I am not going to read the long paper that I submitted to our hosts, the International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies in New Delhi. I shall abide by the time limit, and endeavour to offer you a summary of my paper, which includes some observations on terrorism in India, our host country, and in Turkey where I come from. But I do understand that the original longer text will be printed, along with the other contributions, in book form.

Although both democracy and terrorism are complicated concepts, they are incompatible. Actually an old form of violent behaviour, terrorism is, not only becoming an increasingly important element in world politics, but also expanding by virtue of its brutality, number of victims, geographical range, media effects, arms smuggling, the marketing of narcotics, and the possibility of possession of nuclear weapons. One of the dominant features of recent terrorism has been the proliferation of groups motivated by religion, giving that kind of violence a so-called "divine imperative". Further, the so-called "anticolonial terrorism" cannot be on the same level with the goals of peoples struggling for national liberation. Such a movement does not endorse terrorist acts claiming human lives among innocent civilians.

Only fringe phenomena until recently, extreme political movements in Europe became significant, not only on account of violent attacks on
minorities and immigrants, but also the power of racist political parties has increased, influencing some mainstream parties to compete for the right-wing vote.

South Asia and the Middle East, like many other regions, are also beset with problems of terrorism. Both regions may be testing grounds of the relationship between democracy and terrorism. Paradoxically, some aspects of democracy feed violence.

India and Turkey have been melting pots of peoples and cultures. Modern India and modern Turkey were both established on the unifying principle of secularism, which meant for Atatürk and Nehru equal protection of all faiths. Thousands of years of Indian and Anatolian civilizations have created culturally rich societies. The values that inwardly unite these peoples outweigh those that separate them.

Frequently described as "the largest democracy", India has long been considered a model among developing countries for its success in the implementation of democratic institutions. In spite of the existence of the ideal of non-violence, which has often been identified with the cultural tradition of India, this country experienced collective violence. Part of the answer for social eruptions lies in the many cleavages that are found in India's structure.

Terrorism has also appeared in the contemporary Turkish scene in many different guises. It has brought suffering to innocent people through the hands of extreme rightists, extreme leftists, foreign-sponsored groups and another group that presents itself as talking for the whole of an ethnic minority, the Kurds. The separatist terrorism of a Kurdish organization, shortly known as the PKK, is Turkey's priority problem. An expert defines the PKK as "the most violent guerilla organization in the whole of the Middle East region". It is often but wrongly evaluated in the West as representing Kurdish nationalism. These are two different issues: the Kurdish minority, on the one hand, and PKK terrorism, on the other.

Only a very small percentage of the Kurds are militants, and very few of them entertain the thought of secession. The overwhelming majority of the Kurds and the Sikhs are law-abiding citizens, and are part and parcel of the unique culture that characterizes Turkey and India.

It is a small percentage, whether in India or in Turkey, or anywhere else, that attacks military and administrative targets, kills civilians, executes teachers and engineers, plants mines on roads, blows up bridges and railways, burns construction machinery, demolishes health centers, destroys schools, poisons water supplies, bombs hotels, kidnaps tourists, targets investment projects, sets forests and villages on fire, robs jewellery stores and banks,
smuggles arms, indulges in the extortion of money, and deals in drug traffic. The International Criminal Police Organization established the drug link of the PKK. These are all criminal acts.

The Indian and the Turkish Governments are responding to terrorism in a number of ways. India has restored the democratic process in the state of Punjab and the Northeastern part of the country. And the Turkish Government is building in the Southeastern part of Anatolia a gigantic hydroelectric and irrigation complex, one of the biggest in the world, destined to consist of 22 dams, 10 hydroelectric power plants and 37 irrigation systems. But a handful of PKK terrorists sometimes attacks engineers who are there to bring water, work, wages and wealth to that region.

No matter what their motives are, terrorists everywhere are undermining the democratic process. Their activities in India and in Turkey should be described as assaults on the democratic traditions of these two countries. The assistance that third parties give them should come to an end. There is no acceptable classification of terrorists into "friendly" and "hostile" ones.

There is sufficient basis in international law for cooperation among states to combat terrorism. In order to raise the effectiveness of the agreements already made, all states must strictly fulfil their obligations, and must not apply different yardsticks to the various acts of international terrorism. All states must take appropriate measures at the national level, harmonize their domestic legislation with international conventions, perform their international obligations, and prevent the preparation in their territory acts directed against other states.

Some circles now argue that the laws may be legitimately altered to meet the new terrorist threats. Some advocate regional police force. Others suggest an international court to try terrorists. The U.N. General Assembly resolutions of 1994 and 1995 reiterate great concern over gross violations of human rights perpetrated by terrorist groups. They call upon states to take all necessary and effective measures to prevent acts of terrorism whenever and by whomever committed.

General observations related to ethnic groups may be reduced to two principles: One, the protection of persons belonging to such groups is essentially in the interest of the state and of the majority. If the state exhibits care and loyalty to all citizens, it can expect loyalty in return by those who will have an interest in the stability and in the well-being of the state. Secondly, solutions should be sought within the framework of the state. It is possible to achieve self-realization as an ethnic group within the frontiers of the existing state. Secession is not necessarily an answer to the problems and the aspirations of the minorities. Moreover, it is almost impossible to find a
government willing to cede even a small section of its territory. Examples prove that even the very mentioning of such an alternative causes a greater rigidity in the attitude of the central authorities.

On the other hand, believing in the values that lie at the very base of modern India and modern Turkey, the Indians and the Turks have no other alternative but to uphold secular democracy in their respective countries. Their determination should be all the more unswerving when terrorism challenges it. To dislodge India and Turkey from their secular and democratic foundations will have repercussions beyond their borders.

Lastly, I suggest that this meeting announces in the form of conclusions the following convictions: (1) terrorism is incompatible with democracy; (2) terrorism expands in a number of ways; (3) its deeds are criminal in all respects; (4) the larger groups that the tiny platoons of terrorists assert that they represent are law-abiding citizens; (5) there should be no distinction between "hostile" and "friendly" terrorists; (6) third party support to terrorism should be terminated; (7) states should cooperate in combatting it; (8) a new international convention should be negotiated to meet new challenges; (9) solutions to problems relating to ethnic minorities should be sought within the existing frontiers; and (10) the grievances of smaller groups should be addressed to the satisfaction of all concerned.