

Tusiad-Bogazici University Foreign Policy Forum Conference

Iraq Crisis: Military Intervention And Political Future

28 February 2003 – Swissotel, Istanbul

Tuncay Özilhan: Distinguished guests and Dear members of the Press let me welcome you on behalf of TUSIAD and extend my most cordial greetings. For Turkey this is a rather marked timing we are going to be talking about the prospects of a military campaign in Iraq and the source of political and military assumptions could be into the feature. Before I begin my speech, let me extend my gratitude for the distinguished presenters of the day who have kindly accepted our invitation.

The crisis in Iraq has taken a toll on the Turkish economy, which had already found itself in a recession. Its adverse affects will not be easily eradicated into the future. As a matter of fact, the fact that the crisis has emerged was not caused by the responsibilities of Turkey nor could Turkey have any options as to further procrastinations. Turkey's policy in the Middle East is fundamentally based on peace and harmony in the region. Turkey has abided by international conventions and has pursued a policy in that direction to date. We would rather go for peace and collaboration rather than conflict. We recognize the fact that there will be economic and political benefits should conflict be replaced by peace. The fact that we opt for peace in the future does not necessarily mean that we will entirely refrain from military perils. There are military dangers; there are safety issues that we cannot necessarily get rid of. We realize that this is a process, which could turn the political and economic equilibrium in the region upside down. So we've got to talk about the ways and means of maintaining peace and stability in the region.

So for that reason Turkey has got to contemplate on some of the developments that can take place in the future. We unfortunately cannot quite anticipate what lies ahead and we find ourselves facing lots of exposures into the future. The crisis in Iraq is not merely about the preventing the proliferation of mass destruction weapons nor is it merely about containing the regime in Iraq. The Iraqi crisis is about super powers of the world and their relationships in between themselves as well as regional players. It is about finding equilibrium in the region, a process that will test the powers, the strengths of both regional and international players. Turkey has got to safeguard its long-term interests in the region. Turkey has got to protect and safeguards its benefits in the long term. We do not opt for any sort of a solution that would be against our interests. We unfortunately have not been able to prevent the war. There already are some political solutions ahead and whether we like it or not we've got to negotiate and acrosize for some solutions that we may not quite agree with. We've got to make cost and benefit analysis. However we also have to look at to sorts of solutions or the best scenario that would mean minimized damages in the long term.

We have got to concentrate our energies and political and military planning which means that we do not just prevent the damages and losses but we could also generate some benefits into the long term as well.

We definitely do not opt to wage war against Iraq, there are lots of volatilies that could be faced nonetheless the adverse impact is a cause for concern. The destruction to be caused in the neighboring country, the tragedies that could follow suit and we are highly grieved by the prospect of war. Nonetheless if it is going to take place we as Turkey is not going to be the

ones to wage war. Indeed even if we do not authorize deployment, there will be a war if the parties feel it necessary to be so. Since it is up to our benefit to be entirely outside the war and to be able to avoid all the damages that could be perspective we unfortunately have got to authorize the deployment of American troops which means that the permission that will allow for the US troops to be deployed quiet rightly. We have got to be negotiating with our strategic ally in this very process before we authorize deployment.

Number one issue is the fact that economic losses and damages as well as humane issues have got to be minimized compared to the damages the way incurred back in the Gulf War. We have to extend our concerns to the US administration, we've asked for their support and their commitment into providing assistance to the Turkish economy.

Secondly, it is the fact that during the planning of the US military campaign and there are also military and political prospect that we have got to consider in Iraq. We need to have an elaborate understanding of what the future holds for Iraq and there are certain issues that we are sensitive to that must be accepted by the US administration. Although we are not directly involved in the war ourselves, once the military campaign is over, political development are of grave concern for Turkey. We must monitor these developments and make sure throughout our lobbying activities that we can provide guidance to our benefit into these political developments. At a time when change is inevitable and instituting peace once again, there is no time for being romantic or emotional, we've got to be proactive, we've got to be in command of all the details that are involved, we must have a long term political vision.

As I conclude my words, let me extend my gratitude to everyone of you and I do hope that it will be a fundamentally beneficial seminar in providing us with the ability to grasp these complicated issues.

Gülden Ayman: Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the TUSIAD and Bosphorus University Foreign Policy Forum, let me welcome you to the conference and extend my respectful greetings. We are primarily going to be addressing the perspective intervention in Iraq to talk about political and military assumptions into the future. We have a number of keynote speakers for the day and I'd like to invite them in alphabetical order. Mr. Ibrahim Al Marashi, if you would kindly proceed to the podium please. Assoc. Prof. Nurşin Ateşoğlu Güney, former Admiral Serdar Erdurmaz and Prof. Duygu Sezer Bazoğlu please if you all kindly proceed.

Again we are going to be proceeding in alphabetical order. The very first presenter will be Mr. İbrahim Al Marashi. We would like to extend our tribute to Mr. Al Marashi because he has kindly accepted our invitation to attend; he had to travel long distances. What brings him here is not just his excellent academic background but the Tony Blair report in the UK was actually inspired by the Al Marashi report. It was evidenced that he was inspired by the Al Marashi report. He is with the Monterey University as a lecturer and he is with the Center for non-proliferation studies in Monterey in the US Naval Post Graduate School. So here is where he currently teaches. Mr. Al Marashi is going to be addressing the relationships between Iraq, Turkey and the USA and the decision to go ahead with the use of force in Iraq. He is going to be addressing the Iraqi perspective and what the future holds for Iraq.

We all have a quarter of an hour for the presentation so I'd like to urge every one of the keynote presenters to please sit by the timing.

İbrahim Al Marashi: Öncelikle bana İstanbul'a gelme fırsatı verdikleri için TÜSİAD'a teşekkür etmek istiyorum. İsmimden de anlayabileceğiniz gibi ben aslında Maraş asıllı bir Irak'lıyım. Öncelikle şunu söylemek istiyorum, Türkiye ve Irak ilişkilerine genel olarak baktığımızda, ben Irak açısından değineceğim çünkü paneldeki tek Iraklı panelist benim ve Irak Türkiye'nin rolünü acaba nasıl değerlendiriyor bunlara değineceğim.

Öncelikle kültürel bir konuya değinmek istiyorum, ben Irak'lı bir aile içinde büyüdüm, tabi ki büyükbabam Osmanlı İmparatorluğu döneminde yaşamış bir kişiydi ve ben kendisine hep, Osmanlılardan ne hatırlıyorsun diye sorardım çünkü 103 yaşına kadar yaşamıştı. Hatırladığım tek iyi şey nargileydi derdi hep. Türkiye tabi ki kültürel izlerini Irak'ta bıraktı aynen diğer Arap ülkelerinde olduğu gibi. Aslında Irakta kullandığımız sözcüklere baktığımızda Arap ülkelerinde hala ice cream kullanılmasına rağmen dondurma için biz Irakta 'dondurma' sözcüğünü kullanıyoruz. Yani pek çok Türkçe sözcük hala Iraklıların günlük dilinde kullanılıyor. Yine bunun dışında Irakta Türkiye ile bağlantıları olan pek çok aile var. Örneğin, Irak Ulusal Konseyi başkanı Sayın Çelebi'nin gördüğümüz gibi Türkçe bir adı var.

Irak'ın Türkiye ile olan ilişkilerinde üç faktörün ön planda olduğunu görüyoruz. Bunlardan birincisi;

1. Su
2. Amerikan askerlerinin konuşlandırılması
3. Kürtler

İlkiyle başlarsak yani su ile ilgili konular. Şunu söylemek isterim, Irak'taki rejime baktığımızda tabi ki Türkiye ve Irak arasında su ile ilgili çok önemli konular var. Türkiye tabi ki barışçı bir çözüm sundu. Bildiğiniz gibi hem Fırat ve hem de Dicle nehirleri Türkiye'de doğmakta ve de Türkiye ile Arap ülkeleri arasında bir boru hattı önerdi Türkiye ama Arap ülkeleri bu konuda daha düşmanca bir tavır sergilediler. Hem Irak hem de Suriye'ye baktığımızda PKK'yı desteklemelerinin en büyük amaçlarından biri su konusunda bir müzakerelerde ellerinde bir koz bulunmasıydı.

Türkiye ve Irak ilişkilerinde ikinci konu da tabi ki Amerikan askerinin konuşlandırılması. Amerikan güçleri belki önümüzdeki günlerde sayısı artabilir. Irak tabi ki Amerikan güçlerinin örneğin İncirlik hava üssünde konuşlanmasından kaygılı, Amerikan güçlerinin aktivitelerini yakından takip ediyor. Irakın kuzeyinde uçuşa yasak olan bölgedeki durumu çok yakından kontrol ediyor.

Üçüncü konu da daha önce söylemiş olduğum gibi, kürtlerle ilgili konu. Türkiye ve Irak ilişkilerindeki üçüncü önemli etken. Kürt konusuna daha sonra ayrıntılarıyla gireceğim ama Irak açısından konuya yaklaştığımızda tabi ki Irakın kuzeyinde herhangi bir Türk askerinin bulunması Irakı çok yakından ilgilendiriyor. Örneğin yaklaşık 25.000 kişilik bir birlik kuzey Iraka girdi 1977'de ve de Irak basınına ben şöyle bir baktığımda o dönemde, bu 'Yeni bir Osmanlı İmparatorluğu' deniyordu. Hatırlayacak olursanız 1920'lerde Türkler Musul üzerinde hak iddia etmişlerdi. Bununla ilgili pek çok müzakere yapılmıştı, yani kuzey Irakta herhangi bir Türk birliğinin hareketi hemen Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun tekrardan doğmaya çalışması şeklinde değerlendiriliyor Irakta.

Evet su konusu, Amerikan askerinin Türkiyede konuşlandırılması ve de Irakın kuzeyinde Türk askerinin aktiviteleri, bunlar üç önemli etken. Geçmişte tabi ki Türk Irak ilişkilerinde pek çok gelişmeler oldu. Örneğin Türkiye Iraka insani yardım uçuşları düzenledi ve de ticari bağlantılar tekrardan kurulmaya başlandı, ilişkiler güçlenmeye başlandı ve de tabi ki petrol boru hattı kuruldu Irak petrolunun Türkiyeye aktarılması için.

Öncelikle kuzey Irakta Türk askerinin konuşlandırılmasının sonuçları ne olur buna değinmek istiyorum ve acaba Iraklılar bu konuşlandırma konusunda ne düşünecek ve yine Irakın toprak bütünlüğü açısından bunun önemi ne ve bir kürt devletinin kurulması söz konusu mu? Ben bunları Irakın bakış açısı olarak değerlendirmek istiyorum. Şimdi türk Irak ilişkilerine baktığımızda tabi ki burada Iraklılardan bahsediyoruz, tabi ki bir resmi hükümet var, bunun dışında pek çok kürt muhalefet lideri var, bunun dışında başka muhalefet liderleri var. Herkesin kendi görüşü var bu konuda. Türkiyenin rolü acaba Saddam sonrası Irakta ne olmalı, bu konuda herkesin farklı görüşleri var. İsterseniz Iraktaki bu görüşleri ikiye ayıralım, iki kamp var. Aslında iki hizip var burada, Saddam sonrası dönemde Türkiyenin müdahalesi söz konusu olduğunda. Şimdi bir Irak Türkmen cephesi var ve Türkiyeyi bir koruyucu devlet olarak görüyorlar ve aslında Türkmenler bildiğiniz gibi Irakta üçüncü büyük grup olmalarına rağmen kürtlerden sonra unutulmuş olan bir halk ve de Saddam sonrasında tabi ki ön plana çıkmak istiyorlar ve Türkiyenin müdahalesinin kendilerine faydalı olacağını düşünüyorlar ve şu ana kadar çok göz ardı edilmiş, ihmal edilmiş bir grup. Örneğin Türkmenler şunu söylüyorlar, alıntı yapıyorum, eğer Irakta bir operasyon yapılacak olursa uluslar arası bir kararla yapılmalı ve bize göre bu uluslar arası bir operasyon olacaksa Türkiye tabi ki bunun bir parçası olacaktır, ancak bu Türkiyeye kalmış bir karardır. Türkiyenin katılıp katılmayacağını bilmiyoruz ama uluslar arası güçler Iraka gelecekte Türk askerinin de bunların arasında olmasını istiyoruz diyorlar. Yani Türkmen muhalefet liderlerinin görüşü bu. Muhalefette diğer bir kamp ise, Irak Ulusal Konseyi. Bildiğiniz gibi Çelebi'nin başkanlığındaki Konsey bu ve tabi bu muhalefet grubu içinde farklı hizipler, farklı gruplar ama bu bir şemsiye kuruluş olarak değerlendirilebilir yani Şiiler, Türkmenler, Kürtler, Araplar, hepsi aynı şemsiye altında toplanmaya çalışıyorlar. Çelebi şunu çok açık bir şekilde belirtti, işte Saddam sonrası Türkmenlerin hakları kendilerine verilmeli diyor ve de Türklerin girmesi söz konusu olduğunda şöyle diyor, Türk ordusu hiçbir şekilde kuzey Iraka girse bile problem yaratmayacaktır çünkü Türk birlikleri bu sorunun çözülmesine yardımcı olacaktır diyor.

Şimdi de Türkiyenin rolü söz konusu olduğunda resmi hükümet ne düşünüyor, buna bir bakalım, yani Irak hükümeti ne diyor? Türk askerleri kuzey Iraka girerse ne olur? Şimdi Irak başbakan yardımcısı Ramazan şöyle diyor, birliklerin Iraka girmesi Türkiyenin Iraka karşı bir saldırı olarak değerlendirilir diyor ve şöyle devam ediyor, herhangi bir ülkenin müdahalesi Iraka karşı yapılmış saldırı olarak değerlendirilecektir, bu saldırılara hazırız, Iraktaki yabancı güçlere karşı hazırız, umarım ülkeler böyle bir hataya düşmezler ve de Irak yabancı güçlere karşı koyacaktır diyor.

Peki Irak Türkiyeye nasıl saldırabilir, bu kendini nasıl gösterecek? Evet, birkaç seçenek var. Bunları değerlendirecek olursak şunu söyleyebiliriz. Irak kendi kimyasal yada biyolojik silahlarını kullanabilir deniyor ama bunun olması çok küçük bir olasılık, bunun olacağını sanmıyoruz. Bildiğimiz kadarıyla Irak şimdiye kadar başarılı bir şekilde kimyasal yada biyolojik silahlarını zaten konuşlandıramadı skutlarda yada diğer konvansiyonel olmayan silahların kullanılması da mümkün görülüyor. Biyolojik yada kimyasal silahların örneğin bombalar aracılığıyla atılması gibi bir şey sözkonusu olarak görülüyor. Aslında bunu kullanabilirler Türkiyeye saldırmak için ama hava savunması zaten bunu engelleyecektir.

Üçüncü bir olasılık da şu olabilir, istihbarat güçleri aracılığıyla Irak Türkiyeye saldırabilir. Benim gördüğüm kadarıyla tabi Iraktan kaçan kişileri biliyoruz, yine Iraktaki muhalefeti de biliyoruz. İstihbarat gücü özellikle Türkiye içindeki operasyonları düzenlemek için çalışıyor. Örneğin, Iraktaki askeri istihbarata baktığımızda 300 kişi özellikle Türkçe eğitim almış ve de

bir bölük olarak çalışıyorlar ve Türkiyede belirli hedeflere yönelik olarak çalışıyorlar. Yani ben demek istemiyorum ki Türkiye içinde bir yere saldıracaklar ama Türkiyedeki bir Amerikan tesisine belki saldırılabilir ancak bunun da olması söz konusu değil. Ancak 300 kişilik bir ekibin bu şekilde istihbarat güçleri tarafından eğitildiğini biliyoruz. Yine hatırlayacak olursanız 1998 Şubatında Faruk El Caze Irak'ın Türkiyedeki büyükelçisiydi ve Faruk El Caze'nin siciline bakacak olursanız Ankaraya gelmeden önce herhangi bir diplomat sicili yoktur ancak 1965'ten beri istihbarat görevlisi olarak çalışıyordu. Yani Irak istihbarat açısından uzman olan birini neden Türkiyeye büyükelçi olarak gönderiyor, bence bu da bir takım şüpheleri uyandıracak bir konu. Çünkü bu kişinin diplomatik bir kariyeri yok Ankaraya gelmeden önce. Faruk El Caze terörist organizasyonları desteklemek amacıyla istihbarat güçlerinde çalışıyordu. Filistindeki örgütlerle çalışıyorlardı, PKK'yı destekliyorlardı ve bu kişinin El Kaide ile de 1994 – 1998 yılları arasında bağlantısı olabileceği konusunda gazetede haberler çıkmıştı. Elimizde bu yönde raporlar var.

Yine diğer kaynaklara baktığımızda İraka karşı olan bir Şii muhalefet var İranda konuşlanmış olan. Sadece Türkiyenin müdahalesi değil ama İran üzerinden de çalışıyorlar ve yine Kürt Demokrat Partisi de Türkiyenin müdahalesine karşı olduklarını zaten açıkladılar ve bu Kürt bölgesindeki hükümetin ve de diğer kürdistan birliğinin açıklamalarına baktığımızda örneğin KDP'nin sözcüsünün dediklerine baktığımızda, eğer kuzey Irakta Türk askeri konuşlansa buna karşı çıkarız dediler.

Sonuç olarak şunu söyleyebiliriz, kürtlerin Irakın kuzeyinde bağımsız bir devlet kurmayacağı, 1975 yılından beri Irak anayasasına bağımlı olarak faaliyet gösteren bir bölgedir burası ama özerk olan bir bölgedir, o yüzden kağıt üzerinde bir özerklikleri olduğu doğru. 1991 yılında Körfez savaşından sonra 6 hafta boyunca kürtler yarı bağımsız olarak yaşadılar ama yine de bağımsız bir devlet kurduklarını ilan etmediler. Yine şöyle bir olasılık da var, kürtler zaten Saddam sonrası Irakta tek bir devlet kurmak için bir araya gelmeleri çok zor görünüyor, yani bunun koordinasyonunu kurmaları zor görünüyor ama kürt politikasını önceden tahmin etmek çok zordur ve bağımsız bir kürt devleti kurulmayacağı konusunda Türkiyeye bir takım garantiler verildi Barzani ve Talabani tarafından daha önce.

Çok teşekkür ederim, sürem bittiği için burada kesmek durumundayım.

Gülden Ayman: We would like to thank Mr. Marashi for his excellent time management and for his insightful presentation. He gave us detailed information about different scenarios on part of Iraq if the Turkish troops are to be deployed in northern Iraq and he gave us information regarding the Iraqi intelligence forces. Now we know that there is a special unit working in the Iraqi intelligence especially trained for operations in Turkey and we can ask questions to him later on.

Now if you would allow me I would like to give the floor to Associate Professor Nursin Ateşoğlu Güneş who is teach at Yıldır Technical University in the Political Science and International Relations Department. She has been working a long time on international security issues. She is going to talk about the threats of weapons in the preemptive war.

Nursin Ateşoğlu Güneş: Among all the academic circles in the world unlike what Bush is claiming that there are threats imposed by the Saddam's government so as opposed to the preemptive policies imposed by Bush, many of the academics are claiming that it really is irrelevant especial in international affairs and political sciences but interestingly enough political sciences, academics in the US claim that the preemptive policies of the US are not

very well directioned. So I would like to bring about some of the points regarding the fact that preemptive policies of the US administration are not quite well pointed and that peaceful means of disarmament are much more relevant. I will also give you some of the claims as to whether a military intervention is really required.

Academics who claim that preemptive policies are not very well directioned, they are claiming that mass destruction weapons in Iraq do not necessarily pose a threat. That is why they are saying that preemptive policies are not to be justified simply because as provided by Blix report as well as reports by Baradady have justified these claims. There are actually no evidences supporting the claims of the Bush government that there are mass destruction weapons in Iraq. Since there are no proves evidenced by the UN in Iraq henceforth academics who are against preemptive policies of the Bush government are against the governments policies and they cannot quiet, they've had the ability to probe while the Bush government has been persevering in that direction. Plus they are claiming that Saddam's government has practically nothing to loose and therefore they are questioning why President Bush has been so very persistent.

Now I'd like to talk about the defense strategy in USA and what is called the Bush doctrine. The brand new strategy term that's the Bush doctrine whether the mass destruction weapons in Iraq actually comprise a peril. Now there really is no need for preemptive military operation, instead compare to Gulf War the military positioning in Iraq is highly masculated and this is highly clear. As evidence couple of days ago, the Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld claimed that 50% of the conventional weapons had diminished since the Gulf War so Iraq is much weaker compared to how it used to stand in 1990's. So there are clear signals that there are other alternatives to be considered rather than preemptive policies. This is what members of faculty have been claiming. They are insisting on perseverance, containment and peaceful resolution to disarmament claiming that Saddam can be removed from office through peaceful means.,

So preemptive policies, **Stephen Walt** and **Mearsheimer**, among those academics who opposed to the Bush government, they are saying that there is no need for preemptive military campaign claiming that there is actually no peril against the USA and there is no evidence to be offered by the UN's report. Therefore they are saying that the Bush doctrine is not mandatory. There are those who claim that preemptive policies are compulsory but that is opposed to their views, both of the academics have quiet substantial arguments, they are claiming that Saddam Hüseyin and the leadership in Iraq are not acting in an irrational manner on the contrary although they love to play a gamble but nonetheless they do have tactical computations in mind and if you look at Saddam's track records in the past 30 years, he's only purported war twice in a matter of 30 years.

Primarily Saddam's government if they are exposed to a military campaign they only use force if they feel desperate and secondly if they feel isolated and rather osterized vis a vis hostile powers. So for the matter of 30 years in the past we realize except for these two exceptional cases Saddam's government has not resorted to the use of war and both of these are valid for the Gulf war and the siege of Kuwait. So as many who are proponents of preemptive policies claim there are clear signals that Saddam is not as bellicose as many claim to be. In both of these instances during Iran Iraqi war as well as the Gulf operation, Saddam has never purported to use force except for those instances where there were clear signals of belligerence. It is clear that even if Iraq does hold mass destruction weapons, it is

clear that it can be deterred from exercising their power, so that I'd like to highlight once more.

The new American Defense Strategy is what I'd like to touch upon now. Following 9/11 preemptive policies was not necessarily designed that really was a backdrop prior to 9/11 on the designation of preemptive preeminence, which dates back to the end of the cold war. With the collapse of the Berlin Wall and perception of danger from the USA underwent change. During the cold war, clear signals of threat with the USSR, the USSR no longer existed and the only perceived threat following the collapse of Berlin Wall and the collapse of the USSR were **roakstate, the so called roakstates** and the fact that their mass destruction weapons had to be eradicated. Following 9/11 the perceived problem of mass destruction weapons were to be considered through the perspective of terrorism so US administration had to point a brand new strategy so the strategic development that took place in the US administration was that they had to do away with the containment policy that they used to pursue in the past, simply because 9/11 was there to legitimize most of the policies that were exercised by Bush and his government. So the timing was quiet right, they have a new strategy and that is their priority and they claim that the reason why such preemptive preeminence can be exercised is because they have the right to defend themselves although it seems rather dissolute remark.

Iraq at the moment and the extent of its power can not be compared to the USA, many of the academics are claiming well why they left Iraq alone for the past 12 years and have not done a better job in terms of closely monitoring what is happening in Iraq. One of the major strategic decisions that have taken place at the moment is that containment in deterrence have been revoked at the moment US is much more military campaign driven. During the cold war the convention that prevents the use of missiles have meant restriction of security concerns and they have intriguers and equilibrium on military and safety issues. Back in 2000 the fact that Bush government has failed to comply with these conventions goes on to suggest how perseverant they have been exercising their preemptive preeminence. I think that it goes on to show the mentality of the Bush government. We know that following the Gulf war, the backdrop had already generated a 9/11 very much justify their claims.

I would like to talk about the 33-page Bush doctrine. As of now the military institutions in the US will be directed against ... countries that they believe to be belligerent. These countries that hold or could hold mass destruction weapons. So preemptive operations can be or will be considered against these countries. One of the major areas of differences that containment policies have been left aside and if the US perceive threat to be valid before they are strike by the hostile country, they want to reassure their safety and security vis a vis hostile nations in line with this doctrine. The Bush doctrine also stipulates that in the prospect of a crisis the USA may collaborate with its allies in the international domain but the same doctrine also remarks that the USA can act unilaterally to defend itself regardless of collaboration with other countries so I think the entire dilemma is very much to be justified by the Bush doctrine that the Bush government does not necessarily have to see collaboration from other countries. as I noted earlier on these incidences have not happened spontaneously. One is that there is a need to fight against terrorism as well as the issues that have happened with 9/11.

If we look at the nuclear pasture review in the issue of the year 2002, it suggests that there are explanations on the US position against a nuclear threat, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Northern Korea and China and interestingly enough Russia are among those countries that pause a threat. Those documents suggest that nuclear weapons plus conventional weapons and mass destruction weapons are outlined in this document.

There are lots of details to be covered but since I've only got 2 minutes, I'd like to skip those. What matters is that this is a plan, it is not yet for definite nonetheless it has caused a great backlash among academic circles. There is also the Ramsfeld report that I'd like to touch upon which looks at countries such as Syria, Sudan that their scud missile threats, from that report the access of evil which was outlined by President Bush and many academic circles are trying to find a link between Afghanistan and policies now in Iraq. The Bush government are suggesting that preemptive policies are highly compulsory to bring about a holistic perspective in the fight against terrorism. There are two claims, one is that Iraq may have nuclear weapons; there is no evidence as suggested by the UN reports. Plus during 1996 and 1998 there were inspections by **Anscop** and they have eliminated all the nuclear developments. Plus America had been able to deter the USSR during the cold war and they can easily deter Iraq at the moment so there is no substantial claim plus Condalice Rice has claimed that Iraq can not exercise these weapons, the President Bush has also claimed that Iraq cannot blackmail the USA with the use of nuclear weapons. So on the one hand they are claiming that there are no nuclear weapons and on the other hand they are looking at these weapons of mass destructing as being the cause for military operation. One of the other stepping-stones is that there are weapons of mass destruction; they have been used during the Gulf war against their own people during Iran Iraqi war. But Iraq has already been deterred in that respect especially during the Gulf war. Although scud missiles have been exercised the US made it quiet clear to the Iraqi government that nuclear weapons could be used so it is neither the Iraqi government did not use chemical weapons against Israel or the USA. So in conclusion there are no legal or military justifications for preemptive policy and compared to 1991 Iraq is highly emasculated in terms of its economy, in terms of its army. The economy is practically in shambles and people find themselves in appalling circumstances. So much more then ever we need peaceful containment to be furthered and disarmament is possible thru peaceful means. So we need to set aside the use of force, we need to further containment policies and close the lid on Iraq.

Gülden Ayman: Assoc. Prof. Güneş has touched upon some of the reasons for changing the policies against Iraq. She claims that the backshop has already generated prior to 9/11. She's also touched upon some of the parameters that have been brought attention to for justifying the claims that the US government has. We now going to be talking about the perspective of peoples of Turkey and the way they find themselves to be impacted by this situation in the Southern far eastern regions. I'd like to call upon now the retired Cornel Serdar Erdurmaz. He is with Aselsan and lately he has concentrated in the proliferation of weapons in Middle East, supervision and control of these weapons in the Middle East. He's published number of publications to date. He is going to be talking about the conventional threats and threat of scud missiles from Iraq, whether such threat is valid and the use of biological or chemical war heads in scud missiles, does Iraq has the capacity to strike Turkey and if so what will be the ramifications.

Serdar Erdurmaz: Thank you very much. After the presentation of Assoc. Prof. Güneş, I am going to talk about ramifications of a time if Iraq strikes Turkey with weapons of mass destruction. I am going to talk about weapons of mass destruction Iraq is claimed to have and I am going to touch upon the related issues. I am going to explain whether Iraq can use biological or chemical weapons against Turkey.

Well, first of all let's look at the background of this term, how did we come up with the term, weapons of mass destruction WMD. In two days during the Second World War, 1400

bombers bombed the and thousands of people died in two days but only one bomb which stroked Hiroshima killed hundreds of thousands of people so when you drop a 1 mega ton of bomb to city you can kill hundreds of thousands of people and you can injure as many. When we say weapons of mass destruction, which weapons are we talking about? The nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, you can have these weapons but you cannot use them any time, any place you want and this being the case, they don't mean anything. Of course I am not talking about terrorist operations, I am talking about the armed forces. In terms of conventional weapons, as a result of Iran and Iraq war or the Gulf war in the beginning of 1990's we see that Iraq lost most of its armed forced; they were diminished because they were not up to date and high tech. In order for Iraq to modernize its classical or conventional weapons, they need 30 billion US dollars plus at least 5 years to modernize their weapons. Rafsancani said that biological and chemical weapons were the atom bombs of the poor countries and we need these weapons.

Well, Iraq is very weak in conventional weapons, that is why they were oriented towards biological and chemical weapons and they did every thing they could in order to have biological and chemical weapons. When we say conventional weapons, we are talking about the bombers and some of these have only 75 km range and these are used legitimately, the bomber planes are used legitimately, they have a specific range to fly and if you want to launch biological and chemical weapons to these bomber planes, you can drop them anywhere you want within the range of the bombers. Iraq has bombers which were modified from training planes so their ranges are quiet limited.

When you look at the missiles, there are Cruz and ballistic missiles. The ballistic missiles, the ones that Iraq has are scud missiles and their speed is 8 times higher then the speed of light. I could give you an example, let's say a scud missile from Iraq to Israel would fly in 7 minutes, there would be warning in 2 minutes so Israel would have only 5 minutes take precautions. The bomber would take the same distance in 30 minutes. When you look at the ballistic missile or a scud missile, when you detect them 500 km in distance you have only 5 minutes to take precaution but the Cruz missiles fly at a lower altitude so you have a shorter time to warn. Well we believe that Iraq has these scud missiles but of course we don't know whether they can load these biological and chemical weapons on these missiles. We know that Russia and China used to sell Iraq these warheads and the missiles and they didn't sell the technology to load biological and chemical warheads on these missiles. When there was a strict supervision of UN we don't know what Iraq was up to but as of 1998 Saddam Huseyin tried really hard to modify the scuds to increase their ranges and to load war heads and biological and chemical weapons on the missiles but we really don't know what they did in the last couple of years.

As I said before the bomber planes and Cruz missiles are more suitable to carry biological and chemical weapons and the warheads. When you look at the literature, we see that the ballistic missiles are more suitable for the war heads and when you load biological and chemical weapons if they explode that would be very dangerous and their effect wouldn't be as good if they spread. So the biological and chemical weapons will not be loaded on the missiles because they don't have Cruz missiles but we don't know whether they're working on the fact that biological and chemical weapons will be loaded on the scud missiles. We think that there are projects on the way.

When you look at the ballistic missiles, after the latest announcement, according to Blix's delegation we know that Iraq still has biological and chemical weapons and Iraq is trying to load these weapons on the scud missiles but these are not confirmed by Iraq.

Well I have only 5 minutes left so I cannot go into detail. We know that they have conventional weapons where they had loaded biological and chemical weapons in Iraq. We have some figures on that and they have anti-aircraft missiles too. But during the Gulf war, or during the Desert Storm operation we learned what Iraq did, where they deployed their forces but we don't know what Iraq can do right now. So they are silent, but we received some news yesterday, for example American bombers bombed some Iraqi aircrafts so USA is closely monitoring what Iraq is doing and we know that USA will bomb all the conventional forces or the weapons of Iraq so we know that Iraq will not be able to use their conventional forces because they will be destroyed and bombed by the US troops and forces.

When you look at the aircrafts, we know that they have 135 aircrafts but during Desert Storm and Gulf war they sent 97 of their aircrafts to Iran because they didn't want them to be destroyed and Iran didn't return them all to Iraq. So according to the UN inspectors they have spray tanks which are loaded with biological and chemical weapons and they did some trials. But now Iraq has 47 aircrafts and 6 of them are training aircrafts so believe it is not possible for them to spray biological weapons on these aircrafts.

When you look at the flight range of F16's, they can only fly to southern part of the Persian Gulf so even if they load these biological weapons, their ranges will be more limited so they will not be able to strike Incirlik airbase or southeastern part of Anatolia. They don't have sufficient range and when you think about the strategic military operation of the US, we believe that they are going to destroy the airbases and the aircrafts first. When you look at the scud missiles we know that they have 25 scud missiles, which are called, El Abbas and we know what their ranges are. It is claimed that Iraq is working to load biological warheads on these scud missiles. During the Iran Iraq war they sent 500 scud missiles into Tahrán and they destroyed the city and we know what their ranges are and if its range is higher than 300 km then it has to leave the atmosphere and it has to go to outer space, this being the case its speed is 3 km Per second but in the outer space it is less so there is a rafting period. So when we look at the feedbacks and reports coming from the States they destroy themselves when they go into the outer space. The scud missile which killed 28 American soldiers in Tahrán, it was destroyed in the outer space and it fell on the people in the barracks, that is why it killed so many people so it was an accident because it was destroyed in the outer space.

Because they don't have the ignition technology, we believe that these scud missiles will not be very sufficient and before 1998 they didn't have the chance to develop and improve them and 1998, it wasn't very easy for them to improve the ranges of the scud missiles, the El Abbas missiles. I believe they have may be 12 mobile tanks to throw these scud missiles and it is impossible for the USA to overlook and neglect them and they will be one of the first targets to be destroyed by the US bombs. But we don't have any announcements as to where the warheads are hidden. When you look at the other missiles, they are using liquid fuel and we believe they are demounted and in order for Iraq to use these missiles they have to be demounted again and they have to be deployed in specific places. The loading of the biological and chemical warheads we don't know what Iraq is doing right now. But there is a specific amount of warheads you can load on to these missiles. Because when you increase the amount of warheads then their range will go down so their effect will not be as high. As a result, we know that Iraq does not have any nuclear weapons but they can have enriched

metals and they have the necessary infrastructure to create nuclear weapons but we know that they are creating biological and chemical weapons and they can hide them. But in order to transport them they have to use trucks so they will be seen by the USA. A week ago in North Korea, USA detected the deployment or the transportation of the weapons by trucks and they gave a warning to North Korea. So USA is very sensitive regarding the North Korean Nuclear weapons programs, I believe they are going to do everything in their power to destroy the chemical and biological weapons and the missiles and I believe the missiles will not be thrown into the Turkish territory. Thank you very much.

Gülden Ayman: Now indeed the ability of the scud missiles to hit target and the fact that if there is the presence of chemical and biological weapons in Turkey, it is nice to hear that they are not going to be exercised against Turkey. Thank you very much to Mr. Eryılmaz for his insight and now I'd like to call upon to someone who is renowned as being a pioneer in International Foreign Policy affairs in the country. It is Prof. Dr. Duygu Sezer Bazoğlu from Bilkent University; she is currently a lecturer in the Political Science Department in the capital city of Ankara. Prof. Bazoğlu is going to address how the USA can carry out an intervention in Iraq and how certain issues have now been brought into the lime light, issues such as global strategies and the global vision in global safety matters.

Prof. Dr. Duygu Sezer Bazoğlu: Thank you very much. Dear Gülden has been so very complimentary in her remarks, I had the opportunity to get to know her as a student but that reveals my age, how old I am because I see lots of senior members of academia in front of me and they used to be my students some 20 years ago. Nonetheless let me extend my gratitude to TUSIAD-Bosphorus University Foreign Policy Forum for creating such a wonderful platform.

I think that we could have gone together much more frequent paces especially prior to the war because it was clear that we were heading this direction for some 2 years and perhaps we as Turkey could have been much more prepared if we'd been discussing these issues at greater length but I think we are learning. We are now learning a lesson, as Gülden says some 20-25 years ago none of us were as audacious to deal with these matters to dwell upon issues of military matters. The civic members of the society would not necessarily go into these issues. It wasn't just men or women but no one dwelt upon these matters. We were finding ourselves during the peak of cold war and I was currently being thought at Princeton University back then. Nuclear strategy went on to evidence how horrid a nuclear strategy would be. I was very much fearful of nuclear war that's why I went into the foreign relations studies and I had to ability to specialize in some subheadings and that is why I attended Princeton University. One of my students was Fuat Keymen at METU and I've learned a great deal from him as I've learned from Gülden. Fuat went on to highlight the issue as being not just about the use of force but peaceful resolution could indeed was imminent. He was one of my most intelligent students back then to offer the viability of peaceful resolution and I am highly pleased to be seeing other students of mine in the room.

Nurşin has been very clear in talking about the US strategy. Although we are talking about Iraq at the moment, I think that Iraq is very much to be applauded because they've had the ability to change the world to change the destiny of the world. They've changed the US strategy and perhaps Iraq could be the very first trial of US attempts to change international affairs altogether. Iraq is not just about regional issue, Iraq is going to have huge ramifications for US policies and the military intervention in Iraq is based upon so many other pretexts and there are lots of challenges at the moment for the US government. Iraq is highly substantial

for the region and us. However in an international scale because Iraq is part of some of the international changes that are envisioned I think Iraq is very much significant so it has international implications.

I'd like to extend my personal position in this regard. It hasn't come into formation in isolation since we are all opinion molders so to say none of our remarks are emotional in nature. It is all based on facts and figures. It is highly based in scientific findings and results. We as opinion molders we haven't necessarily generated these findings based on our dramatic emotions, we have the responsibility to justify them thru scientific findings. I personally believe that the scenario of war is not to be justified, is not necessary and it could have severe damages or severe ramifications and other colleagues of mine have voiced similar claims around the table. I am not saying this is merely my own personal opinion but Nurşin as she said earlier on everyone including US circles, both in the civic and military circles who know the issue very well, they've often said that such a strike is irrelevant, it is not required and it would be very dangerous. They've said throughout the past two years that it would be highly dangerous to go ahead with a military intervention. But the government for one reason or the other does not want to step back. Interestingly enough US experts have unique qualities. They may be higher quality than we are or much more interesting simply because they have the privilege to work very close with the public sector or the government. So they get lots of information to draw from and they get lots of feedback from the government so they can process these bits and pieces of information and extrapolate. Unfortunately we are not so close to the government, all we do is we collect bits and pieces from the media and we don't know how valid they are. As I use the word we, really I am referring to all of the members of academia in the country. So academics circles in the US are opposed to the war, their claims are highly justified by the sound information that they draw from the government so they are not just voluntary or ambiguous claims, they know for sure. So we must be aware of this fact. If we are going to be proponents of any circle, if we are going to be advocating any party we have got to act in an ethical sense, we've got to look at it through the issue of morals as well. Through morals and ethics I have to say on behalf of the entire academic circle that this is highly immoral to go ahead with this war.

So what was the process that has triggered where we stand at the moment? In terms of war, what replenishes it, the system of values, parameters that need to be looked at. This isn't just any old war; it is about a policy of preeminence. Unfortunately it is a term that has become rather vulgar, it is a matter of serenity everyone is now alleging the USA to wage its supreme power against the entire world. It may be quiet valid but nonetheless the terminology that we are using in social sciences have very much is being introduced into the vernacular. What is so interesting about political sciences is the fact that there are two major concepts and they've had huge implications in the global history. One is war and the other is peace. It is the use of force that has propelled war. War actually stands for use of force in systemic manner once the parties have been identified as adversaries.

The USA ever since it became so very powerful throughout the outset of the twentieth century simply because prior to that it was merely a continent, it conquered the entire continent back in the eighteenth century. In a matter of 100 years it conquered the entire continent. As of the twentieth century, it has become a substantial candidate for yielding global power and there's been lots of brain storming as to how to yield international power. It is a huge power, huge preacher in that respect. There have been two different approaches; one of them is a realist approach. A realist approach is based on power and strength, generating power and tending to use force or extortion as a way of solving problems. Parallel to such extortion as policy has

been the liberal approach, which foresees collaboration in synergy rather than using force alone. Such a liberal approach means that America could use a much more interdependent policy. The latter is the principles of Wilson that were designed following the First World War. On the one hand, it is a policy that driven by equilibrium of forces rather than having a single super power that will its strength all across the world. So these are the two approaches that have been instituted by the USA. The weight has differed from time to time. On the one hand it is about maintaining a balance of powers between different powers of the world and it is also about restricting and inhabiting one another's power. The second approach is about Wilson and the UN, it is about creating collaboration, and it is about making a better world and democracy. The issue of democracy and enhanced collaboration in the aftermath of the Second World War, it was the USA that has established the statuesque, they've done their best, it is **brettenwoods** the World Bank, the IMF that were shaped by the USA following second world war, they had the political and the economic mentality although they had to fight against the former USSR they weren't entirely liberated, they were to a large extend hindered by the USSR and the former Russia was not a part of international organizations during the cold war.

In 1991, the dynamics that have shaped international affairs have evolved in such a sense that the USA had to recontemplate once again as to how to yield its power. There was no longer a clear enemy and the USA did not necessarily know how to channel its strength. That is where we find ourselves at the moment. The power at disposal, the strength at the disposal of the US governments where there is no clear opposition against the US so that US strategy has got to be redefined. The USA has chosen to become this single super power as of 2-3 years ago within the new government that has come to power in the recent polls. It is a strategy that has been largely executed by the recent government simply because number one, there is no clear enemy against the US, there are no properties of hostile powers and there are no at the moment in a matter of 10 years there are threats which are not necessarily nations in their own right and these threats have culminated in the form of terrorism. So the new government has been able to find pretext or justification for wielding superpowers. They may very well now claim that they can will their own power regardless of any form of opposition. Of calling it preemptive policy what it really boils down to is the following; America cannot necessarily identify with these ample threats, the USA does not want to relinquish power to any other organization. What I'd like to conclude in saying that for the past 100 years this is a brand new water shed compared to what the US strategy had been 100 years, this is a brand new view for the US and what they are doing now is that they are struggling to fulfilling this vision. I think this is the window that we should approach the USA.

There is a huge battle going on in Europe at the moment. I know that everyone of you attend the international events, in a recent gathering in London, the Bulgarian envoy claimed there they are the US and the members of the EU fighting in between themselves. They may be at a government level, but the Bulgarian envoy said, to be able to assuage such conflict, he said you've always fought within NATO, he said, we used to look from outside the NATO and laugh at all the bickering that goes on inside so he really said that this was nothing new between the US and the EU. I wanted to speak up then but I spoke up later on in claiming that this is unprecedented. It is not like the crisis in Cuba that was like within the family, now it is outside the family and as far as I can see that the family is being broken into pieces. Many are saying that NATO has very much smeared in terms of its reputation but nonetheless the US has a brand new vision that we got to appreciate. And the US says that they have peerless timing and they have to make best of this timing, which means that the entire world order will be redefined by the US. It is no longer about the balance of powers, and America was trying

to establish a balance with about NATO, Russia and china for sometime now. Western Europe for some time did not want to establish balance of powers in between states. They claimed to be a civic organization and every time they deal with Turkey, the EU claims or rather alleges Turkey of giving too much importance to the armed forces claiming that EU is an organization for civic identities alone. So from the EU perspective what is prioritized is a peaceful resolution. But then America was the one who propelled this strike in Kosova as well as the deployment of troops in Bosnia. America is looking for partners and allies and they are saying that there is no one to come into alliance with me, I can do it alone. The megaphone diplomacy carried out by the USA is very much caused by the absence of a clear strategy from the EU. It may seem to be an interesting point in time but every time it is about reengineering the order. There are the morals and ethics to be considered. I think morals have got to be given priority. Europe has been destructive by countless wars, I know that USA had its civil war and it is about loosing people, USA lost half a million people which was %1.5 of the 30 million population. In the Second World War, we had 400.000 American soldiers dying but for Europe it was 80 million people who died overall. It is a history process, definitely the EU do not want to go ahead with another war simply because dangers of damages and losses are much more grave. So from such a vintage point speaking of power, power is a critical term so we need to define what power really means for countries such as US. Happened in Germany, Germany didn't know how to contain its power, how to monitor it, that is why Germany caused 2 different world wars. The advent of the cold war was very much caused by those two world wars. America is contemplating on how to use its power and that is where they stand at the moment. They are saying it is about time we wielded our own problem, we don't want others using in our own custody.

The world order that was instituted following the Second World War had many benefits, the World Bank and the IMF. What I am afraid of is that we are going to loose the World Bank and the IMF and the NATO as well. That is why we need to talk about preemptive policy. Preemptive operations mean destabilization or could bring about destabilization because they haven't necessarily defined on how power can be used. Secondly defense, the issue of self-defense is no longer to exist. Who are you going to defend against whom, unlike the past there were strict rules and regulations or restrictions defined by the UN. So I am afraid we may be loosing international conventions, international rules and regulations. I think that these are highly important issues for Turkey. We still look at the NATO being a defense organization, legally speaking NATO is valid but it is not there in politics and it doesn't have spirit any longer. If America draws itself away if not officially but rather morally from NATO, it would be all over with NATO. The Bush government does not believe in NATO. So what happens then, Turkey couldn't confide in NATO or any other super national organization? These are highly important issues for Turkey. The issue of a nation state becomes highly ambivalent. Financially and trade and commerce wise we realize that states are being deregulated and downsized at the moment but the same will happen in terms of military powers. The American government is saying UN nations states, get hold of your terrorists, control them and do not send them into other countries and control your own weapons as well. America is also saying but if you don't do it, I'll come and do it myself which disrupts the entire concept of sovereignty.

Thank you very much; I know I've taken a lot of your time, if there are questions I can take them later on.

Gülden Ayman: Prof. Bazoğlu talked about preventive war and sovereign forces. She talked about the necessity of this concept and she also said that we shouldn't forget the historical

realities. I am sure you have questions for our panelists; we have 15 minutes for Q & A. Please keep your questions brief and please tell me whom you are pausing your question to.

Question: for the last couple of years USA have had a new vision, which is what you said. Very briefly, regarding these new equilibrium, what is the percentage of security, economy, what is the weight of the operation?

Prof. Bazođlu: Thank you very much. I didn't go into details regarding that in my presentation but this is military and security. Because during the Clinton administration we also saw this, they are always aware of their strength. They say that Turkish society is a military society but we are not aware of our strength but in the States it is totally different, they know what democracy and strength or power is. Bush administration prioritized military power. When you compare it with the previous administration you can see it clearly because for Clinton administration world trade was prioritized, open market, lifting the barriers, eliminating borders, emerging markets, China being accepted into the WTO or signing trade agreements with countries such as Viet Nam. So that government prioritized trade agreements whereas this government prioritized military operations and military power. And we can see their budget allocated for military operations. Their budget is 10 times higher then that was allocated during the cold war. So military technology, military operations are fore grounded here. Between 1991 and 2002 the American power is much stronger because Clinton administration made real military investments during his presidency. Thank you very much.

Question: I have a question for Mr. El Marashi. You had an article in Merrial(?) Journal regarding Iraq and Mr. Powel referred to your article during his presentation, that wasn't exactly a reference but you know what I mean, so what is your personal reaction to this?

El Marashi: Kişisel tavrımı şöyle tanımlayabilirim. tabi ki İngiliz hükümeti de aynı şekilde benim makalemden alıntı yaptı ama bu bir intihaldi tabi ki skandal olarak da değerlendirilebilir. Belki Irak hakkında yeterli bilgiye sahip olmadıkları için bunu yaptılar, İngiltere için bunu söylüyorum. Belki benim makalemi aldılar ve belirli bölümlerini kesip kendi makalelerine eklediler ve bu şekilde prezantasyon yaptılar. Yani acaba Amerikan hükümeti Irak hakkında ne kadar çok şey biliyor, bence çok fazla şey bilmedikleri için benim makalemden faydalanmak istediler. Tabi ki Orta Dođu hakkındaki bilgi düzeylerini arttırmalılar ve ikinci olarak da akademisyenlerle daha iyi bir koordinasyon içinde olmalılar. Çünkü akademisyenleri işin dışında bırakmaya çalıştılar şu ana kadar. Belki de benim makalem o döneme kadar bir istihbarat amacıyla kullanılacak kadar güvenilir olmayabilir ama Powel bunu kullandı. Ama bana gelip te yardım isteselerdi tabi ki seve seve bu yardımı onlara verirdim. Ama onlar işin kolayına gittiler, benim makalemden parçaları kesip kendi konuşmalarına eklediler.

Question: I have a question for Mr. Marashi. You talked about post Saddam period so what would be your solution for the post Saddam period. Secondly you said that there was semi-independent period for the Kurdish people but they didn't announce an independent state during that period, what would be the reason for that and Faruk El Cazire supported the terrorist organizations while he was an intelligence officer allegedly as you said, what is your bases for this intelligence, what country's intelligence do you base this allegation. Thank you.

El Marashi: İlk sonunuzla başlayayım. Saddam sonrası için acaba benim çözümüm ne olur? Bence bir denge kurulmalı, Irak hükümeti kurulmalı ama aynı zamanda da şunu söyleyeyim, Saddam sonrası dönemde pek çok konuyla mücadele etmek zorundalar. Tabi ki intikam

almaya çalışacaklar, belki savaş mahkemeleri kurulacak, tekrardan bir takım kabile tarzı gruplar gücü ele geçirmeye çalışacaklar, onların arasında mücadeleler olacak, ABD bu sorunları çözmek için Irakta kalmak isteyebilir ama İngiliz hükümetinin düştüğü tuzağa düşmemeliler hiçbir şekilde. Yani askerleri belki orada kalacak ama Irak hükümetinin kurulmasına destek olmalılar. Burada biz İngiliz hükümetinin yaptığı hataların sonuçlarını görüyoruz şu anda. Yani ben Irak hükümetinin yaptığı şeyleri meşru kılmaya çalışmıyorum sadece bunun sebeplerini açıklıyorum. Çözüm olarak İngiliz hükümetinin düştüğü tuzaktan kaçınmalı diyorum Amerikan hükümeti. İkincisi, Kürtler niçin bağımsız bir devlet kurmadılar 91 Körfez savaşından sonra? 91'den sonra tabi ki bir sığınakları vardı, güvenli bir bölgede yaşıyorlardı, neredeyse bağımsız bir durumdaydılar ama yine de bağımsız devlet kurduklarını açıklamadılar, eğer böyle bir şey yapsalardı hem İran'ı hem de Türkiye'yi çok rahatsız edecekti bu. Hem Talabani, hem Barzani tabi ki o bölgenin reel politikasını çok iyi anlıyorlar, Kürt devleti kurulsaydı bu onlar için intihar olurdu. Şu anda yarı özerk bir yapı var. Faruk El Cezari'ye gelince şunu söyleyebilirim, hangi ülkenin istihbaratına dayandırdığımı soruyorsunuz, herhangi bir ülkenin istihbaratına dayandırmıyorum bu söylediklerimi. Irak istihbarat gücünden kaçan bir takım yetkililer var, iltica edenler var ve bunun dışında daha önce Irak İstihbaratında çalışmış olan kişiler var, Filistinli terörist gruplarla koordinasyon yapıldığını yada PKK'yı desteklediği biliniyor ve Irak İstihbarat gücündeki görevine baktığımızda muhalefet grupları destekleyici birimin başındaydı yani bunu herhangi gizli bir istihbarat belgesine dayanarak söylemiyorum. Aslında onun pozisyonunu ilk kez Radikal gazetesinde okudum Türkiye'de. Yani bu çok gizli olan bir şey değil, herkesin bildiği bir konu.

Question: I have a question for Mr. Erdurmaz. Between 1998 and 2003, Irak was under strickt supervision by the UN and you are saying that Turkey should not be concerned about the missiles because they were under strickt supervision but what should be the possibility that Iraq did something, which couldn't be estimated by UN. I have a question for Duygu Hanım, you talked about Sept. 11.....

Erdurmaz: In 1991 there was this ceasefire agreement and Iraq was forced to destroy all the weapons of mass destruction and the missiles, this was one of the articles in the ceasefire agreement. But they also had short-range missiles and they said that Iraq could hold on to these short-range missiles. But until 1998 there was strict supervision by UN and there were some inspections imposed on Iraq and there were more then 1000 inspections in more then 300 sights. But the inspectors didn't know what they had to look for and the Iraqis didn't have them so the inspector used the Israeli and the US intelligence and they had a lot of experience. After 1998, together with Saddam's instructions the Iraqis started to work on El Abbas missiles to increase their ranges. These were the allegations on Iraq and on Saddam. They have facilities for Samud missiles but we also know that they worked on El Abbas missiles to increase their ranges and power and they established facilities to make the improvements and the Americans detected the sites by satellite. And UN also detected these sites and El Samud missiles, as you know they are consuming liquid fuel and the Iraqis also worked on these missiles to increase the ranges by 300 km. when you reach 300 km range with these missiles then you have an intercontinental facility to develop missiles, that is why USA is focusing on 150 km of range for these missiles and Iraq had mass production for these missiles Ababil 100 km missiles was also created. Because when you are using solid fuel you can use them for a long time and you can store them for a very long time. But if you are using liquid fuel then the preparations take much longer and it requires more meticulous preparation stage. The UN requested Iraq to destroy these missile and Iraq didn't show any evidence, Iraq is saying that

she destroyed all the El Abbas missiles and they have 25 war heads loaded with biological and chemical weapons and these El Abbas missiles have 650 km of range.

Iraq reached a consensus with the UN saying that they destroyed the missiles, which were loaded with chemical weapons, but the UN is not satisfied and as you know they found 12 empty warheads in sites, which were inspected by UN inspectors, and the Iraqi officials confirmed this. So UN let go of Iraq in 1998 but they were not satisfied and they started inspections again in various sites. First they have the exploration stage and then they had the execution stage. Right now they have completed the exploration stage. Based on their 8 years of experience now they know what is where and they know what was destroyed and what is still going on in the country. As you know they are producing and using aluminum tubes, these are multifunctional and they have double use and you can't do anything for this double used aluminum tubes and the like. Because UN didn't request them to destroy these double use aluminum tubes and these tubes are necessary to get enriched uranium.

So with the al Samud missiles they've reached 200 km range, we know that they are loaded with war heads loaded with chemical and biological weapons, they have 25 war heads. We know that they have launchers but we don't know where they are right now so we say there is a threat right now.

Prof. Duygu Bazoğlu: your question compliments this panel. This is not very easy to discuss because the role of the State is the last stage because the USA is the center of the world. As you know the twentieth century is named as Century of USA. But this is a new model for them and they are not so sure of themselves either. That is why the Americans also are discussing among themselves and now we can read it in the press but the discussions are still going on in the States. This is not like the war in Viet Nam, that was different but intellectually people are discussing this issue. I didn't read and I don't know what **Mirşaym** has written. I read him 10 years ago but what he said did not come true anyways. Well he is very interesting but I cannot say that he is always right.

So your perspective is necessary, we have to talk about and think about that. An intellectual presentation, which is given here, might be logical but we have to look from all angles. I am not here to criticize. Here we are talking of a phenomenon, we are talking about this formation. There are sides that we can approve and there are aspects we cannot approve and these aspects that we cannot approve higher in number than the aspects we can approve. When you look at the region, when you look at the Middle East, they cannot solve their problems, when you look at the Balkans, they couldn't solve their problems either but they have reached a certain stage and now we are hopeful but the States tried to solve the problems in the Balkans and they got the support of the EU. Right now they are trying to do same thing for Iraq. Of course this is a problem and these are main problems in international relations.

You know failed state is a buzz word, failed states are that they couldn't become a nation, they couldn't become a civilized society, these are the failed states who don't have the organization, they do not have the coordination so there are 10's and dozens of failed states like this. So should we just watch millions of people die Rwanda, actually we did we didn't do anything. So international community is accusing the US and the UN of not intervening because this was genocide, millions of people died in Rwanda. So this is a new world order may be. But we have to establish a new order and we have to think hard on the organizations to be established in this new order but the world is against is the following: the world is against one sole power to intervene in everything. This is what the international community is

against and this is the first time the world is coming together and discussing this before the war breaks out. May be this is very good for the world because people understood the importance of peace and people understood that without peace you cannot make any improvements or development in trade, in culture, in anything. Of course we have to think about this, you are right but while doing that USA is being choosy, they are taking sides. Within the last two years if Bush did similar things that Clinton did, then may be the problems would have been solved by now, we wouldn't have bloodshed in Palestine, but the incumbent government doesn't want to waste time on diplomacy, this is the dangerous aspect. I am not saying that this is a new vision for the USA, the philosophy is the same, USA is trying to create democracy for all the states and together with democracy the welfare and peace will abound but if you go about it like this Palestinian and Israeli people will go on killing one another, there will be more bloodshed in the region and it would be dangerous for peace. I mean you cannot say I wont do anything for Palestine and Israeli but I am going to intervene in Iraq, you can't be that choosy.

Gülden Ayman: We have other questions but I am sorry because we ran out of time. I would like to adjourn this session and I would like to thank our panelists and I'd like to thank the audience for their attention.

Soli Özel: Now we begin the second session. In this second session we are going to be addressing the perspective operation in Iraq and its implications for Turkey, policies in turkey and options for Turkey. If indeed the war does come about what would be the advantages and interests for Turkey in the new establishment. I'd like to introduce Mr. Sönmez Köksal, you seen his photographs so many times in the newspapers, he is the undersecretary of National Intelligence Office and he was ambassador to Paris, no other intelligence officer has ever been covered so much by the press.

Sönmez Köksal: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I have some 8 headings to address and I suppose that means I've only got 2 minutes for each.

First heading is, could a peaceful resolution be exercised. As it was mentioned earlier on in particular following 8 of November upon which resolution 1441 was passed in UN, a major crisis environment escalation rather has taken place and the motion for authorization will probably pass by the parliamentarians tomorrow, therefore management of these crisis becomes ever more important. So the prospects of war will highly be dependent on how these crisis ends. There are two different elements to a peaceful resolution. 1) If Saddam could be extradited voluntarily, he could become a voluntary defector. Since 1991, his government has been... could be contained just like Tom & Jerry sort of a strategy, he could be rather candid and open about his entire armistice and could be subject to further containment but I really have to admit that neither one of these scenarios highly imminent nonetheless we do have to talk about a peaceful resolution. We don't necessarily find there is the assumption that military operation could take place nonetheless we have to bear in mind that military operation could indeed be averted. We have to look at the properties of the current regime in Iraq, could they decide all of a sudden that him and two of his sons could actually defect from Iraq, could be extradited and could immigrate somewhere into Russia or Saudi Arabia. But that could entail serious mayhem in Iraq, there could be series conflicts in terms of government but nonetheless a military operation could be averted should Saddam leave office voluntarily.

Second heading is if a military operation is and is capable then we do hope that it can be over and done with as soon as possible. That would be the most beneficial scenario for the entire region and Turkey alike. That means that as it happened with Desert Storm the alliance forces from South alone would mean that it would impact Turkey as well which north to Bagdat, that could manifest in a series influx of immigration from Northern Iraq. So we do hope that if military operation does happen, should be minimized in terms of duration and there should only be a single if not two different fronts, one in the North and the other in the South. The south covering the alliance forces and Bagdat could be besieged. We would then have to see the outcomes in terms of who comes to power in a post-Saddam environment.

Third heading is the prevention of influx of immigration from Northern Iraq. Once the Gulf War came to an end back in 1991 and 1998, unfortunately Turkey was subject to in increasing number of immigrants across the Iraqi border which had severe implications in the economic and the environmental realm, it had long term destructive elements for turkey. So third influx of immigration ought to be preempted. In the year 2003, we've got to take all forms of measures so as to prevent it. What could be done is, the Turkish arm forces could establish security belt in Northern Iraq and secondly the coalition forces with the USA ought to be able to contain Southern portions of Northern Iraq and that means instituting confidence for the people of Northern Iraqs vital so that they don't need the feel to move out of their homes. Building confidence and trust also brings about liabilities for Turkey. Turkey has got to revise her policies so as to institute a confident environment for the peoples of Northern Iraq so that immigration can be prevented. If Turkish troops is going to be deployed across Northern Iraq then there must be very much peaceful and natured.

The Fourth heading I'd like to address, perspective scenarios for post-Saddam environment for Northern Iraq. There are lots of scenarios that have been deliberated upon, Barzani and Talabani are not the only players to take a role there, further players or players in a greater distance so to say. What matters for Turkey is that as it happened in 1991, we don't want Northern Iraq to turn into swamps. We need to establish order that builds confidence in the minds of the government and the military forces in Turkey. There could be misperception in the press, might be perceived as Turkey has got to manipulate the construction in a post Saddam environment but we have to bear in mind the controversy as well. If it weren't for the establishment in Northern Iraq, could terrorism in Turkey be solved so very effectively?

The fifth heading is the Turkomans and Kerkük and Musul question. We know very well the Turkoman factor is very significant for Turkey since Turkey has emotional and historic ties with the Turkomans in Iraq. They have been subject to discrimination and policies of assimilation over the years by the Iraqi regime. We could recall that the current constitution which is in force in Iraq stipulates that the Iraqi state made up of Iraqi and Arab societies, such a principle clearly **ostherasizes** the Turkomans and I have witnessed personally myself that families or members of Turkoman families have merely right to live and they have adopted Kurdish identity merely to save their right to live. So should democratic or liberal government be instituted in Iraq after Saddam leaves office, it is quiet likely that if Turkoman identity is going to be elevated or is going to gain awareness. The issue of Kerkük and Musul is quiet clear, the largest portion of Iraq's oil revenues have got to be controlled in a federal or central sense. One could not claim that Southern resources lie in Southern authorities and the northern resources lie in the hands of northern authorities. There could not be such segregation; there must be central approach to the management of natural resources, including the pipeline and the network as well. Bagdat should be the hub for the management of oil.

Sixth heading is the state, the infrastructure of the state in Iraq. We've got to look at it through holistic vantage point, we may look as if we are only focusing on the south of Bagdat but nonetheless Iraq is a very complex country 40-50-60% of the population is Shiite in the South and they have a huge role to play in the destiny of Iraq. Speaking of Shiites they have huge relations with Iran as well which a grave importance. We know that what Mekka and Medina is for Muslims, Samara and for Shiites. So in terms of ideological values for the Shiites, Northern Iraq plays utmost importance. So we as Turkey we shouldn't merely concentrate on the North but nonetheless we have got to have much more global vantage point.

Number seven will be the economic issues to address quiet rightly the fact that Turkey enjoys a neighbor with such abundance of natural resources, Turkey has got to honor such a neighboring country. There were major developments in international affairs in the past and no doubt in post-Saddam environment there are going to be developments with Turkey. Turkey has to look at Iraq as being an economic partner, so we've got to create an environment where we look at Iraq as being a major economic partner in the long term.

What could be the long-term vision, what sort of a vision can we have in the long-term? I very much believe that the region plays a grave role; there are 5 major actors, Syria, Jordan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Iran. Changes that are to occur in Iraq would mean that there would be profound implications for every one of these countries to be closely felt in the nearest term. Plus, it looks as if eccentric tendency is gaining ground and Turkey has got to concentrate on relations with the US as well. As was mentioned in the previous session, we've got to have full understanding of what America envisages for the future. The additional remarks in the doctrine, one is on internal security, another is on anti-terrorism campaigns. So there are lots of elements to be very well understood of the Bush doctrine. The entire world has got to concentrate on this doctrine to make sure to internalize it because these are documents upon which the US is going to move forward and try to introduce a world order.

Another element I'd like to talk about is the prospects of international affairs. We came across major ups and downs or major turbulence in NATO two weeks ago and the UN seems to find itself in a similar limbo. The negotiations that will reach an outcome as of the 24 of March, I've marked important. Russia, France and China may indeed wield their veto rights and if they do enforce their veto right, that could mean a major blow-out for the UN. What could be the reaction of other permanent members in the Security Council, this is what France has got to consider. The EU has found itself in a strategic limbo for a matter of 5 years. The outcome could be rather surprising, 9/11 was rather surprising outcome, rather than having interstate threats we find ourselves in an environment stroked by international terrorism. So Turkey has got to follow these developments especially when it comes to the appraisal of threats, we as the state and the government got to make sure to gage these threats in the best way possible. The number one issue is if an outcome of an operation, what would be its ramifications for international terrorism. Turkey has always had to fight against terrorism throughout history but international terrorism is of much higher importance, is at much higher scale, so countries have got to perceive it international terrorism as being great threat that could be generated by the military operation, thank you very much.

Soli Özel: Thank you very much Ambassador. I'd like to ask the next speaker Prof. Baskin Oran, he is from İzmir and he graduated from Sein Joseph High School and that pleases me to a great extend. He teaching at Ankara University, Political Sciences department, he has published books and articles on Northern Iraq, Turkomans and he has a book about the memoirs of Kenan Evren and on Nationalism of Atatürk.

Prof. Baskın Oran: I believe that there are two mistakes committed in Turkey, actually one begets the other. It would be the conclusion of my presentation however I will say it right now and it would be easier for you and me.

The first serious mistake is the following; Turkey cannot prevent US from striking Iraq. The second mistake is that, Turkey can prevent the formation of a Kurdish State in Northern Iraq. We can have political, military and legal aspects for these two mistakes.

When you look at it legally, we are saying northern Iraq, even the most meticulous person says northern Iraq. Is northern Iraq separate from Iraq, do we say Northern Viet Nam or Southern Viet Nam, is it a place like Northern Korea or Southern Korea? We are saying that if it is legitimate for the US troops to enter Iraqi territory then Turkish troops can enter northern Iraq. Turkish entering northern Iraq is against international law; just like the US troops cannot enter Iraq. We did it in Cyprus but we had a guarantor ship agreement in Cyprus, so we had the bases and Turkey is considered, as a state where we have torture, now people will say Turkey is torturing people as well as invading other countries. But you can say that you have suspicions in your mind and you can say Turkey is not as small as it seems and Turkey is also powerful so as people cannot do anything to US, people will not say anything to Turkey. Well Turkey is strategic site country so if Turkey attacks a territory which is not strategically important then people will not say anything and if turkey gets the permission from the dominant state then nobody will say anything to Turkey either. In 1932, Turkey annexed the small Ararat after the insurgence of the Kurds and in 1939 we annexed Hatay practically and in 1974, our troops entered Cyprus. Here we have the approval of the dominant states. But here we don't have any of these, I mean Iraq is in the middle of the strategic powers and we can't have the permission of the dominant state also USA doesn't want Turkey to enter northern Iraq. So they are not giving their approval to us. The Kurds are against it and USA is against it but Turkey wants to enter into northern Iraq.

In military aspect, I don't think it is good either because the Kurds started to demonstrate, Kurds took to the streets and they are being armed by the USA. So the USA is provoking the Kurds against the Turkish troops' possible entering to northern Iraq. I think Turkey is going into a trap. It is easy to fall into a trap but it is very difficult to come out of trap. As Mr. Köksal Sönmez said if there is not an attack, I am not saying war, I am saying attack, what will the Turkish troops do in northern Iraq? What will their position be? And if there is a federal state, what will the Turkish troops do in northern Iraq, will they try to destroy that federal state or will they try to protect the federal state?

I think the most important aspect is the political analysis of the situation. This is the biggest weakness of Turkey. First of all, if there is an attack and it is successful then the order will be established by the USA, do you think their troops will stay for two years at least if necessary they are going to stay longer and they are going to have bases and they are going to have a puppet government in Bagdat. The fact that USA will establish bases in Iraq will adversely affect the geopolitical importance of Turkey. Because USA will not need the military bases or the air bases that they have in Turkey. So Turkey's strategic importance will diminish for the USA. And as Turkey we said that we were against the possibility of Kurdish state in northern Iraq, without seeing as in the card game called Bezik, we said that we would be against the formation of a federal Kurdish state. Well, we had a Kurdish problem in southeastern part of Anatolia so in order not to make other people say that Turkey is the enemy of Kurdish people, we are trying to make them say that Turkey is the enemy of the terrorist organization called

the PKK. But people will say that Turkey is against the terrorist organizations as well as the Kurdish people so this slogan will be used by the other states. When you look at the American press, they are belittling Turkey; I received through e-mail at least 7 cartoons showing Turkey begging for money from the States.

As for the oil in Musul, legally people are claiming that Turkey has a right on the Musul oil and some people said that we have to ask for our oil from Musul, even if you confirm that there is a right, you cannot ask this from a state which never attacked you and which had trade relationships with you. Iraq is trying to save its neck and it is not a good prestige for Turkey to ask for the Musul oil claiming that Turkey has a right coming from the World War I.

The Kurdish nationalism started to move again claiming that Abdullah Öcalan is being isolated in his cell in the island of İmralı and there will be insurgence if Turkey continues with this approach. The Turkish government did not do much in reforming in that area but tried to reform the Kurdish people by bringing Kurdish kids from Diyarbakır to İstanbul to Tatilya and of course we know that this is not sufficient and this is going to exacerbate the situation. And we neglected the Turkomans till 1990 and immediately in 1990 we realized that we have Turkomans living in Iraq. I don't want to go into details here but we neglected them and then we said that we have brethrens living in Iraq and the Turkoman leader such as Orhan Ketene are saying that the Turkish army is our guarantor. If these people given the impression that their actions will be approved by the Turkish government and the Turkish troops then this is not going to be good for us in the eyes of other state. So I believe that if Turkey doesn't support this then the USA will find it very difficult or nearly impossible to attack Iraq because if the northern front is not open then the war will last longer and losses will be much higher. And people are saying that the price of one-barrel oil will increase up to 80 dollars and the loss will be 1.5 trillion if the war lasts longer then planned.

And of course Turkey should forget about EU if she supports USA because when you look at the situation, we see that EU member states are against this looming in Iraq. Whatever its name is a Kurdish state will be established in northern Iraq may be it is not going to be totally independent but may be it is going to be a federal Kurdish state supported by the Turkomans. I don't know what the structure will be but one way or the other a Kurdish state will be promulgated in northern Iraq. Turkey is saying that she is against this but may be rather then being against it Turkey should work hard to improve or make it legible. Turkey never tried to make reforms; Turkey never recognized the identity of the Kurdish people or never worked hard for these people to recognize the Turkish identity. If a federal Kurdish state is established in northern Iraq, we have to support our Kurdish people, we have to bring democracy, we have to bring employment, and we have to bring welfare so these people will not be enthusiastic to participate in the Kurdish state in northern Iraq.

Soli Özel: Thank you very much. Our third speaker is Prof. Ümit Özdağ. Currently he is the Director of ASAM, the Eurasia Strategic Research Center that is based in Ankara. He published one of the best books about the relations about the society and Army and he has another important book regarding May 27 and ASAM has various publications regarding northern Iraq and Turkish troops in northern Iraq.

Prof. Ümit Özdağ: Thank you very much and my respectful greeting to every one of you. I am going to talk about the parameters shaping Turkey's northern Iraqi policy but in a rather larger framework.

I'd like to talk about why is this war happening in the first place. It is fundamentally based upon the USA trying to establish unilateral hegemony across the world. Throughout the twenty-first century, which means that Eurasia, Caucuses and the Middle East have got to be under strict control, controlled from Afghanistan, which means that the US can stretch into Russia, China all the way down to the Indian Ocean. But I would also like to remind you of the fact that they have their nuclear weapons themselves. These are not the residential areas based on oil alone but rather where oil is transported also. In terms of its geography, it is clear that powers that could carry out an insurgent against the USA in 21 century can easily be suppressed thanks to its expansionist policy in the region. It is clear and funny enough that as America seems to find a residential in this period to fight against terrorism. It is funny enough; it somehow coincides with world's richest oil reserves so that's highly to be coincidence. 65% of the oil is generated by these reserves but merely consume any and 2 of the countries that control 20% of output Iran and Iraq will be controlled by the USA. There is one other primary objective and that is 9/11. 9/11 has created a shocking affect across the US as a turning point like the Mexicans who shot USA in the 18 century but their homeland stroked all of a sudden in an unprecedented way.

They are also saying why is it that people hate us so much what could we do to eradicate this anti-American sentiment so we don't live 9/11 ever again. There are three reasons for that, one is the USA has oil in geopolitical concerns, during the cold war what they have done is they supported Afghanistan...., so the Americans claim that they will do three things all in one, number one, they will no longer support anti-democratic governments in the region and they must champion democratic life-style. Some claim, they are often called as being democratic imperials largely residents across the Pentagon, funny enough those opting gradual democratization is the Secretary of State where as those opting for spontaneous democratization is the Pentagon which could lead to geopolitical instability. They say it is OK, it doesn't matter in long term you need democratization in the region.

Secondly, they need to minimize their military presence in the region. The only way to do that is, they need to do away with the opposition, which is embodied by the Saddami government by and large. So having dissolved the government they are going to remain there for a while but in the long term they are going to eradicate military presence in the region, which has caused that anti-American sentiment.

The third reason is to assuage the conflict with Palestine. No doubt Americans are going to be much stronger in the region. Not necessarily vis a vis the Arabs but Israelis as well. They are going to be much stronger against the Israeli population. Following Desert Storm the Americans represented forceful actions to resolve the Likut government and it was thanks to the Labor Party that peaceful action could be introduced. So it will be a process, Americans will instigate a process that will bring about an independent Palestinian government.

So what are they going to do when they move into Iraq? Number one, they are going to have to redesign Iraq. They are going to have to point a brand new Iraqi government, brand new Iraqi state and major source of friction could be ethnic political issues. American has a federal model to offer based on Kurdish and Shiite axis. The Shiite pillar for that is not yet quiet brought to the agenda simply because Anglo-Saxons in the USA look at Shiites as being a variable in the equation. Especially Americans of Jewish origin realize that Israel should not be a parameter in the Shiite equation and see Shiite as being a part of Arabs over all. Number three is Americans believe that Turkomans are myth, overestimated by Turkey and claiming only make up like 5% of the population which add up to 1.2 to 1.3 million people over all,

claiming that Turkey is overestimating the role of Turkomans. That is why there is a conflict or there is a lack of reconciliation between Turkey and the USA. That is simply the reason why the authorization bill is yet to be passed by the Council of Ministers. If there is no consensus with the US and if the government cannot withdraw it, members of the government are going to redesign the bill claiming or putting in an article stipulating that Turkomans be among those to promulgate in independent Kurdish government in northern Iraq.

Why does Turkey support this military strike, because Turkey is so very fearful of an independent Kurdish government? But as I noted earlier on, the USA have plans and tactics again in the Middle East but that does not foresee the promulgation of a Kurdish state. On the contrary, the Americans do not have the chance to set up an independent Kurdish state. If the US does that then they wouldn't be able to set up an Iraqi government in Bagdat, which will be Americanized. The entire Bagdat population would maximize anti-American sentiment. If the Middle Eastern population scheme is ever to become a success, then they wouldn't set up a Kurdish government. So they have to consider anti-American sentiment and Middle Eastern peace plus international affairs would come to a collapse if America sets up Kurdish government. America will not do that simply because they are highly aware of these issues. As Prof. Oran would verify me, no UN member country has ever invaded another UN member country, Bangladesh could be the exception during the war between Pakistan and India but Bangladesh had its own unique property and Pakistan was not under siege. There was merely a frontier battle, so that is why we shouldn't be so very paranoid of a Kurdish state.

The other policy parameter, we've got to talk about is the federal government because Turkey says, well something rather interesting happened Yugoslavia and it was the collapse of Federal State. If a federal state collapses then the center to the federal government has got to permit it to happen so that it could be a lawful collapse. But that is not what happened in Yugoslavia, when independence was promulgated many EU states including Germany, what they did illegally in breach of the laws of states and countries, they have actually promulgated the independence of faction groups. The EU then claimed, fine we could not settle for independence simply because you are not a federated government, you don't have boundaries and frontiers, you don't have an overriding authority nor do you have your own indigenous peoples, that's why we still talk about Kosova. So unitary state and a sovereign region, these are some of the preferences that are highlighted plus Turkey is stating that Turkomans and Arabs have got to have equal rights. There are two parameters for that. Back in 1932 when Iraq gained its independence a document was proposed to league of nations, which was irrevocable. That document is still valid in terms of international law which states that there is equality between Turkomans, Arabs and Kurds. Its equality in terms of interpretation of the law but we can see in terms of enforcement that there is a Kurdish interpretation to the constitution and Kurdish and Turkish is often addressed in an equal sense. What they have done is they have bridged it as the government. They gave a sovereign area to the Kurds but they did not necessarily provide sovereignty to the Turkomans. Turkey discovered the Turkoman issue back in the 1970's not in 1990's. Turkey sent Turkish teachers into the Turkoman land. Five of the Turkoman leadership were funny enough killed in the very same evening and since then a serious oppression have taken place on the Turkomans. Most of them have been relocated and deported into the Persian Gulf or the south of Bagdat. What justifies Turkey's claims is the census of 1957, as the Americans claim today it is not 5% of the population, back in the 1957 it was 15% of the population, Kurds comprised of 18% of the population. Turkey wants Kerkük to be independent from any ethnical management or governance.

So there are 3 different models. One of them is for Turkomans to be among the founding powers, the unitary government and a sovereign region, which is in line with the Iraqi constitution. We want Turkomans to be entitled to what was offered to the Kurds back in the 1970's could be reinforced and perhaps members of the UN as well to be warranted could reinforce the sovereign zone or region by them.

The second model could be, as in cantons as in the Swiss example, which is like a federal model. Not just Turkoman and Kurdish cantons but also hybrid cantons and quasi cantons for Arabs, Kurds and other tribes in the region. So you could have a federal Swiss like model.

The third is the federal government, triple federal government, on the one hand an Arabic federal government, Kurdish federal government and the Turkoman federal state. However Turkomans will they be seen as a fundamental element or not. If they are not seen as a fundamental element, it is about time Americans forget about the northern front and that would extraordinarily difficult for the US to try and siege Iraq from the South. Thank you very much.

Soli Özel: Thank you indeed Professor. Since I am the moderator quiet worried because there are loads of questions I love to ask. The last presentation has been very comprehensive in terms of the imminent models. I'd like to give every one of the panelists 2 minutes to talk about the models offered by the last speaker and then I will collect all the questions.

Sönmez Köksal: In terms of what Professor has outlined, especially regarding Turkomans, he said that Turkomans were discovered by Turkey quiet late in time. We shouldn't forget the following, indeed when you are a member of diplomatic circle, it is inevitable for you to refer to your memories; during Jivkov I was the ambassador to Bagdat and to Burgaz. I know how similar both of the governments are, I know what would happen to Turkomans who were seen strolling around the Turkish Embassy in Bagdat and I also know how brethren could be treated walking around the Consulate in Burgaz too. We have to defined a regime, not doubt that there are lots of positive elements about the Turkomans but there are lots of negative destructive elements as well to be considered. To be able to understand the BAAS regime very well, one of the wings is based in Bagdat and we know the price that we have to pay in terms of terrorism. Similarly the regime in Bagdat had a huge price to pay in terms of terrorism. So there are two regimes and they could cause a peril for the entire region, I think we have to talk about it in length, I think this is what Washington is discerning, they are contemplating upon long-term implications.

The scenario drawn by the professor, I more or less agree with him, the Turkoman element, there are hesitations in terms of their population, I am saying that they are largely assimilated. There was this sensus back in 1957 when they claimed that there were 470.000 but Iraqi population back then was only 5.5 million, 10% were the Turkomans. Now we have 20-25 million Iraqis and if Turkomans was not subject to any form of systemic genocide then they should still compromise 10% of the population including immigrants. Thank you very much.

Prof. Oran: Indeed assessing the might of a nation you don't necessarily look at the percentages of the population. You've also got to look at their properties so it is not merely about quantity but rather quality. In Iraq today Kurds have played a prominent role not because they are 3.5 million in nature but rather because some of the qualities that they posses that makes them so very mighty or prominent. Turkomans are not of a similar nature, they are merchants and they are rather residents in out in valleys whereas Kurds live up in the

mountains and they are like nomads. Turkomans are urban, they don't care about weapons, they don't go up and live in mountains, they don't care about safeguarding themselves, and they are merchants and urbanized whereas Kurds are like nomads in the mountains. Indeed I think it is much better if stick to nationalism drawn by Atatürk, indeed nationalism drawn by Atatürk states that minorities finding themselves in other countries should live in a peaceful environment. Atatürk was dedicated to maintaining peace for minorities living in other countries. so disarmament for them, in the fact that Turkish government should be a warrantor for them, these are not to be discerned what so ever. The Turkish government cannot be a warrantor for them or these should not be even considered. We have to make sure that they enter local administration and the central administration so as to safeguard themselves plus the Kurdish issue can be contained in that respect. We don't want them sticking their heads into the mud, they have been subject to genocide a couple of times, this time it could be a serious issue so Turkomans should not be perceived as the fifth arm of Turkey, not should they perceive of themselves as having an entirely Turkish identity.

Sönmez Köksal: This issue of identity of Turkomans as being as the fifth arm, he has brought up the subject for the second time and I gave you the example of Bulgaria and I did that purposefully. When democracy was introduced to Bulgaria, the Turkish minority joined the parliament we now have three ministers actually working for the Bulgarian government. Turkey doesn't look at Bulgaria as its fifth arm or anything. This is ridiculous, so what we should go for in Iraq is to establish, not necessarily democratic place because Bulgaria is not same as Iraq, Iraq cannot have democracy so easily but we got to make sure that Iraq is somewhat like Bulgaria, we have to make sure that the minority there can safeguard their identity and culture whatever but necessarily as you looked at it as Turkey's fifth arm, this is ludicrous.

Ümit Özdağ: I am not going to talk about a theory that was expanded but nonetheless there are lots of specifics to be covered and there are lots of documents, which are not yet disclosed, and I don't necessarily agree with them. They weren't discovered back in the 90's, they were discovered much earlier to the 1970's. And the Turkish state has always dealt with the Turkomans. Back in 1966, Turkish aircraft bombed two different Iraqi bomber planes that were trying to establish preeminence against teh Turkomans. So it was a policy that it has its roots back in the 1960's, may have had its weaknesses but there is always been this policy deeply rooted. What is to be extrapolated from his presentation is that Turkish government would be perceived as being racist, to look at this people as brethren. These people are not like people in Kırgızistan, they had Turkish passports so many years like the Professor born in İzmir and the people in İzmir may have been subject to the same people, you can't expect to state of integrity to look at these people as if they were French or something or aliens nor does it have anything to do with Atatürk. I could give you so many documents justifying Atatürk's desire for Turkey to besieged Musul and Kerkük. So it has nothing to do with Musul and Kerkük.

....You can't be deprived of human rights simply because you are an urbanite, you can't be awarded fundamental human rights and freedoms simply because you are a mountain tug. This really is a terrible parallelism. Turkomans, it is not like Turkomans are not guerilla organization because they are urbanized. They had a guerilla organization since 1982. Turkomans have had paratroops; they have waged a guerilla war, which was largely inhabited by Turkey. Turkey has not had anti-Turkoman policy; for the sake of regional stability the Turkish government has been against both of the ethnic minorities doing anything against the central government in Bagdat. If you go out to the region, you will see for yourself what I

really mean because unfortunately the Kurds and the Turkomans, they are so very belligerent to one another, this huge enmity and they are almost about to kill one another. There was a conference in Selahaddiniye today, you can see it there, these two commanders getting up and screaming out to the Kurds that the Turkish army is coming to kill them. So you have to look at it in that sense otherwise it can end up in bloodshed and nothing else.

Ayan Aktar: There is one thing that confuses me until this point in time, we talked about the strike in Iraq and its implications in terms of international affairs, what we have done is we by in large talked about international affairs, but the question that pops up in my mind is the following; as you acknowledge since early 1980's until mid 1990's Turkey has had to fight against the Kurdish terrorists in the region and with the 1999 elections what made the fight against terrorism, what brought MHP into power was the fight against terrorism that took so many years. As a result of operation in northern Iraq quiet highly there will be a death toll. I'd like to hear your comments on its political implications.

My second question, in terms of nationalism, statisticians often use statistics against nationalism, what I mean is, OK the share of minorities in any one population may be significant, I don't really know a lot of details about Turkomans since I am a socialist nonetheless since they made up %10 of the population back in 1957 and as Turkomans are urbanized mean that the birthrate was lower where as Kurds which lived in nomadic and tribal environment had higher birth rate, so it is quiet inevitable that population of Turkomans may have decreased in society because they are much more civilized compared to the Kurds.

Oran: I'd like to make two points. One is what Mr. Aktar is saying is totally presumption. We did have coffins covered with national flag carrying martyrs of the fight against terrorism. That might have entailed the fact that MHP has come to power. The presumption is quiet right the fight against northern Iraq could propel similar results and could instigate nationalistic sentiment. But that is not like what is happening in America, if you have coffins of lieutenants going back to America that could propel what was felt after Viet Nam and that could propel increasing labor sentiments in States whereas in Turkey would be the other way around, we could see a rise in nationalism.

Özdağ: Let me begin with the last question, statisticians could be a weapon not merely by those preparingnationalism, you are saying that Turkomans do not give birth to so many children. That is more for the Western cities but if you look at different parts of the country, you'll see that provincial patterns have not necessarily disturbed tribes. Everyone still continues to live in traditional homes with large courtyards both Kurds and Turkomans live in houses with large courtyards so they continue to live in that way and when they move into urban areas have persistent to live that way. Talking about birth rate, it doesn't matter whether they are Turkomans or Kurds but more or less the average children Per family is like 6 and it is the national regime that has in a way not being able to hinder it.

Your second question is quiet right. The government whether it realizes or not but has oppressed the society rather in a psychic manner, they are saying not a single soldier is going to die in this operation but that is ridiculous really to presume.

The US, which is the third generation army, the only third generation army in the world is about to wage war against another army and we have our own arms forces to be deployed in the prefront of the front and here we are to find ourselves vis a vis some 4.000 paratroops of the former PKK so whether we like it or not we will have soldiers dying in northern Iraq but

there won't be a strategic battle will be much more tactical in nature. The Turkish armed forces have huge supremacy in terms of gun power, they will be besieging strategic centers, they will not be besieging urban areas. The KDP may be shooting in strategic sense but there will be much more fighting against the Iraqi regime. The major conflict will begin once the war is over. So there the USA has got to act with common sense. Because such dispute means that Syria and Iran coming to question and the entire region could turn into Viet Nam but America won't let that happen. It will easily be prevented by the USA; the region will not turn into Viet Nam example.

Köksal: A state will be demounted, Iraq and it is going to be mounted again. We experienced the same thing in the Balkans, in Bosnia, in Kosova, the international community did the same thing and the Turkoman issue could be tackled in the same approach. If you are going to mount a state which is demounted, of course this is something existing so are we going to create an atmosphere where these people will subsist. Of course the population could be 10%, 15% whatever, this is not the important issue but the figure is much higher than what is claimed because people who are against it are saying between 40.000 and 100.000. Maybe it is not %10 but it is much higher than those figures claimed by people who are against this. Thank you.

Fuat Keyman: My question is to Mr. Özdağ. Well, I've been listening to you on TV and I've been reading your articles in the papers, while we are discussing about this looming war in Iraq, there are three hypothesis, one of them is that USA will change the world order so there will be new hegemony and the second is that the war is inevitable, it is going to start and even though there are people who are against it in Security Council or in NATO, this war will be on and if there will be a war then Turkey has to participate in the war. Because if Turkey doesn't support it then it is going to be worse for Turkey, that is why this motion should be approved by the Turkish Parliament even though the society doesn't want the Turkish troops to enter into Iraq. Because if Turkey is isolated then Turkey will not be able to intervene in the developments in northern Iraq and Turkey should be in a position to intervene in the developments in northern Iraq. So we have to be a party at the table and as Mr. Köksal says 'something demounted will be mounted again' and Turkey has to be a party at the table. But to what extent do we know that the USA wants to unilaterally establish a new world order? And even though if we approve this motion, even though we open the northern front, we will sit at the table but to what extent will USA will listen to what we have to say? Or are we going to have a say in these matters? I believe that a federal Kurdish state will be established in northern Iraq.

Soli Özel: I have another question to Mr. Özdağ, NATO started an initiative whereas Denmark will take on the responsibility of strategic transportation. USA used to this on behalf of NATO, and what do you think about the Kurdish maps, so called maps of so-called Kurdish state?

Özdağ: Well I have my suspicions too. If the States till Saturday accept that Turkomans will be a real part of the state then all is well. If not, then I believe that they will not accept Turkey to be party at the table. But if they don't accept this and if they will not take us as a party at the table then Turkey shouldn't let the USA use İncirlik base. Turkish troops want to enter northern Iraq because we want to protect our borders in Hakkari. But you have to enter northern Iraq, you cannot do this without entering northern Iraq, you will not be able to protect your borders by deploying your troops in Hakkari, you have to go into northern Iraq if you want to protect your border in Hakkari.

I don't think EU is betraying Turkey at this point because they were always candid about this. But in Turkey we are going to have anti-Americanism approach, all the political parties will be against the USA even before the war people are saying that they are against the States and again the relations between Turkey and Israel will deteriorate even though we have good relationship now, our relations will be suspended because we know that Israel will be part of this war. Turkey will move towards Germany and France axis instead of USA and England. So would you rather you give a small region to Turkomans or would you rather you created problems in the region. I think the USA will be logical. A federal Kurdish state creates threats first of all for the Arabs, Iran and then Turkey. So the disintegration of Iran is a worse problem than the disintegration of Turkey. The Azeris, the Kurdish people and the Persians will have separate regions in Iran so disintegration will create very serious problems in Iran.

What I am trying to say is the following; the guarantors are saying that we have to draw the maps again in the Middle East. They are saying that all the borders are artificial but this is not the case. I think this will have a domino effect, if you move one of them then all of them are going to be moved.

Köksal: I want to add something. What Mr. Özdağ just pointed out is very important. Tahran is not saying anything right now, we don't know where they are standing, and we cannot read it in the Turkish papers and in the foreign press either. Actually they would be one of the important players but they are not saying anything. We have to take into consideration what their stand will be because in Iraq and in northern part of Iraq there will be serious problems and they will be related to Iran.

Oran: I am going to answer my question, so called state maps of the Kurdish groups, you are saying so called or sudo, there are two implementations in Turkey and in the world, we can claim this in order to say that we haven't seen what we didn't want to see. We can use the word so called or sudo in paranthesis. Secondly we can use so called in English, it Turkish 'sözde', we use this word and we are claiming that we are not seeing what we don't want to see, we are over looking it. But it is used very illogically in Turkish, al right there is the so called Armenian genocide, we know so called allegations on part of the Armenian people or the so called Armenian Congress and you can read it on the web sites. So-called state maps for the Kurdish groups, well these are prepared by people who support Kurdish state, proponents of the Kurdish State. Mete Tunçay published some of them in Birikim magazine. They go till Cairo in Egypt. Kurdish state start from Turkish border till Cairo in Egypt, so this is one of those so called Kurdish maps. Musul wasn't left in 1926; we left Musul to Irak in 1923 with the Lozan treaty. If you read the Lozan treaty, you can see that the Musul Kerkük problem, that is the southern border between Turkey and Iraq were negotiated for 9 months and if we cannot reach a solution in the negotiations then the league of nations will decide on the future of this region. But Mustafa Kemal Atatürk knew where he should stop, he always understood what would happen in the future and that is why he was very successful in the solution of this matter. You know there is a movie called "Back to Future" actually we are living this back to future, now we are reliving the end of the First World War. That's what we did at the end of the First World War, we tried to establish our borders and the USA is trying to do the same. They are trying to recreate the borders but they can't do it because USA is very powerful right now and then the British Empire was very powerful. The borders were drawn by England in those days and England didn't let any state to become a party to these matters. For example in 1916 with the treaty Palestine was given to France, **Syspico treaty** gave certain commitments both to France and Italy but this created big depression in both of

these countries because these commitments were not kept by England and with the Sevr treaty England gave certain regions of Anatolia to France and Italy, for example only Yozgat and inner Anatolia region was left to the Ottoman Empire, the rest was shared among these countries. Kurdistan would be a separate state, İzmir would be a separate region, it was given to Greece and economically powerful regions were given to France and Italy and of course all these countries that is to say England, France and Italy have their economic interest and these were bribes given to France and Italy by England. Because they were to become markets so England betrayed these two countries so in summary there is no such thing as being a party at the table or being a party during negotiations. These social engineering issues, let's leave them aside and the borders were created nearly 80 years ago and nations started to develop and as Mr. Köksal said they are going to be demounted and the wound will be reopened and then it will be impossible for you to put the stitches.

Soli Özel: Only one last question please, we don't have the time.

Question: I have a question for Prof. Oran. You say that Turkey is recognized as torturer and with the Turkish troops deployed in northern Iraq Turkey will be known as attacker. When you look at the current political map in Turkey, do you think that Turkey invaded any Kurdish region?

Prof. Oran: Well you can say that we invaded Cyprus or we invaded 55.000 Armenians who are still living in Turkey or we can say that Turkey invaded the Arabs living in Turkey. I mean if this is the logic then you can't do anything because in Turkey, not only Turkish people but the minorities Armenians, Cypriots and other minorities are living. But you can say that there is a theory as such, the indigenous peoples of Anatolia are Armenians, Kurds and the Greeks if this is the theory Turkey can be considered as an invader or an attacker.

Soli Özel: Thank you very much for your participation, I would like to thank our panelists for their insightful presentations. In the end at least the panelists agreed that the border are recreated then this is not going to be good for any of us. Thank you very much.