and act to expose and end the nature of these types of unacceptable ‘actions’ and ‘activities’.

Note: Desmond Fernandes and Iskender Ozden’s book, US, UK, German and NATO ‘Inspired’ Psychological Warfare Operations Against The Kurdish ‘Communist’ Threat in Turkey and Northern Iraq, will be released in November 2006. It is published by Apec Press (Stockholm, Sweden) and can be obtained in the UK from Housmans Bookshop (5 Caledonian Road, Kings Cross, London N1 9DX. Tel: 020 7837 4473).