

International Symposium Report:

“Internal Displacement in Turkey and Abroad: International Principles, Examples and Policy Proposals” TESEV

**4-5 December 2006
Istanbul**

by
Elif Kalaycıođlu
Internal Displacement Project Assistant
TESEV

BACKGROUND:

- 1) TESEV’s “The Restitution of Citizenship Rights and Social Rehabilitation in the Aftermath of Internal Displacement Project”

During the armed conflict between the Turkish security forces and the PKK between 1984 and 1999, massive internal displacement took place in the eastern and south-eastern regions of Turkey. Although some legal mechanisms (“Law no 5233 on Compensation for Losses Resulting from Terrorism and the Fight against Terrorism” and the “Village Return and Rehabilitation Project”) have been developed since 1999 in the context of the EU accession process; they are unable to produce a durable, participatory and democratic solution to the problem of internal displacement.

Contrary to the dominant perception, the Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV), sees the problem as neither limited to the southern and southeastern regions of Turkey nor as one that can be solved through “village returns” only. In this context, TESEV has started a project titled “The Restitution of Citizenship Rights and Social Rehabilitation in the Aftermath of Internal Displacement”(hereafter- Internal Displacement and Social Rehabilitation) in 2004. The project has brought together five scholars from different disciplines under the name of “TESEV’s Research and Monitoring Group on Internal Displacement” (hereafter – TESEV Working Group). The members of the TESEV Working Group are a jurist (Dilek Kurban), a sociologist (Deniz Ykseker), a conflict-resolution expert (Aye Betl elik), a demograph (Turgay naln) and a psychiatrist (A. Tamer Aker).

The first publication of the TESEV Working Group was a report titled “The Problem of Internal Displacement in Turkey: Assessments and Policy Proposals” (October 2005), where the group provided preliminary analysis and policy proposals based on its filed work in four provinces. This report was submitted to the Turkish Government through the Minister of Interior and was later shared with the public at large. In June 2006, TESEV published another report, this time in cooperation with the Norwegian Refugee Council’s Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC). This report is an assessment of the implementation by the Turkish Government of recommendations made in 2002 by Dr. Francis Deng, the then UN Special Representative for Internally Displaced Persons following his mission to Turkey. Co-published by TESEV and NRC/IDMC, the report is titled “Overcoming a Legacy of Mistrust: Towards a Reconciliation between the State and the Displaced.” All in all, the members of

the group carried out a nearly two-year long study that included a survey of the relevant international scholarship, existing research and legislation in Turkey as well as fieldwork in four provinces affected by displacement. This work culminated in the publication in June 2006 of a book entitled “Confronting Forced Migration: the Construction of Citizenship in the Aftermath of Internal Displacement in Turkey” which brought together all aspects of this research as well as policy proposals for the solution of Turkey’s internal displacement problem.

The conference “Internal Displacement in Turkey and Abroad: International Principles, Examples and Policy Proposals” is the most current event within the scope of this project. The conference has been organized by TESEV Democratization Programme Officer and TESEV Working Group member Dilek Kurban.

Based on the wholistic perspective set in TESEV’s book titled “Confronting Forced Migration: The Restitution of Citizenship in the Aftermath of Internal Displacement in Turkey,” the conference has aimed at discussing all aspects of internal displacement – such as returns, urban conditions, compensations, resettlement, integration and rehabilitation – with the participation of all parties. The conference has tried to demonstrate how policies targeting IDPs should be based on such a wholistic perception and include the concerns of all parties.

The conference was the first of its kind in Turkey in bringing together all parties to the issue. As emphasized in “Confronting Forced Migration,” mistrust between the state on the one hand and the local population and local NGOs on the other is one of the main obstacles to the solution of the issue. Thus, one of the main successes of the conference was bringing together these parties that often do not engage in dialogue with one another, whereas in the conference Assistant Secretary to the Ministry of Interior Zekeriya Şarbak not only made the opening speech but attended both days of the conference and Mehmet Niyazi Tanılır, the governor of Van, presented on the same panel with NGO representatives from the region who work directly with IDPs.

2) The format:

The conference was organized as a two-day long symposium and included eleven panels and a roundtable discussion. Please see Annex 1 for a detailed schedule of the symposium.

3) The participants

The conference has brought together fifty-seven participants as speakers, discussants and chairs. Among these fifty-seven participants there were representatives of national and international NGOs that work with IDPs, academics, public officials, members of local bar associations, health professionals and key international actors. Dr. Francis Deng and Roberta Cohen, former co-director of the Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement; who have been among the key figures setting up the current international legal framework on internal displacement, were present at the conference. Dr. Deng made both the keynote speech and gave the closing remarks whereas Roberta Cohen outlined the main debates in the field of internal displacement. As there were presenters from Sri Lanka, Colómbia, Georgia, Palestine, Russia, Bosnia and Serbia; participants had a chance to see the bigger picture and evaluate different policies on internal displacement. In the case of participants from Turkey; there were academics, NGO representatives, lawyers and health professionals allowing a truly interdisciplinary approach to internal displacement.

SUMMARY OF THE PROCEEDINGS

Based on the multidisciplinary and wholistic perception of internal displacement put forth in *Confronting Forced Migration: the Construction of Citizenship in the Aftermath of Internal Displacement in Turkey*, the aim of the conference was to look for effective and durable solutions to Turkey's internal displacement problem. For this purpose, the conference tried to situate the problem within the international framework and approach it from the angles of government responses, NGO responsibility, current conditions of IDPs, return, resettlement, reintegration and the ways in which reconciliation and justice can be achieved.

1) The conference opened with the welcoming remarks of
Dr. Can Paker, Chairman, TESEV
Zekeriya Şarbak

Guest of Honor: Dr. Francis Deng, Former Representative of the United Nations
Secretary General on Internally Displaced Persons

2) The first day was divided into five panels:

- Internal Displacement in Theory and Practice: International Framework I
- Internal Displacement in Theory and Practice: International Framework II
- Government Responses to Internal Displacement: Return, Resettlement and Reintegration
- The Role of Civil Society in Addressing Internal Displacement
- IDP Stories from Villages and Cities in Turkey: Poverty, Lack of Safety and Social Exclusion

3) The second day was divided into four panels:

- Women and Children: the Traumatic Impact of Internal Displacement on Vulnerable Groups in Turkey
- Current Conditions of Urban IDPs in Turkey
- Reparative vs. Retributive Justice: Are Compensation and Accountability Mutually Exclusive?
- Towards Reconciliation: Justice, Rehabilitation and Integration

4) The last panel of the conference was a roundtable discussion titled “Towards a Solution of Turkey’s Internal Displacement Problem: Opportunities and Obstacles” centered around the question: Is integration possible? If not what are the obstacles to integration and how might they (if possible) be overcome?

5) Dr. Francis Deng made the concluding speech of the conference.

FIRST DAY

Introductory Remarks:

In his introductory remarks, Can Paker introduced what has been done so far within the scope of TESEV's “The Restitution of Citizenship Rights and Social Rehabilitation in the Aftermath

of Internal Displacement.” Paker stated that the aim of the project is to help the government develop a human rights based solution to internal displacement which emphasizes equal citizenship. Paker also communicated his wish that the conference provides the grounds for new networks and collaborations.

Assistant Secretary of the Ministry of Interior Zekeriya Şarbak spoke on behalf of the Minister of Interior, Abdülkadir Aksu. After stating that the reason why many citizens had to leave their places of settlement is terrorism, Şarbak said they were aware that some of these people had settled in the cities and did not consider return as an option. Şarbak further commented that they realized the inadequacy of compensations paid by the government yet considered them an important step in overcoming the mistrust between the state and the internally displaced persons (IDPs). Defining forced migration as a moment of crisis, Şarbak admitted that the state as well as the NGOs had failed in managing the crisis.

Keynote Speech:

Dr. Deng mentioned in his keynote speech that prior to his 2002 visit to Turkey; his requests for a visit were denied multiple times. Visiting the country in 2002 with the pre-notions that either Turkey is in complete denial or overwhelmed with the magnitude of the problem, Deng commented he found openness on part of the government. Focusing more generally on internal displacement, Dr. Deng conceptualized the issue as always being tied to a crisis of identity; stemming from sharp divisions and cleavages between identities and the narrow definitions of the nation which are not inclusive enough. Deng emphasized that although diversity is seen as a threat to the unity of the nation; it is denying diversity that actually threatens the nation. Acknowledging the issue of sovereignty as an obstacle to international intervention in cases of internal displacement, Deng explained the ways in which as a special representative he has redefined sovereignty as the state responsibility to protect its citizens rather than a guarantee of protection from intervention. Concluding his remarks, Dr. Deng emphasized that displacement and the conflicts generating the displacement are only symptoms and that the real solution is addressing the root causes such as building unity on pluralism or using a more uniting national label that integrates multiple identities.

First Panel: Internal Displacement in Theory and Practice: International Framework I

The aim of the first panel was to lay out the international framework in theory and practice in order to set the stage for the upcoming presentations and provide a context for understanding and responding to various experiences of internal displacement. Roberta Cohen outlined the main policy debates in the internal displacement field as the first speaker. Commenting that although internal displacement was an old phenomenon it was newly being studied, Cohen outlined the main areas of debate as sovereignty, the categorization of individuals as IDPs – who qualifies, when one no longer should be considered an IDP and whether the category is useful –, the necessity of an international legally binding treaty and the international protection of IDPs. Cohen said that a lot of progress had been made in the field; yet some of the most fundamental debates were ongoing and a lot more effort is needed. Emphasizing the protection of IDPs; Patricia Weiss Fagen examined the relationship between IDPs and peace processes. Fagen argued that the lack of a peace process or a formal peace agreement did not signal the lack of progress whereas peace agreements did not guarantee a solution for IDPs. In order to express their unique needs; IDPs should be present at the negotiating table and

committees should be formed to ensure that the parts of peace agreements that relate to IDPs are in fact implemented. Taking a more critical approach to the field of internal displacement, Catherine Phuong argued that internal displacement should be considered as a human rights issue rather than a humanitarian issue and should be mainstreamed within international human rights law rather than being confined to the mandate of the special representative to ensure better protection for IDPs among other things. Relating her argument to the example of Turkey, Phuong argued that the committees on racial discrimination; prevention of torture and the committee on women's rights should be aware of Turkey's IDP situation and include such violations in their reports.

Second Panel: Internal Displacement in Theory and Practice: International Framework II

The members of the second panel took a more critical position vis-à-vis the international framework and international actors as well as offering concrete action plans. Erin Mooney mentioned that even though the international framework emphasized national responsibility, what this responsibility entails has never been defined. Mooney then presented on a 12 step Action Plan drafted by the UN which defines state responsibilities concerning internal displacement. Evaluating the recent process of increasing collaboration between the Turkish government and international actors; Bilgin Ayata commented that the dialogue has resulted in a significant problem of language which alienates the IDPs and the public and identified the government as open to international dialogue yet completely resistant to internal dialogue. Furthermore, Ayata recognized that the international community accommodated the government at the expense of Kurds and was very patient with the incremental progress whereas such patience was hard for Kurds to grant after fifteen years of negligence. In conclusion; Ayata emphasized that internal displacement cannot be disentangled from the Kurdish issue; that a sincere apology, acknowledgement and the restoration to Kurds of a sense of belonging to the country were necessary as well as the inclusion in the dialogue of those who are not favorable to the dialogue. Karine MacAllister criticized the international theory and practice on internal displacement based on the experience of Palestinians – especially Palestinian IDPs whose right to return, restitution and compensation have not been protected by any UN agency since 1952. MacAllister saw the solution as starting with the self-organization, research and advocacy on the part of IDPs rather than international assistance.

Third Panel: Government Responses to Internal Displacement: Return, Resettlement and Reintegration

Since internal displacement occurs within the borders of a country and the principle of sovereignty comes to the forefront and often limits international involvement, great responsibility lies with the states in terms of prevention, protection and remedies. Bekir Sıtkı Dağ of the Turkish Ministry of Interior presented on the “Return to Village and Rehabilitation Project” and informed that between 2000 and 2006, 56-57 million YTL had been spent for infrastructural improvement in places to which returns were happening. Dağ commented that the state had adopted the principle of voluntary return and was unfairly criticized. Dağ defined the Framework Document on internal displacement adopted by the Turkish Government a statement of political will demonstrating that the problem can be solved with the use of international frameworks and laws. He said that this document will be developed into an action plan with the participation of IDPs and NGOs. He informed the audience of the new Settlement Law (19 September 2006) which states that population relocations due to reasons

of national security are lawful; all other relocations are extra-legal. In response to some of the previous presentations and remarks, Dağ said that the root cause of internal displacement should be recognized as terrorism. Joost Jongerden argued that instead of a return policy based on the principle of choice, the government had discordant and contradictory policies under the name of village returns which actually aimed to develop a new settlement structure in the provinces affected by village destruction and evacuation. Stating that return should be understood as both the reconstruction of livelihood and the reconstruction of homes and villages, Jongerden argued that the village return policies were actually territorial redesigns which involve concentration of the population in large settlements whereby return is possible but it is not an end. Jongerden further argued that such policies are highly controversial given that 98% of the population rejects return to another settlement than their own. Presenting on the case of Georgia, George Tarkhan-Mouravi said that problems shared by IDPs in both countries are vulnerability, poverty, unemployment and the problem of return. Focusing on the particularities of the Georgian case, Mouravi said the government policy had been one of “temporary integration” which meant that IDPs should be integrated into their new environments only to a certain extent so that they still desire to go back. Thus, many IDPs live in abdominal conditions. Commenting that the discourse of temporary integration is slowly being replaced by integration; Mouravi said integration might mitigate the sensitivity of political issues whereas return is a concern for the population in places of return. Presenting on the conditions of Chechen IDPs in Russia, Alena Zaks commented that in addition to the state’s failure to fulfill its responsibilities, IDPs suffered from conscious and cruel societal and state discrimination. Chechen IDPs are forced to return to Chechnya where living conditions are poor and dangerous, illegally evicted from temporary settlements and when they receive state aid – which is also distributed on a discriminatory basis – it is very inadequate.

Fourth Panel: The Role of Civil Society in Addressing Internal Displacement:

This panel investigated the responsibilities of civil society in addressing internal displacement as well as the difficulties of carrying out such work in the face of various resistances including on the part of the government. Zozan Özgökçe of VAKAD, an NGO that works with women in the province of Van in Turkey, started her presentation by saying that the Kurdish identity of IDPs should be acknowledged. Criticising the Van Action Plan, Özgökçe said the word “Kurdish” did not appear once in the text and that there was no mention of the village guard system. Emphasizing that the mother tongue of and the language used by the IDPs should be used in policy and solution proposals, Özgökçe commented that the counseling and educational services of VAKAD were provided in Kurdish and in the everyday language of women. Özgökçe further commented that in order for state policies and programs to be successful, the state should gain the trust of IDPs. Presenting on Colombia, Patricia Guerrero commented that until 1999 displaced women were unaware of their rights as displaced persons or their rights as women. Her organization Liga de Mujeres used international treaties on women’s rights and human rights signed by Colombia as tools to protect the organization and to further the rights of IDPs. Mentioning being harassed by the paramilitaries and the guerilla for the work they did, Guerrero remarked that displacement is a permanent human rights violation and the perpetrators are in a state of impunity regarding their actions before, during and after the displacement. Miodrag Shrestha presented on the work of his NGO, Group 484 as well as more generally on NGOs that work with IDPs in Serbia, where civil society is fairly well developed and organized. Shrestha grouped the responsibilities of NGOs that work with IDPs as protection, capacity-building for both the IDPs and the local population, and awareness-raising work targeting the state and decision

makers. Şefika Gürbüz of Göç-Der, an NGO representing IDPs in Turkey, also focused on harassment and said that as Göç-Der was founded to research and improve the socio-psychological and socio-economic conditions of IDPs, was under close state scrutiny, its office was regularly raided by police, its members were subjected to random ID checks and often detained. On work Göç-Der has done with IDPs, Gürbüz explained that since IDPs are still traumatized, relationships of trust are necessary before they can share their stories since sharing meant re-experiencing the trauma for most of them. Gürbüz said that recently their work had become recognized by international and national actors and they were often asked to present their findings in forums and consulted on the issue of internal displacement.

Fifth Panel: IDP Stories from Villages and Cities in Turkey: Poverty, Lack of Safety and Social Exclusion:

Since all services targeting IDPs should be based on the concrete conditions of this population, the last panel of the first day focused on the difficult conditions of IDPs in Turkey. The speakers presented on landmines, the village guard system and the critical discourses produced by IDPs. Muteber Öğreten defined landmines as perfect soldiers in the sense that they do not need to be attended to; they can be on guard for 75 years; they remain active regardless of peace agreements and they are mass destruction weapons because in the last decade approximately 2,000 people have lost their lives or become disabled due to landmine explosions. In Turkey, initially the government claimed that landmines were laid along borders but now it is known that landmines have been laid around evicted villages as well. There is no comprehensive map laying out the numbers and exact locations of these mines and they constitute a great danger for returning IDPs. Furthermore, although Turkey is a party to the Ottawa Convention there is not enough effort to clear the landmines; the government focuses exclusively on soldier victims of landmines and does not provide enough protection of civilians from landmines or educate them. Mihdi Perinçek focused on the village guard system as another obstacle to the return of IDPs. Perinçek first listed the reasons for which people have accepted to become village guards as: wanting to be on the side of the security forces in the armed conflict, need of an income source, having permission for gun ownership and use, self protection due to the pressure by the state to join the village guard forces, and logistical support for the PKK. The danger of the village guard system lies in the fact that the guards can guarantee state support for their actions; ensure local superiority and have the freedom to act extra-legally and guarantee protection of the security forces in court cases. Arguing that village guards were the second most important force behind the eviction of villagers; Perinçek stated that the system must be abolished. In doing so; it should be recognized that village guards have been leading an armed lifestyle for the last 15 years. Thus, the state should demonstrate political will against the extra-legal actions of the village guards and take the necessary measures for their disarmament, rehabilitation and employment. Nazan Üstündağ emphasized that IDPs are understood through their lacks and needs whereas they have a significant repository of information and criticism and that they have rights over the spaces of the city just like its other residents. Üstündağ argued that internal displacement is constitutive of the Kurdish identity and IDPs are aware of their collective identity and want social policies as well as politics of daily life to take this identity into consideration. In other words, through the discourses they produce and their practices, IDPs demand public representation and are slowly changing public institutions.

SECOND DAY

First Panel: Women and Children: the Traumatic Impact of Internal Displacement on Vulnerable Groups in Turkey:

Based on Turkey's internal displacement problem, the first panel aimed to explore and find solutions to traumas of displacement suffered by women and children. Although they are the most vulnerable groups and are differently affected by internal displacement, the experiences of these groups are understudied. Nükhet Sirman, who presented on gender regimes and cultural violence, explained that gender regimes enable a similar form of cultural violence exercised on the East by the West to be exercised on the Kurds by Turks. Thus, Kurds who were subjects of state violence are now subjected to this new form of violence which involves their portrayal as exotic and sexually desirable/intriguing as well as primitive. Handan Coşkun, who presented on behalf of Diyarbakır Metropolitan Municipality Center for Women's Issues (DİKASUM) mentioned that the mistrust of IDPs – especially those who have suffered physical violence - towards the state makes provision of services difficult. Coşkun further commented that the lack of responsibility and empathy on the part of health experts, academics and researchers that come to the region from other places and their perception of IDP women as research subjects have grave consequences. Moreover, research based on such understandings will not result in successful analyses and policy proposals. Betül Altuntaş, who based her presentation on urban poverty studies, focused on the marginalization experienced by children who in addition to working on the street and living in abdominal conditions suffer from societal prejudices. Altuntaş remarked that Kurds constitute the urban poor. Zübeyit Gün, who presented on children, forced migration and trauma, commented that although the traumas of forced migration are severe for children and the youth, it is an under-studied area. Gün mentioned the results of a field study he conducted, which indicate that for the case of Turkey, when IDPs move to cities outside of Southern and Southeastern Anatolia, they suffer from bigger traumas due to increasing cultural differences and prejudices. In this context, Gün emphasized the necessity of developing both wholistic programs that target IDPs and of efforts to eradicate prejudices.

Second Panel: Current Conditions of Urban IDPs in Turkey:

Since, TESEV recognizes the problem of internal displacement as an urban problem that cannot be solved solely through village returns; a panel was devoted to discussing the current conditions of urban IDPs in Turkey through the examples of Diyarbakır, Tunceli, Mersin and Van. Based on a field study carried out by the Development Center in five neighborhoods of Diyarbakır, Tahir Dadak argued that urban IDPs in this province suffer from unemployment and poverty: fathers are unable to find jobs resulting in economic unrest, income expectations are increasingly centered on children who either work on the streets or are pushed to crime. Dadak said that demands for cultural rights and freedoms are almost equally emphasized as IDPs count the inability to exercise their culture and speak their language freely amongst their most important problems. Focusing on the example of Dersim (Tunceli), Bilgin Cengiz of the Accessible Life Foundation emphasized the unique condition of the population since they had been exiled in 1937 as well. Cengiz argued that the memories of the 1937 exile was still fresh

in the minds of many when internal displacement occurred in and around 1994 and although another return is possible; there needs to be a guarantee that this population will not again be relocated against their will. Cengiz argued that although IDPs must organize and voice their demands to improve their conditions; this is very hard under the burden of the trauma and both the PKK and the state must apologize for the suffering they have caused. Furthermore, the state must help develop a sense of belonging in the IDPs and help them feel that they are equal citizens of Turkey. Atilla Göktürk focused on the city of Mersin which has received significant waves of incoming migration. Similar to Dadak's findings, Göktürk also emphasized poverty and unemployment as major problems faced by IDPs and argued that Kurds constitute the poor classes of Mersin. Furthermore, the findings of Göktürk's study point to increasing ethnic polarization and nationalism for Turks, Kurds and Arabs; the three major ethnicities in the province of Mersin. Leyla Şen of UNDP talked about the Van Action Plan which is a pilot project on internal displacement that involves the examination of current services provided to IDPs in that province and the development of an action plan through the participation of the stakeholders – IDPs and representative NGOs. Van Action Plan focuses on both return and integration in current places of settlement for those who do not wish to return. Mehmet Niyazi Tanılır, the Governor of Van, presented on the services provided to IDPs by his governorship, such as the construction of a neighborhood and the establishment of a food bank. The governor emphasized his openness to all constructive criticism and the fact that he had learned a lot in the symposium. Yet, he also remarked that he did not accept claims that the state did not do anything to solve the problems of IDPs.

Third Panel: Reparative vs. Retributive Justice: Are Compensation and Accountability Mutually Exclusive?

Ali Fidan of the Ministry of Interior presented on the Compensation Law. Fidan started his presentation by saying that the Compensation Law does not target solely IDPs but all individuals who have suffered damages due to terrorism and the fight against terrorism. There is no precondition of return in receiving compensation and both in-kind and monetary compensations are provided. Fidan emphasized collaboration with UNDP and said that the Ministry of Interior takes into serious consideration the criticisms made by NGOs and IDPs and tries to benefit from constructive criticisms. Also presenting on the Compensation Law was Zekeriya Aydın of the Batman Bar Association. Aydın argued that the law was based on actual needs of the population and thus had a strong basis but the implementation is very limited both conceptually and in scope. Aydın argued that based on the numbers Ali Fidan provided on compensations paid for deaths and injuries; one should ask the question of why there are so many deaths and injuries and use this data to identify the perpetrators. Arguing that compensations are inadequate to achieve justice for the victims, Aydın supported the establishment of truth commissions in the region to record the stories of IDPs, since a state that does not listen to the stories of its people cannot solve their problems. In this context, the state should not take action based on pity but based on the recognition of its responsibility and its past mistakes. Also questioning the adequacy of reparative justice, Rhodri Williams commented that post-conflict property restitution runs into the difficulty of how to provide reparations that are capable of addressing all the harms done and argued that reparations should be proportional to the gravity of the violations and the harm suffered by the victims. He complicated the present understanding of restorative justice in Turkey by stating that compensation should include physical or mental harm as well as lost opportunities. Furthermore, Williams pointed out rehabilitation which includes medical and psychosocial aid, satisfaction and the guarantee of non-repetition as part of post-conflict restorative justice

tools. Peter Van der Auweraert presented on the Commission for the Resolution of Real Property Disputes in Iraq. According to Van der Auweraert, the biggest difficulty faced by the commission is the fact that compensation is not a state policy and that there is a lack of political coordination and will surrounding the issue. The fact that compensations are perceived as solely the responsibility of the commission and that no public funds are set aside for compensation makes a successful implementation very difficult.

Fourth Panel: Towards Reconciliation: Justice, Rehabilitation and Integration:

The last panel of the symposium focused on the ways in which reconciliation might be possible in the case of a violent and hurtful past. Paul van Zyl who presented on the truth commission in South Africa began by saying that as Turkey grapples with its past; it is important to recognize that this is not an isolated effort but part of a global phenomenon and to draw from a sophisticated analysis of what has proved successful and unsuccessful elsewhere in developing its own solutions. Van Zyl argued that it is important to realize that if a society does not face its past; its past comes back and haunts that society. Furthermore, there are moral and legal obligations towards victims. Victims need an effective remedy which recognizes that their rights have been violated and this remedy should be a legally binding agreement rather than a demonstration of good will. The steps leading to reconciliation are prosecution; truth seeking; reparations and institutional reform. Arguing that truth has a moral dimension and is about acknowledgement as well as knowledge, van Zyl emphasized that one cannot diagnose the problem and offer remedies without officially acknowledging it and one can easily misdiagnose the problem without listening to the stories. Presenting on the Sri Lankan experience, Darini Rajasingham-Senanayake described the conflict as a postcolonial nation building process' failure to create an inclusive multicultural identity. Senanayake argued that in the case of Sri Lanka, the return of IDPs is necessary for the restoration of multicultural communities and diagnosed the restart of conflict as resulting from a lack of local ownership of the peace process and not enough community level participation at the negotiating table. Whereas Senanayake emphasized that needs of victims should be prioritized over the concerns of the international community, J. Paul Martin focused on the ways in which external agents can help the situation. Martin recognized that rather than telling communities what to do; external agents should focus on capacity building and help people do things in such a way that they gain sustainable skills and do not need external agents in the future. Focusing on how reconciliation might be achieved in Turkey; Sezgin Tanrikulu emphasized that the Turkish society does not have a culture of confronting the past. Thus the very difficult yet necessary process of coming to terms with its past and reconciliation will also constitute a cultural transformation for Turkey. Much like van Zyl and Senanayake, Tanrikulu focused on the correct diagnosis of the problem which is possible only when all parties to the conflict are included in the dialogue and are listened to. As further conditions for the solution of the problem, Tanrikulu said that Kurds should be recognized with their own identities; should not be seen as potential/actual PKK members; an environment of democracy where armed conflict is no longer a possibility should be ensured; and a language that is cleansed of violence should be developed.

Roundtable Discussion: Towards a Solution of Turkey's Internal Displacement Problem: Opportunities and Obstacles:

Due to lack of time, the roundtable discussion centered around the question: Is integration possible? If not what are the obstacles to integration and how might they (if possible) be

overcome? The participants were Yılmaz Ensaroğlu, Haşim Haşimi, Necdet İpekyüz, Doğan Erbaş and Mümtaz'er Türköne. Doğan Erbaş began by saying he preferred the term "co-existence" to "integration" since integration meant to him the inclusion of a certain population in an already existing order. Erbaş commented that as a party (DTP- Democratic Society Party) they understood forced migration as connected to the Kurdish issue, for which a democratic solution is immediately necessary in the regional and international context of today. Mümtaz'er Türköne commented that prior to the conference he was not knowledgeable on forced migration and learned a lot throughout the two days. Yet; Türköne said he believed that linking forced migration with the Kurdish issue is taking the easy way out and delaying solutions. Türköne said a common language was a precondition of any possible solution and that memorized discourses should not become a part of this common language. Yılmaz Ensaroğlu first observed that integration has existed since before the foundation of the Turkish Republic and the problem lay in trying to erase and suppress the differences and declaring everyone as being Turks. Also sharing the example of refugees, Ensaroğlu observed that people can exist in this country only as far as the official state ideology accepts their existence. Necdet İpekyüz said that despite the provocations, there is still grounds for reconciliation. The precondition for reconciliation is a Turkey where everyone can freely express their ethnic, racial and religious identifications and no one will be perceived as the "other." As a health expert, İpekyüz observed the need for a long-lasting rehabilitation for all parties. Haşim Haşimi began with the analysis that the Kurdish question has changed shape both regarding Turkey and regionally. Haşimi recognized that the Kurdish question in Turkey is both connected to international dynamics and no longer limited to rural areas. Observing that the current societal tension was absent during the years of intense armed conflict, Haşimi said the lack of political will is the reason why the Kurdish question is still not resolved.

Closing Remarks:

Dr. Francis Deng began his closing remarks by saying that he found the comparative approach of the conference very useful. According to Dr. Deng, this approach not only provides a chance to learn from other experiences but also demonstrates to governments who feel they are unjustly attacked that theirs is not the only experience of internal displacement.

Dr. Deng observed that Turkey has come a long way from complete and outright denial of its internal displacement problem and that this progress should be the grounds for international dialogue. While commending Turkey on its progress, Deng noted that the stance of the UNDP can also be more open to change. Deng said that at the end of 1990's when he wrote to resident representatives asking for information on the situation of internal displacement in the countries they are situated, the Resident Representative of UNDP Turkey responded by saying that "Turkey does not have a problem of internal displacement." In the context of this example, Deng commented that sometimes international organizations' actions depend on what they assume to be the attitude and expectation of the governments. Deng stated that the government of Turkey has been more open to dialogue and change, and that the UN was usually behind the curve.

Dr. Deng said that he was very impressed by the wholistic approach of the conference and the depth and variety of research on Turkey's internal displacement problem. According to Dr. Deng, it is now time to use the findings of these research for advocacy. In doing advocacy work, both people who will cry out loud and people who will use the findings of scientific study to engage in constructive dialogue with the government are necessary.