

NJCM COMMENTS

on the

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT

under the

INTER-STATE ECHR-COMPLAINT AGAINST TURKEY

December 1986.

NJCM COMMENTS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT UNDER THE INTER-STATE ECHR-COMPLAINT AGAINST TURKEY

1. Introduction

In 1982 the governments of Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden complained to the Human Rights Commission of the Council of Europe about the violation of human rights in Turkey. They were worried about allegations of the imprisonment of prisoners of conscience and torture.

In 1984 57 Dutch jurists asked the Dutch Foreign Minister in a petition to take all possible steps to make an end to the human rights violations in Turkey. They also suggested some measures which could be taken by the Turkish Government to make a "friendly settlement" possible. This petition was an initiative of the Netherlands Juristen Comité voor de Mensenrechten (NJCM), the Dutch section of the International Commission of Jurists. The conditions mentioned in the petition read as follows:

1. the unconditional release and full rehabilitation of all prisoners of conscience;
2. the establishment of an independent inquiry into complaints about torture and the prosecution of suspects;
3. to shorten the length of pre-trial and incommunicado detention;
4. the procurement of safeguards against torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment of prisoners;
5. a prohibition of the admission in legal proceedings of confessions or other evidence obtained through torture;
6. the indemnification and rehabilitation of victims of torture;
7. the lifting of restraints which impede lawyers in their defence of political prisoners.

In December 1985 the European Commission of Human Rights secured 'a friendly settlement of the matter on the basis of respect for human rights as defined in the Convention' (Article 38.2 ECHR). In this settlement, Turkey undertook to report on 1 February 1986, 1 July 1986 and 1 October 1986 to the European Commission of Human Rights of the measures by which the internal law and practice of Turkey ensures the effective implementation of Article 3 of the Convention (prohibition of torture). Also Turkey undertook to inform the Commission of developments with respect to the granting of amnesty. As is mentioned in the settlement, 'work on amnesty has been started by the Turkish Government with a view to facilitate, within the framework of the Turkish Constitution, the granting of amnesty, pardons or similar measures of leniency'. A final report on the first part of the settlement (on torture) is to be prepared by the Commission by 1 February 1987.

This settlement was reached one year ago. For this reason, for the fact that within one month the European Commission will publish its final report, and because of the confidentiality of the follow-up 'dialogue' between Turkey and the Commissions, the NJCM feels it is important to present its own report on the human rights situation in Turkey. In this report not only attention is paid to the issues of torture (par. 2) and amnesty (par. 3), but also to

the possible effectuation of the suggestions made by the Dutch jurists in their petition to the Dutch Foreign Minister.

The report is based on recent evidence (collected up to December 1, 1986) from a wide variety of sources like Amnesty International, Helsinki Watch, newspapers etc.; it is a collection of existing information.

The NJCM hopes that the report will contribute to the discussion on the present human rights situation in Turkey. This human rights situation should be in accordance with the rules of the European Convention on Human Rights, to which Turkey has subscribed.

2. On torture

a. Torture in 1986

During 1986 the NJCM received information from several sources that torture is still widespread in Turkey.

Amnesty International stated in its February 1986-report that it "... continues to receive allegations that both political prisoners and common criminals are tortured or subjected to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, while in police custody and military prisons." In May 1986 Amnesty stated that nothing fundamental has changed since. The allegations were repeated in Amnesty's last report of November 1986.(1)

Early in 1986 two other human rights organizations, the American Helsinki Watch and the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, confirmed these findings by Amnesty. Helsinki Watch based its findings on a mission made by Jen Laber and Alice H. Henkin in December 1985. According to Helsinki Watch "everything (they) heard testifies to the fact that torture continues".(2) Ole Espersen, of the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, stated after his mission in April 1986 that article 3 of the European Human Rights Convention, which prohibits torture, is still being grossly violated.(3)

Finally, Helmut Oberdiek, from the German Turkeiinformationsstelle in Hamburg stated during his lecture in April 1986 that only in exceptional cases political prisoners are not being tortured. In most of these cases torture was systematically practiced.(4)

Not only human rights organizations stated in 1986 that torture is still widespread. Two members of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Mr Stoffelen and Mr Steiner, claimed that torture still existed. Mr Stoffelen said in March 1986 that torture was widespread and a serious structural problem. According to Mr Steiner the problem of torture and ill treatment had only partially been alleviated.(5)

b. Some individual cases of torture in 1986

During 1986 the NJCM received information on individual cases of torture in Turkey from Amnesty International.(6)

On March 11, Amnesty stated that Mehmet Aytuny Altay, Ali Aslan, Raziye Aslan, Cüllü Alkan and 5 other members of the Turkish Communist Party-Union (TKP-B) were detained. It feared that these people might be subjected to torture while being held for interrogation in police custody.

On April 15, Amnesty published its concerns about Servet Ziya Corakli who was arrested in Izmir on February 21 and held at Buca civilian prison in Izmir. Servet Ziya Corakli had told his lawyer that he had been tortured. As a result of this he had lost the use of his left foot and hand, and was bleeding from his anus.

On July 4, Amnesty said that it feared that Sinan and Emel Ciftiyürek, Kemal Bilget and Remzi Bilget were being tortured after being detained in Istanbul on June 24.

On July 30, it once again reported that Mehmet Aytuny Altay had been tortured, while being held in Metris Military Prison in Istanbul.

On September 8, Amnesty expressed its fear concerning the torture of Arif Hikmet Cyrodogan, Remzi Coban and three others. They were arrested in the first week of September near Istanbul.

On October 16, Amnesty stated its concern that Sehmus Cibram, a Kurd, was being tortured. Cibram, who had been granted political asylum in Sweden, was arrested on October 9 in Diyarbakir, while visiting his family. In November Amnesty once again repeated this concern. Cibram had been taken to Ankara. Neither his family nor his lawyer had been informed of his whereabouts.

On November 18, Amnesty expressed its fear that Turan Özcan, a journalist working for Milliyet had "disappeared". It also feared that he might be subjected to torture.

c. The attitude of the Turkish Government

The attitude of the Turkish Government towards the allegations of torture can be described as ambiguous.

On the one hand it claimed to be the first government in Turkish history to admit to the existence of torture and to take steps to punish torturers.(7) Mr Stoffelen from the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe stated in his report from Spring 1986 that it was quite clear the Turkish Government and the Grand National Assembly were firmly determined to fight against torture.(8) It was also striking that during 1986 there was a public debate on torture in Turkey. Turkish newspapers and parliamentarians paid a lot of attention to the problem.(9) This would only be possible as the government more or less tolerated this debate.

Unfortunately the discussion also revealed many negative aspects of the attitude of the Turkish authorities. For example, the Chairman of the Parliamentary Commission for the Inspection of Prisons and Detention Houses, Mr Akarcali, spoke about a communist conspiracy abroad that was intent to destabilize Turkey by the suggestion that torture in Turkey was systematic and state-supported. The Minister of the Interior, Mr Akbulut, when questioned about an incident in Giresun (in which a newspaper editor was forced to eat his entire newspaper after printing details about an alleged case of torture) charged that the incident had

been created by an international conspiracy.(10) A number of other examples could be mentioned.(11)

This attitude is also reflected in the way the government tried to 'combat' torture. According to our information it only made limited attempts. No fundamental changes in the government's attitude towards torture have taken place, in spite of all the evidence on torture which has been published during the last years and the assumed willingness of the authorities to 'combat' torture. Some examples of the attitude of the government are the following.

First, the authorities have taken steps to punish torturers in recent years. Only relatively few torturers have been convicted compared to the number of cases that have been brought. Furthermore, in many cases of alleged torture no inquiry by the authorities has taken place. At this moment there is no impartial body to investigate complaints and reports on torture. Torture victims must bring their complaints to the military prison commanders or the district prosecutor.(12)

Second, Amnesty International and Mr Stoffelen of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe have asked the government to publish clear instructions to all officials involved in the custody, interrogation or treatment of prisoners that torture would not be tolerated under any circumstances. So far, the government has not done this.(13)

Third, a bill amending the law on duties and powers of the police was passed by the Turkish parliament in 1985. Under this amendment, in areas not under martial law the 24-hour maximum detention period may be extended to 15 days in cases involving three or more persons, into which category most political cases fall. In addition, prisoners may be taken back to police custody at any time when new information has become available. These amendments only facilitate torture as most of this is inflicted on people during interrogation, with the purpose of obtaining information and confessions. Furthermore, incommunicado detention is still permitted for 30 days in areas under martial law.(14)

Fourth, according to Amnesty International, relatives, lawyers and doctors do not always have prompt and regular access to prisoners and detainees. The International Helsinki Federation concludes that it is unlikely that the government and the ruling party would accept measures that could facilitate this.(15)

Fifth, Amnesty also reported that evidence gained as a result of torture was used against defendants in political trials.(16)

From the information available it can be concluded that torture still is widespread in Turkey and that the government's attitude towards torture is ambiguous.

It is the opinion of the NJCM that it is unacceptable under the European Convention that the Turkish Government is not taking, and does not seem prepared to take effective measures to eliminate torture, as appears from the information mentioned.(17)

3. On the situation regarding prisoners of conscience in Turkey in 1986

With regard to the situation regarding prisoners of conscience, the NJCM draws attention to, successively, Turkish legislation, the attitude of the Turkish Government and some individual cases.

a. Turkish legislation

The problem regarding prisoners of conscience results from the relation between the Turkish Constitution, in particular Article 14, and several articles of the Turkish Penal Code. Article 14 reads as follows:

'None of the rights and liberties in the Constitution shall be exercised with the aim of violating the indivisible integrity of the State comprising its land and the nation, jeopardizing the existence of the Turkish State and Republic, of destroying fundamental rights and liberties, of bringing the administration of the state under control of an individual or group of people, or establishing the hegemony of one social class over others, or introducing discrimination on the basis of language, race, religion or sect, or of establishing by any other means a system of government based on these concepts and ideas.'

Acts such as 'subversion of the economic and social order' and 'domination of one class over the other' are punishable under Article 141 of the Penal Code. This article does not necessarily presuppose that violence has taken place; the intention alone suffices, namely the intention to carry out acts punishable under the article. Article 142 of the Penal Code prohibits propaganda 'in support of action prohibited under Article 141'. The violent attempt to subvert the constitutional form of government and expressions in favour of such an attempt, whether it be in writing, orally or by means of posters, is punishable under Article 146 of the Penal Code. Article 163 prohibits activities aimed at imposing religious principles upon the order of the State.(18)

Most of the prisoners of conscience are accused of having violated these articles. Therefore, people can be punished simply because they have a certain opinion. According to the Turkish authorities, these articles prevent the granting of amnesty to political prisoners. As may be recalled, the friendly settlement between Turkey and five applying states refers to the issue of amnesty in point C. The Turkish Government promised to work on a ruling '(...) with a view to facilitating within the framework of the Turkish Constitution, the granting of amnesty, pardons or similar measures of leniency (...)'.(19)

In the beginning of 1986 the Turkish Grand National Assembly adopted a law proposed by the government. Under this new law (law on the remission of sentences):

- a) death penalties, already approved by the National Assembly will be reduced to 30 years imprisonment, unless the National Assembly ratifies execution;

- b) life imprisonment sentences will be commuted to 20 years;
- c) in all other cases a conditional release will be given after the prisoner has served 40% of the total length of his sentence.

This law applies to violent and non-violent political offences alike. On 29 March 1986, after this law came into force 338 people were released from prison.(20)

The new law on the remission of sentences has nothing to do with amnesty. The final verdict will not be acquittal; the defendants will be sentenced as criminals. This means that they lose:

- a) their passports;
- b) the right to elect or to be elected;
- c) the right to be a civil servant.

Moreover, even if they benefit from this new law, this does not mean that they are really free. According to information gathered by Amnesty International, periods of internal exile, which are part of their sentence, will have to be served, immediately following release. During that period, people live under police surveillance in designated towns, usually at great distances from their home town.(21)

b. The attitude of the Turkish Government towards amnesty

So far Turkey, as presented by Prime Minister Özal, emphasizes the argument that the Constitution prevents the granting of amnesty to political prisoners.(22) Rightly the sincerity of the Turkish Government on this matter can be seriously doubted. Two reports from fact finding commissions of the Helsinki Watch and the International Helsinki Federation of Human Rights respectively show clearly that the Turkish Government have never seriously had the intention of working on an amnesty, despite the promises. Some examples are the following:(23)

- Statements by Mr Özal in parliament about a law that did come to effect: 'it is not a law on amnesty, but then, the government had not promised any such law anyway', 'we will never in this house discuss an amnesty'.
- The acknowledgement by members of the management of the Foreign Ministry's section for the Council of Europe Affairs that false hopes were created, either to induce willing States into a compromise or to end a political stalemate, i.e., a situation where there was no political will to continue with the inter-state complaint.
- If necessary, President Evren would veto such a proposal and should such a proposal still get through he would then put it to a referendum.

This shows clearly the negative attitude towards amnesty. Mr Esperson, in the second report mentioned above, arrives at the conclusion that 'as the Turkish Government has constantly been negative towards amnesty in its internal statements, it has at the same time in relation to other countries tried to give the impression of positive attitude towards amnesty.'

This negative attitude becomes even more clear when we look at some individual cases.

c. Some individual cases

The number of political prisoners as of September 1985 was 12,349 convicted people in civilian and military prisons and another 5,606 political suspects in detention. These figures were mentioned in a document given to the Helsinki Watch Commission by Mr Akarcali, Deputy Chairman of the Prime Minister's own Motherland Party. Amnesty International by quoting Cumhuriyet, a Turkish newspaper of 1 January 1986, mentions a figure of 15,569 as of November 1985.(24)

At the end of March 1986, from official quarters in Turkey the number was fixed at 9,805 convicted and 5,500 in detention.(25) It is not clear whether the figure quoted by Amnesty International comprises both convicted people and people in detention. In view of this fact one can not be quite certain of the real number of political prisoners. Nevertheless, if the official figures mentioned above are correct, a considerable reduction in that number has taken place and any reduction for that matter is a positive development.

In spite of all this the number of political prisoners is still regrettably high. According to Amnesty International, not all of these can be considered prisoners of conscience, but at least several hundreds. Besides, trials against prisoners of conscience are continuing and arrests are still taking place.

A first example are the three trials against members of the Turkish Peace Movement. In the first trial although all 23 accused were released from prison, charges have not been dropped.(26) The second trial in which charges were brought against 48 members of this Peace Movement, including 15 lawyers who defended the first group, is in abeyance awaiting the outcome of the first case. In the third case, charges have been dropped altogether, although twelve of the original 150 defendants might be included in the second case.(27) The release is said to have been due to the new law on the remission of sentences.

Five trials are continuing against leaders and members of the 'Socialist Workers Party' and the 'Socialist Youth League'. On 8 September last Amnesty International reported the detainment, for the third time, of Arif Hikmet Iyidogan, who in November 1985 had been convicted on charges of membership of the 'Socialist Youth League'.(28)

Illustrative is the case against six leaders of the Medical Association. They face two years imprisonment on the grounds that, in their capacity as physicians, they have condemned the death penalty (of which President Evren is much in favour). In doing so they were said to have expressed political opinions.(29)

Significant are the trials against trade unions. The most sensational is the one involving leaders and members of the Workers Union DISK. Although the military prosecutor dropped his earlier demand for the death sentence, between 15-28 February 1986 out of 1477 accused involved he asked acquittal of 674 and heavy sentences, ranging from 6 years and 8 months to 20 years, for the others.(30) The trial is already in its fifth year, and still has not come to an end.

In the meantime, new trials were started:

- 12 February in Diyarbakir against Kurdish Labour Party-members;
- 17 February in Istanbul against an organization known as the DDO;
- one of the more significant trials is the one at the State Security Court against eight trade unionists of the Union of Progressive Teachers, for acts allegedly committed prior to the Coup d'Etat of September 1980;
- 13 March, a case against 77 persons for having shouted 'political' slogans during the Türk-Is organized workers' mass rally in Izmir;(31)
- during a meeting of the Union Oleyis last June Mr Orhan Balaban, secretary of Türk-Is, supposedly said that the ultimate goal of the Union should be to set aside the ANAP (Motherland Party). This is considered an infringement of Article 37 of the labour-law, which prohibits the political engagement of trade unions. Accordingly the state prosecutor opened a case against him.(32)

Also according to the daily Cumhuriyet of 30 and 31 July 1986, several trials against members of political parties ended with heavy sentences for most of the defendants.(33)

As far as people are concerned who are prosecuted for their religious beliefs we refer to a news item in the daily Milliyet of 26 July 1986. That article reports the 'continuation' of operations against 'religious radicals' who are accused of being reactionary. During the said operations 22 people were arrested in Diyarbakir. Also in that same town, a trial has started against 30 suspects who had arranged a so called 'nur ayini' (prayer ceremony). The prosecutor asked for sentences ranging from 8 to 15 years.

Lastly we have to mention the law which prohibits the political activity of former politicians (Party Leaders).(34) On the ground of this law, e.g. Mr Demirel is involved in three lawsuits directed against him. Another example is Mr Ecevit, who had to face a second trial in September 1986. The first trial ended with his acquittal on 23 September last. With this policy the Turkish Government continues harassing her political opponents.(35)

As has been shown above prosecutions are going on and many political prisoners, and prisoners of conscience for that matter, are still being detained. From testimonies of people who were released from prison it is clear that prison conditions are bad.(36) If the recommendations made in a report on these conditions, a report by a Turkish Parliamentary Committee which was issued on 22 November 1985, were to be implemented, this would mean a substantial improvement in prison conditions. However no such information is at our disposal. Similarly we were not able to find anything about the steps toward the development of programs for the rehabilitation of prisoners, apparently taken by the Turkish Government.

d. Conclusions on prisoners of conscience

The attitude of the Turkish Government towards prisoners of conscience is negative. This attitude appears not so much from her

external statements made on the subject, but more from the internal ones. Moreover, as far as the latter are concerned, the outspoken intentions have materialized. There will be no overall amnesty.

It can be feared that the new law on the remission of sentences is as far as Turkey is willing to go. Suggestions to draft and to accept a law, which describes exactly which crimes are supposed to be included within the scope of Article 14 of the Constitution, were not adopted. (This legislation would increase the number of crimes where an amnesty can be given in the case of crimes against the State.)

Even though a number of Prisoners of Conscience were released, this does not mean they are really free. A new detainment is possible, and in fact this has happened. Trials still have to be faced; others are continuing and new trials have started. More important, the defendants will never be acquitted, this causing them great disadvantages. Although the new law is considered 'a step in the good direction', it does not solve the problem.

4. General conclusions

Although the Turkish Government claims to be the first government in Turkish history to admit to the existence of torture and to take steps to punish torturers, we conclude that torture is still systematic and widespread in Turkey. Also shown is the fact that Turkish authorities are covering up reports about torture.

In the opinion of the NJCM, the measures which the government claims to have taken are insufficient. Also the (real) attitude of the Turkish Government towards an amnesty for all political prisoners is shown. A new law on the remission of sentences appears not to be to the advantage of prisoners of conscience. Also facts are given about the continuing prosecution and ill-treatment of such people. Prison conditions are still found to be inhuman. On the other hand, we were not able to find anything about the steps towards the development of programmes for the rehabilitation of prisoners, apparently taken by the Turkish Government.

In view of all these facts there is no reason to be satisfied with the situation regarding torture and Prisoners of Conscience in Turkey. Furthermore there seems to be no reason to be optimistic about the future.

Taking account of all this the NJCM fears that torture will still be widespread and systematic in the near future. Suggestions to improve the situation, for example those made by the Turkish Parliamentary Committee for the Inspection of Prisons and Detention Houses, by Mr P. Stoffelen, member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and by Amnesty International, were not yet transformed into legislation (at least not to our knowledge).

With regard to prisoners of conscience it must be feared that the new law on the remission of sentences is as far as Turkey is willing to go. Suggestions to draft and to accept a law which describes exactly which crimes are supposed to be included within the scope of article 14 of the Constitution were not adopted. (This

legislation would increase the number of crimes for which an amnesty could be given in the case of crimes against the State.) Although the new law is considered 'a step in the right direction' it does not solve the real problem.

There seems to be very little reason for the five complaining states to be satisfied with the actual human rights situation in Turkey. From the information collected in this report it appears that, although the inter-state complaint may have had a positive influence on the human rights situation in Turkey, it has not led to a human rights situation that can be qualified as being in accordance with the European Convention.

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA VAKFI
TÜSTAV

1. Amnesty International, 'Violations of Human Rights in Turkey', 6 February 1986, A.I. Index Eur 44/07/86; Amnesty International, 'Violations of Human Rights in Turkey', 8 May 1986, A.I. Index Eur 44/16/85; Amnesty International, 'Turkey: Torture and Ill-treatment of Detainees and Prisoners', 5 November 1986, A.I. Index Eur 44/28/86.
2. Helsinki Watch Report, 'Freedom and Fear in Turkey', March 1986, p. 54.
3. International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, Fact Finding Mission to Turkey, April 1986.
4. Helmut Oberdiek, Folter in Turkei: Übergriffe Einzeler oder Systematische Praxis im Dienste Politischer Zielsetzungen, Turkeiinformationsstelle Hamburg, April 1986, p. 46a.
5. Parliamentary Assembly Report on the Situation in Turkey, Doc. 5546, Council of Europe, 7 April 1986, p. 4 (mr Steiner); Parliamentary Assembly, Legal Affairs Committee, Doc. AD/JUR (37) 36, Council of Europe, 25 March 1986, p. 17 (mr Stoffelen).
6. Amnesty International, A.I. Index Eur 44/08/86, Eur 44/12/86, Eur 44/18/86, Eur 44/16/86, Eur 44/21/86, Eur 44/23/86, Eur 44/29/86 and Eur 44/21/86.
7. See: Stoffelen.
8. See for example Helsinki Watch and Oberdiek.
9. Helsinki Watch, pp. 55, 56 and 96.
10. For more information, see Helsinki Watch and Oberdiek.
11. Helsinki Watch, pp. 67-69; International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, and Amnesty International, November 1986, pp. 3-4.
12. Helsinki Watch, p. 68; Amnesty International, November 1986, p. 4.
13. Amnesty International, November 1986, p. 4; Stoffelen, pp. 13-14.
14. Amnesty International, February 1986, p. 3, and November 1986, p. 1.
15. Amnesty International, November 1986, p. 4; International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights,
16. Amnesty International, February 1986, p. 6.
17. See also Oberdiek, p. 46a.
18. An outline of this can be found in a Legal Affairs Committee - Report Council of Europe, Doc. AS/JUR(37)36, 25 March 1986. Also International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, Doc.89EB/7(c)(i), May 1986.
19. Report of the Commission of Human Rights (Council of Europe), December 1985.
20. NRC-Handelsblad, 29 March 1986, From that date on no more mass releases have taken place, to our knowledge.
21. Another thing is that the law does not improve the position of those already under death sentence, in fact it worsens their position. All death sentences have to be ratified as before, but previously, if that ratification failed to appear, the sentence was automatically commuted to life imprisonment, which meant 19½ years to serve. Presently, the commutation will be 30 years, which have to be served in full; A.I., 1 May 1986.
22. Interview with the Dutch newspaper 'Algemeen Dagblad', 21 March 1986.
23. Helsinki Watch Report, 'Freedom and Fear, Human Rights in Turkey', March 1986; International Helsinki Federation For Human Rights, Fact Finding Mission to Turkey, April 1986.
24. Amnesty International, 'Violations of Human Rights in Turkey', 6 February 1986.
25. Dutch newspaper 'NRC-Handelsblad', 29 March 1986. In the above-mentioned interview with 'Algemeen Dagblad' (note 22) Mr Özal said there were no more political prisoners in Turkey, thereby contradicting these official figures. Incidentally, something similar happened in March 1985. During a visit to the US he made the same denial. On 12 September he told the New York Times that there were 7,000 to 8,000 Political Prisoners in Turkey; quoted in the Helsinki Watch-report.
26. NRC-Handelsblad, 18 February and 11 March 1986.

27. Op. cit. 25. Also International Herald Tribune, 12 August 1986.
28. A.I. Eur. 44/21/86, 8 September 1986.
29. NRC-Handelsblad, 1 March 1986. About a second trial involving leaders of the Medical Association, Turkish Daily Cumhuriyet of 4 August 1986.
30. ILO, Governing Board, 233rd Session. Doc. GB 233/9/10, Geneva, May-June 1986.
31. Information by mr T. ETTY of the Dutch Federation of Trade Unions (FNV). About the Türk-Is rally in Izmir see NRC-Handelsblad 24 February 1986.
32. Turkish Daily Milliyet of 7 August 1986. News items taken from Turkish newspapers can be found in 'Türkei Infodienst', which is a compilation of political-, socio-economic- and human rights-news from Turkey issued by Informationsstelle Türkei Hamburg e.V. The publications used here are the ones issued in August and September 1986.
33. Trials against members of the Communist Party, the Socialist Party and the Turkish Labour Party. Apart from prison sentences, which ranged from several months to life-imprisonment, five death penalties were imposed.
34. After the military intervention all political activity was prohibited and political parties were dissolved. A new Constitution and new laws were drafted, including those relating to the political parties; for this Bülent Tanör, 'Who's in Charge in Turkey?', ICJ-Review No. 34, June 1985.
A ban on public statements, directed to former politicians, was lifted on 2 April 1986; Dutch Daily 'Haagsche Courant', 3 April 1986.
35. NRC-Handelsblad, 30 July, 16 August and 24 September 1986.
36. Among other things an interview with Madam Reha İsvan, one of the accused in the first trial against the Turkish Peace Movement, who was released in February this year; NRC-Handelsblad 12 July 1986 and a news item in the Yeni Gündem of 21 and 27 July 1986 about the refusal to give elementary medical treatment at first, and the conduction of unauthorized medical acts by a replacement of the prison doctor, an orderly, afterwards.

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİHİ