THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

CENTER ON THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE

INAUGURAL SAKIP SABANCI LECTURE

"AMERICA, TURKEY AND THE WORLD"

PRESENTED BY

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT, FORMER U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE

Tuesday, May 3, 2005

The Madison Hotel
Mount Vernon Room
15th and M Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

[TRANSCRIPT PREPARED FROM A TAPE RECORDING.]

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC.
735 8th STREET, S.E.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003-2802
(202) 546-6666

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. GORDON: Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. Let me welcome you here. My name is Phil Gordon. I'm the Director of the Center on the United States and Europe at Brookings. It's a great pleasure to welcome you here this morning for the First Annual Sakip Sabanci Lecture.

As I think everybody here knows, Sakip Sabanci was one of the most prominent business leaders of this generation in Turkey, but he was much more than that.

He was a visionary supporter of domestic and economic reform and progress in Turkey, to which he and his work contributed, and also a strong supporter of Turkey's membership in the European Union, which is something of great interest to us at Brookings in the Europe Center.

And that's why it's such an honor and a privilege for us to be able to host Secretary Albright for the First Annual Sabanci Lecture.

We launched the Turkey Program at Brookings two years ago--under the leadership of Omer Taspinar, who's with us this morning--as one of the core pillars of the Europe Center, because we think that Turkey really belongs in Europe and wanted to focus on that important relationship.

And that program has produced a wide range of publications, analysis, meetings, and conferences.

And because we care so much about that issue, it's again that much more of a privilege to be able to add this activity to our work on Turkey. We also worked in sponsoring this with Professor Ahmet Evin, a former dean of Sabanci University, about which I'll say something in a minute, and Professor Evin is also with us here today.

Before I turn to Strobe Talbott for the introduction of Secretary Albright, I would also like to say that we are honored to have Ms. Guler Sabanci herself here with us this morning. She is the niece of Sakip Sabanci, and the CEO of Sabanci Holding, one of Turkey's leading industrial groups. She was chosen for that post by Sakip Sabanci himself.

In addition to running this major global corporation, she has had time for some side activities, like launching a major university in Istanbul about five years ago, Sabanci University. And we're also delighted that not only do we get the opportunity to hear Secretary Albright engage with us on these issues, but we also, technology

permitting, will be engaging with students at Sabanci University in Istanbul.

Maybe before I ask Ms. Sabanci to come up to the podium to say a word, I can connect with Istanbul and make sure--I've been reassured that the technology is functioning properly. Can you hear me in Istanbul?

Everyone was nervous that this wouldn't work, and I assured them that it would. I think we should be connected with the president of the university, Tosun Terzioglu. Professor Terzioglu, can you hear me?

MR. TERZIOGLU: Yes, I can hear you. I can hear you.

MR. GORDON: Okay. All of the doubters in the room--thank you very much.

[Applause.]

MR. GORDON: All of the doubters in the room should now be reassured. I was told that there was a little bit of a traffic problem in Istanbul, and I was astonished to hear that. But I understand that people are now assembling, and it will be great to have them for the question and answer period afterwards.

Before I turn to Strobe Talbott to introduce Secretary Albright, let me ask Guler Sabanci if she would come up and say a few words herself.

[Applause.]

MS. SABANCI: Thank you. Well, good morning, Washington, and they say good afternoon in Istanbul I suppose. It's a great pleasure to be here on behalf of Sabanci University. It is an honor for me to be here for the introduction and the launch of the Sakip Sabanci Lecture Series.

We are, of course, particularly honored that Secretary Albright has accepted to be the first lecturer in this Sakip Sabanci Lecture Series.

The joint work between Brookings and Sabanci University is had started a year ago I think, and the real aim is to have this lecture series under Mr. Sabanci's name, but also to announce a research effort, in his will he wanted an international research effort, and Brookings and the Sabanci University joint team will be announcing the details of this research.

But today I'd like to give the first topic of this research effort, which will be given next year, the year

2006, during the second lecture I presume. That is our planning, and that's our target.

The topic of this research effort will be "Turkey's New Geopolitical Environment: Policy Changes and Opportunities for Engagement."

The details, as I said, will be announced by both Brookings and Sabanci University in the near future, with an international jury and everything.

I'd like to also, of course, especially thank Strobe Talbott, Philip Gordon, Omer Taspinar, Professor Ahmet Aykac, Professor Tosun Terzioglu, and Professor Ahmet Evin for making this possible and am looking forward to Mrs. Albright's presentation. Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

MR. TALBOTT: Thank you very much, Ms. Sabanci. And welcome to all of you.

I'd like to add just a couple of words to what you've already heard both from Ms. Sabanci and from my colleague, Phil Gordon, about this occasion before I say a few words about our speaker and our guest of honor.

As Phil said, it is a great honor for the Brookings Institution to host the inaugural lecture in the

name of Sakip Sabanci. In addition to the distinctions that Phil already mentioned about Mr. Sabanci, he was also an extraordinarily generous philanthropist. His family foundation established one of the most prestigious universities in Turkey, which bears the family name and which, of course, is participating in our event this morning and this afternoon. He also contributed to building or restoring 120 schools, hospitals, and community centers around Turkey.

Today's event marks the beginning of what we all hope will be a long-term partnership between Brookings and Sabanci University.

Now, a few words about our speaker. I'm proud to say that she has been a personal friend over many years. And I was lucky enough to be part of her team when she was this nation's Secretary of State.

America and the world--and I would add Turkey--were all very lucky to have her in that job. She, and the United States, had global responsibilities. But she and the United States during her tenure as Secretary of State paid particular attention to Europe, because Europe presented special challenges and opportunities.

Our speaker was, of course, born on that continent. She understood the issues and the stakes. She understood the importance of the alliance that binds the United States and Turkey together. She understood the history of Turkey's neighborhood--the Balkans, the Eastern Mediterranean, Asia Minor and the Greater Middle East, in short, the intersection of civilizations that must not clash.

She believed in and argued for the compatibility of Islamic culture and secular democracy and modern society. She championed the expansion of Europe to the East.

Put all that together, and she is the perfect person to speak here today and particularly to our friends and colleagues joining us in Istanbul on the subject of Turkey and the world.

She goes by a number of titles. You've heard of several of them already. She is, of course, known to the world as Madam Secretary. I think it's also appropriate that she has borne the title Professor Albright. I would like to introduce her to you as my friend, Madeleine.

[Applause.]

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Strobe, for that kind introduction. I don't know about everybody else, but I could listen to you talk about me all morning.

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Actually, I could listen to Strobe Talbott discuss almost any subject, at almost any length. His mind is indeed a national treasure and a service to our country as a journalist, an author, and diplomat and think tank czar and has earned our ongoing gratitude. So thanks again, Strobe, for everything that you do. And good morning to all of you here in Washington. And in Istanbul, good afternoon.

Years ago, former U.S. Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, claimed with pride that he was present at the creation of NATO and the United Nations and World Bank, and today we can say with pride that we are present at the creation of the Sabanci Lecture Series.

It may not quite have the same ring, but it is offered in very much the same spirit, because, like Dean Acheson, Sakip Sabanci was a visionary who believed deeply in the importance of transatlantic cooperation and the

integration of democratic states. He believed that Europe and America belonged together and that the term "Europe" should embrace all of Europe, including its southeast pillar, Turkey.

And I'd like to dedicate this lecture to that same vision and to recognize the many contributions made by Sakip Sabanci to his own country and to the widely shared dream of Europe whole and free.

And I also am very pleased to be here with Ms. Guler Sabanci, who is carrying on the family tradition in a manner that would make her uncle very proud and that's an inspiration to women and business everywhere. So it's a great pleasure to have you here.

This morning I've been asked to speak about Turkey, the United States, and Europe. And to get in the mood, I have been reading a remarkable novel, "Snow," by Mr. Pamuk.

The story is too complicated to explain, but it takes place in Turkey and combines poetry and politics, love, God, and some truly bad weather, and I heartily recommend the book, although I can't tell you about all the themes in my speech. But it is fascinating in terms of

understanding the mingling of West and East and the influence of the West on Islam.

Whenever I think about Turkey, I cannot help but remember one of my trips there as Secretary of State. I went to Turkey many, many times, either as U.N. ambassador or later as Secretary of State, and I found it always to be essential in terms of our agenda; central in terms of geography, culture; and obviously central strategically.

But the trip that I remember a lot is the one that took place in August 1999 following the earthquakes. Ismael Cem, who was then Foreign Minister, traveled with me to the affected areas, and we visited a tent city at Izmir that had been set up for the survivors. And I was horrified by the devastation, but also deeply impressed by the local population's determination to recover and rebuild.

Those earthquakes were a terrible reminder of the turbulence in which we live. Whether the forces transforming the globe are natural or man-made, they are relentless and unforgiving. Technology advances quickly. Ideas come and go. The unpredictable happens. And the world is place of constant change.

To keep pace, we must be creative and nimble, but we must also insist that some things not change. In business, this means maintaining a reputation for integrity and customer service. You lose that, and you have no brand, as you well know. So branding and customer service is what you are so well known for.

In world affairs, it means preserving the alliances and friendships that allow freedom to prevail over those who threaten it. For half a century, one such alliance has been that between Turkey and the United States.

For decades, during the Cold War, our nations served side by side in NATO, with Turkey tying down no less than 24 Soviet divisions, stemming the advance of communism.

In the 1990s, we adapted and enlarged our alliance to prepare for the new dangers of the post Cold War world. We cooperated to contain Saddam Hussein, and were able to work together on the no-fly zones.

During my years in government, our leaders helped to halt violence in Bosnia and Kosovo, and worked to transform the Balkans from a source of strife into a partner in the new Europe.

Along the way, we learned the habits of security cooperation in every dimension, including energy security, and I was proud to be Secretary when the legal framework for the Baku-Ceyhan Pipeline was finalized.

The project is good for Turkey, good for Central Asia, good for Europe, and good for the world.

Just as Turkey has played a key role in the past, it is certain to do so in the future. This is not simply because of where Turkey is located, although its strategic position has been recognized for centuries. It's the result of what Turkey is, a country of democratic values, committed to preserving liberty and maintaining peace.

Turkey has earned the world's respect, and so its voice should be heard with respect, especially on matters that directly affect Turkish interests, such as the future of Iraq.

It's no secret that President Bush's decision to invade that country was unpopular in Turkey and that the parliament in Ankara prevented the invasion from being launched from Turkish soil; and this led to criticism by some in the White House, Congress, and the media. And there were even those who equated opposition to the war in Iraq

with complacency toward Al Qaeda and the forces of international terror.

This is simply nonsense. Osama bin-Laden and Al Qaeda were not given sanctuary in Iraq. They were given sanctuary in Afghanistan. And one of the first countries to lead the international stabilization force in Afghanistan was Turkey. It is ridiculous to suggest that Turkey is indifferent to extremist violence.

After all, Americans are not the only ones who've been victimized by terror. We were reminded of that in the fall of 2003, when a series of bombings rocked Istanbul.

It's not the purpose of this speech to debate the merits of invading Iraq. Let us simply agree that President Bush made that decision for better or worse and part of the worse has been the damage done to relations between Turkey and the United States.

Today in Turkey, a best-selling book imagines an American invasion of that country. A recent survey found that four in 10 Turkish citizens consider America their greatest enemy.

On this side of the Atlantic, there's a lack of appreciation for Turkey's contributions to stability and

freedom. And on American TV, a popular action program features a massive terrorist plot involving a person of Turkish descent.

Now, those of us who care about the relationship between our two countries have some important work to do.

We cannot allow more than five decades of partnership to unravel, pulled apart by stereotypes and suspicion. It's important for Americans to understand that it's wrong to make decisions affecting Turkey without taking Turkish views and interests fully into account.

And it's important for people in Turkey to understand that what happened in Iraq is not a precedent for anything. The United States has neither the resources nor the will, nor the intention, nor the grounds to do to any other country what the Bush Administration felt compelled to do in Iraq, or at least I hope that's the case.

I also hope very much that Prime Minister Erdogan's upcoming visit to Washington will help to clear the air and put relations on a sounder footing.

Governments in both capitals must work together constructively for the common good.

In Iraq, that means supporting the forces of peace against the insurgents who are trying to prevent the new government from getting off the ground, and it means supporting Iraq's territorial integrity so that it becomes a stable and unified country where minority rights are protected and terrorist of all descriptions have no place.

It means establishing the principle of human rights so that Iraqis are judged by the actions they take, not by the ethnic and religious groups to which they belong.

And it means ensuring that hard issues, such as the future of Kirkuk are settled fairly, and with respect for the interests and security of all.

And it means enabling Iraqi women to fully participate in shaping the future of their country.

In the words of Ataturk, "you cannot catch up with the modern world by modernizing only half the population."

People ask me all the time what I think will happen in Iraq. It's a good question, because the stakes couldn't be higher.

An Iraq that is stable, democratic, and prosperous could help transform the entire region. An Iraq that is

unstable and violent could conceivably trigger a region-wide war.

The outlook at the moment is something in between. The elections in January seemed at the time to be a very important breakthrough. It was inspiring to watch so many Iraqis defy terrorist threats, and a pleasure to see the voters smiling and showing off their fingers dipped in purple ink. For the first time in history, we hoped Iraq would have a legitimate government. But now, more than three months later, we have to ask whether the elections were really a turning point or just another bend in a very crooked and dangerous road.

The elections haven't done much to slow the insurgency. They haven't simplified the hard political job of drafting a constitution acceptable to all major factions. And they haven't clarified when it might be possible to begin the withdrawal of American troops.

In the best case, the formation of a new Iraq government, which I understand is being voted on right now, will put an end to the squabbling we have seen these past few months.

Sunni leaders who boycotted the elections will decide they made a mistake and be allowed to join in writing a constitution. The insurgents will lose support. More Iraqi security forces will be trained, and the conditions for a gradual U.S. withdrawal will begin to materialize. And that's a scenario we all have reason to support, whether we thought the war was a good idea or not.

The main reason for hope is that our adversaries have nothing to offer the Iraqi people except destruction and death, and we offer democracy and the chance for a better life. In the end, they make all the difference. And so let us persevere, because although going to war in Iraq was a choice, not a necessity, winning the peace is a necessity and not a choice.

In the months preceding the Iraq War, Bush Administration officials talked much about their plan for transforming the entire Middle East, and their idea was that a stable and democratic Iraq would become a model for the rest of the Arab world. They predicted that dictators, impressed by our resolve, would abandon plans to develop nuclear weapons. Terrorists would retreat or go into hiding, and prospects for negotiating an Arab-Israeli peace

would dramatically improve. This was a very bold vision, and I hope it comes true.

But I think it's fair to say that we have not yet reached the point where most Arabs look at Iraq and think to themselves, I wish my country would look just like that.

I, nevertheless, support President Bush's call for greater democracy in the Arab world. I know that some people say Arab countries aren't ready for democracy, and my reply is that I don't know of any country that has ever truly been ready for anything else. I'm a strong supporter of political freedom, and I believe it's especially important that democratic countries work together as closely as possible, and that's one reason why I would like to see Turkey admitted to the European Union.

Of course, it's not my place to tell Europe what is good for Europe or to tell the people of Turkey what is best for them. I respect both and speak only of my hope. But I believe Turkey belongs inside the major economic and political institutions of the West. Turkey can both strengthen those organizations and be strengthened by them. And that's been true of Turkey and NATO, and it would be true of Turkey and the EU as well.

I was pleased in 1999 when the EU finally declared Turkey to be an official candidate, and I am pleased that formal negotiations will get underway this fall.

As we all know, there remains some complicated technical issues that must be resolved: the so-called Copenhagen criteria must be met. But this requirement is only part of the political debate within Europe.

There is the economic issue. Turkey is big, and compared to much of Europe relatively poor. And there's also a matter of culture. The rest of Europe is primarily Indo-European and historically Christian. Turkey is Turkish and has long been a leader in the Muslim world.

As negotiations proceed, and along with it political debate, it seems to me several principles should be borne in mind.

First, the EU and Turkey already have an understanding. If Turkey continues its rapid progress toward European norms, it has a right to expect European leaders to endorse its membership. That's the whole rationale behind the negotiating process.

Second, Turkey's European identity should not be questioned. Although the Ottoman Empire was, at times, more

than a European power, it was never less than a European power. And since Ataturk, there can be no question that Turkey's orientation is toward the West.

Third, Turkey's religious identity is not relevant to its application to join the EU. That may seem basic, but it's by no means clearly understood. Both Europe and Turkey have secular governments. Both Turkey and Europe are home to millions of Muslims. And Europe, like the United States, has evolved into a multi-denominational society.

Just as important, the EU is organized around the fundamental norms of Western democracy, at the heart of which is religious liberty. And it would be contrary to Europe's own values to exclude a country on religious grounds.

Finally, it's not possible to argue that Turkish membership would disrupt the cultural homogeneity of Europe. That line of thinking might have made sense in the days of a six-country common market, but an EU with 25 members is a cultural kaleidoscope. Adding Turkey will not change that.

The fundamental question is whether Turkey fully shares the democratic values of Europe, and that is the real test, a test I'm confident Turkey will continue to pass.

And the current members of the EU cannot move the goal posts, as Turkey moves toward living up to the criteria.

We have learned much over the past 15 years about the value of democratic integration. During the 1990s, the prospect of joining NATO provided a huge incentive for democratic reform within the newly free countries of Central and Eastern Europe. And instead of resuming historic rivalries, they focused on democratic goals, such as respect for the rule of law, human rights, free enterprise, and civilian control over the military.

NATO provided a magnet for positive change, a place where one time rivals could work together on behalf of peace. I have had the pleasure in the last weeks of being with former President Havel of the Czech Republic, and he has spoken very movingly about the influence of potential NATO and EU membership has had on his country, and he does favor that Turkey become a part of the EU.

But I think that all of that will only happen if the EU keeps its doors open to new and qualified applicants, and its mind open about judging those who apply.

While in government, I was proud of the warm relations that existed between the United States and Europe.

We didn't agree about everything, but there was little question that we agreed about the big things.

Since leaving office, I have to tell you I've been worried. We have seen gaps develop between the U.S. and some European governments, as well as significant portions of the public.

And it's absolutely vital that we work on both sides of the Atlantic to repair the damage. It's in America's interest to have a united Europe as the strongest possible partner, not a Europe divided by U.S. pressure and unilateralism.

And it's in Europe's interest to work side by side with America, not to pretend that the purpose of its own unity is to counter balance the United States.

According to the poem by William Butler Yeats, it is when the best lack all conviction and the worst are full of passionate intensity that things fall apart. The center cannot hold, and anarchy is loosed upon the world.

That doesn't describe our times, or at least not yet. But certainly the worst among us are full of passionate intensity.

The question is whether the best have the courage of their convictions so that things will not fall apart and the center will hold.

To me, the answer to that question during the next few years will be found in the relationship between the United States and Europe, including Turkey, because for all the changes that have taken place, the Transatlantic partnership remains the center of the international system. And I admit that on this subject, I am far from neutral.

As an infant, I experienced the turbulence of Europe divided by fascism and crippled by appeasement. And as a child, I saw evil defeated by a mighty war-time coalition that stretched across the ocean. As an adult, I saw a powerful alliance bring prosperity to the West, and joined with dissidents to bring down the Berlin Wall on both sides. And as Secretary of State, I saw NATO confront and defeat the evil of ethnic cleansing in the Balkans.

Europe and America are natural leaders, not simply because of what we possess, but also because of what we believe. The New Europe stands as a rebuttal to the hundreds of years of human history in which wars were fought over the symbols of national identity, in which national

borders were constructed out of barbed wire and concrete walls, in which past grievances continually fueled new conflicts, and in which citizens were taught to focus on how they differed from their neighbors and not on what they had in common.

Europe has much to teach the world about the benefits of democracy, the lesson of history, and the value of collective action, and the costs of war.

Within Europe, there is Turkey, a country with its own lessons to teach. Turkey as much as any other nation in the world today is a shattering of stereotypes. It's living proof that those who believe Islam is incompatible with liberty are wrong. It provides a model of how a great empire can transform itself into a great democracy, and it shows how a proud nation can work with historic rivals in pursuit of shared goals.

The United States, too, has much to teach the world. Last year, it chose its president by a free and democratic vote for the 55th time. America is a country composed of people who trace their heritage to almost every other country, but who are bound together by the values of

liberty and by an unyielding sense of confidence about the future.

It is because of these separate strengths that Europe and America are such an extraordinary team when we are a team. Together, there is nothing we cannot do, but apart there is little we can hope to accomplish.

Perhaps the cliche is valid that Americans are from Mars and Europeans from Venus, but we should remember that according to mythology, Mars and Venus actually got along pretty well.

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Together, they produced a number of children, including Harmonia, the goddess of concord.

It's not a myth that binds America, Turkey, and the rest of Europe together, nor some pieces of paper, nor decades of toasts and pretty words. The bonds that link us go deeper than that to the fundamental values we share--a love of peace, a commitment to the rule of law, and respect for the inherent dignity and worth of every human being.

We may live on different sides of the ocean, but wherever the principles of freedom are on trial, we belong

on the same side, the right side, and thereby ensuring, through our unity, that liberty is the winning side as well.

Thank you all very much, and I now look forward to taking questions.

[Applause.]

MR. GORDON: Madam Secretary, thank you very, very much. That was terrific, and if I may say characteristically thoughtful and straightforward. And I know you have provoked a lot of--

[END OF TAPE 1, SIDE A; BEGIN SIDE B]

MR. GORDON: [In progress.] Well, I know that was what you were thinking. And I thought of writing something myself, but I know you have set the standard that I hope others will aspire to.

We would indeed like to open the floor for questions. I think with the indulgence of the room, maybe what we ought to do is take the first one or two direct from Istanbul. If Professor Terzioglu can still hear me and would like to maybe ask one of the participants from Istanbul to go first.

DR. TERZIOGLU: [Off mike.]

MS. : Hi. What are the continuities of the U.S. policy towards Turkey and the Middle East, between this Administration and the previous Clinton Administration? Thank you.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I have no idea.

[Laughter.]

MR. GORDON: Well, take the next question.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I can talk a lot about the discontinuities, because I feel that one of the biggest ones is to do with the Middle East peace talks, where we came very, very close to getting peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians. And this Administration dropped those ideas and came up with others.

I have thought that the famous road map that the Bush Administration came up with has never really been taken out of the glove compartment, so it is hard to tell where it is going. And I believe that it was very important to have a high-level special envoy, a Secretary of State, who is deeply involved, and a President who was deeply involved and knowledgeable about all the details.

Our policy on Iraq is obviously quite different. We believed that Saddam Hussein was a terrible person, and

we talked about regime change. But we never thought about invading Iraq.

And I do think that our policy towards Turkey may be getting back on the right track, but I think we had a much more proactive relationship. And I remember with tremendous pleasure President Clinton's trip to Turkey and the rousing welcome that he received when he came to the Turkish Parliament.

DR. GORDON: Okay. Let's take another one or two from Istanbul.

MR. : From Istanbul, I have another question. Ms. Albright, would you say your comment regarding American and Turkish contributions to European security with regards to future incentives for the U.S. and Turkey? Thank you.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I think that clearly there are many challenges, and I think the role that we all played together in terms of working in the Balkans is an example of what can happen when we work together, and what is also happening in Afghanistan.

But I think one of the big issues that needs to be talked about generally and that is what is the evolution of NATO, in which Turkey obviously is a major player? How much there is going to be out of area activity? And how we will all make decisions within the enlarged NATO, which I happen to believe has to continue to have a very relevant role. And obviously, Turkey will play a very large part.

The process also, as I indicated, of making sure that Turkey is constantly negotiating towards getting full membership in the EU will also be not only an economic and political issue, but will end up also being a strategic issue as there is discussion about a European force.

So those are all parts of a very full agenda. But it has to begin with the Europeans understanding the importance of Turkey to their own security and their economic wellbeing.

MR. GORDON: Okay. One more from Istanbul for this round, before we come back here.

DR. TERZIOGLU: Can we take another question from Istanbul?

MR. GORDON: Please. Maybe you can tell him. I'm not sure he's hearing me well.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes. Yes. We can. One more.

MR. : [Off mike.] The last [inaudible] the Turkish-American [inaudible] the Europeanization of the Turkish foreign policy. Bearing this in mind, to what extent do you think the European Union is successful in imposing its normative power in world politics?

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I'm not sure I fully understand what you're saying, but let me just say I think that clearly they are part of the criteria for becoming a part of Europe that are laid out for Turkey. I don't know whether you would call that Europeanization, but that is part of the plan. And the number of Turkish officials and private citizens that I've talked with I think accept that and understand it.

I think the question really is are there--is it an attempt to dismiss the large variety of people who make up Turkey and mean that everybody has to be homogenous. That is different from really talking about the importance of living up to criteria that have to do with democratization and the rule of law.

I would hope that what this is all about is that the distinctive attributes of the Turkish citizens, and that is what it is, you are all citizens of Turkey, would be respected within Europe and that there is not a homogenization, but that there is a common purpose.

MR. GORDON: Great. Thank you. Istanbul, please stay with us, and why don't we take a few questions here from Washington. Madam Secretary, would you like to as a professor, field your own?

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes. Happy to do that. But somebody has to raise their hand to make that happen. Otherwise, I will call on you.

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay. If they can do this in Istanbul, we can do it here.

MR. GORDON: There's one in--I think Ambassador Weston.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes. Ambassador Weston. How about the mike?

AMBASSADOR WESTON: Madam Secretary, I really appreciated your early reference to Orhan Pamuk's book, *Snow*, because it is such a wonderful book and such a

wonderful description of some of the dynamism going on in Turkey right now in relating Islam with secularization.

What do you make, however, of some of the recent attacks on specifically the book itself and on Pamuk coming in the Islamist press in Turkey?

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I think that the hardest part--and in watching Turkey and doing more and more reading about it--is for any country, and especially Turkey, to absorb--and Pamuk describes this so well--in terms of not Islam, but extremism and fundamentalism or whatever--jihadism--and the difficulty of a very modern society, which Turkey is, to deal with it, which I think in many ways is almost harder than when Islam surfaces in countries that are less developed.

I would hope that with Erdogan's government that there is possible actually to have a full discussion of this. I mean that is--it's been very interesting to follow Turkish events to see what it's like when it does have a government in which the Muslim Party is the ruling party, and the extent to which it allows discussion and, in fact, encourages tolerance.

And so I think one would have to look to see how Erdogan and his people handle this. And what we have maintained I think many of us that are looking at extremism within Islamic countries is that--and the terminology gets always very confusing--but that moderate Muslims would be the ones that can do the most in tempering the extremists, and it is much more successful than when it is done from the outside.

In my last discussions, when I was in Istanbul and Ankara, I thought it's very hard to understand fully how the Turks see their role in terms of--I was told very specifically not to say it's a model; that it might be a bridge or an example, but that model is a bad word.

But it clearly does serve as something in terms of an example of a democratic country that is able to have an Islamic Party that could be voted in or out, and from that respect, I think people are going to watch the reaction to all this.

I haven't read the Turkish reactions to his book. I have had a fascinating time reading American reviews who are having trouble understanding what the book is about. It is a complicated book, I must say--not light airplane

reading. But I think it is very, very important to absorb a lot of the messages that come through, and your point on that is right. And the question is how the Turks themselves will handle it.

He clearly has had a difficult time himself. Henri, yes.

MR. BARKEY: Madam Secretary--

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I don't like answering questions from people who taught me everything that I know about Turkey.

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Tom and [inaudible].

MR. GORDON: Henri, maybe you can state your name for the record.

MR. BARKEY: Henri Barkey from Lehigh University.

Madam Secretary, one of the things that makes the Turks very nervous is the future or Iraq, whether or not will split into ethnic states. The other thing they worry about, is of course, the creation of a federal arrangement in Iraq, with the Kurds controlling most of the north.

Now, you--when you negotiated a cease fire, or an arrangement, between the two sides in northern Iraq back in

1998, I remember you said that you believed that Iraq should become a federation. Do you still believe that? Do you think an Iraqi federation is the best way to resolve the current problem there?

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, let me say I think one of the things that we accomplished that I'm quite proud of is to bring Barzani and Talabani together. It was not easy, as you know, for a large portion of the time that we were in office. There were intra Kurdish issues, and trying to get these two quite dynamic and powerful men together and having them stick together I thought was a big accomplishment. And I've seen them both since, and they actually thought it was a pretty good idea.

I think, first of all, we know that Iraq is an artificial country. And one of the things--some of you have heard me say this, but it bears repeating--President Clinton read a lot of books, and he actually told me to read many of them, but one specific one that said was to read the *A Peace to End All* Peace by David Fromkin that describes the break up of the Ottoman Empire and the creation of the modern Middle East.

Now, there's one lesson out of it, which is that the Middle East was created basically as a result of the fact that the British and French bureaucracies lied to each other. But in the process, Iraq was created, and a country that was pulled together in many ways out of disparate elements. And clearly the Kurds are a part of that.

If one were to design--I'm a political scientist, and I do think that in many ways a federal system responds to some of the issues of having a diverse community of people who feel that they have different roots, but possible to live together if it's designed properly with a central system that has various powers and the federal federated parts of it that can exercise some other parts.

I actually think that it is the best answer to Iraq not splitting apart. And for me, that would be a great danger. And one of the things that I think we should all aim towards is a stable and unified Iraq, with a system of government that allows there to be some level of autonomy by the various groups. So to me a federal system, if it can be worked out with the right proportions, is the way to go.

And I must say that I hope very much that as this government is pulled together, and with President Talabani's

role, that there can be a way to do this in a peaceful and systematic way. But it has to happen relatively quickly, because there obviously are the elements that don't want it in that way, and then there are those who are afraid of any kind of movement towards any kind of localized autonomy.

But I would think it would be better for Turkey frankly if there were a federal system, I mean a federation of some kind that kept the country together centrally, but allowed for autonomy so there wasn't a constant kind of sense that justice has not been done or that there's a better way to recognize some of the Kurdish legitimate needs.

MR. GORDON: Maybe one more here from Washington before we go back to Istanbul.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes?

MS. : Hello, Madam Albright. I was wondering--you stressed in your speech--

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Can you identify yourself?

MS. KAFRA: Yes, Anika Kobret Kafra from SAIS, the School of Advanced International Studies.

You stressed in your speech the centrality of the transatlantic relationship from the point of view of

America. But do you not feel that the reality has increasingly been that Europe has become less of a priority from America's point of view and that others regions of the world, notably the Middle East and East Asia, are those that America in the foreseeable future will be concentrating upon? Thank you.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I think there is no question that there is a great deal of interest in other parts of the world, and some parts of the world where there should be more interest, and there isn't--North Korea, for example.

But I don't think that it removes the centrality of the European relationship, mainly because if the strength of the European-American relationship can be maintained, and we don't see each other as competitors, but as partners, then it does allow us, for instance, to take greater action in other parts of the world.

I think if you're looking at the Middle East, for instance, or specifically take Lebanon at the moment, I think that the role that the Americans and the French have played in terms of trying to and succeeding in getting most of the Syrians out has been very important. I hope that the EU sends a representative to the Lebanese elections. The

role of the EU in the Middle East peace talks is important. The role of the three ministers on Iran is very important. The role that European countries are playing in Afghanistan is very important, and I think that the extent to which we can strengthen our relationship with Europe and don't have to worry about the fact that we are going down different paths or are competing for dominance in Africa or something, I think it helps.

So that's why I think it's worth shoring up the foundation as we build on to the rest of the house or the larger organization.

MR. GORDON: Why don't we go back to Istanbul for a couple of more? Professor Terzioglu, do you have a questioner there for us?

MS. : Okay. The Iraqi arguments that Europeans are from Venus and Americans are from Mars [inaudible] to deal with them. Turkey generally is called [inaudible]. What do you think will be the major obstacles in terms of Turkish foreign policy if that divide actually does not improve?

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I think that the main problem will be is that Turkey will see its strategic

interests in some different way; that it will feel that it has to play a different kind of a role in terms of its relationship within the area, and I think will also feel--and this I think in many ways is more serious--is to try to decide with whom to be. I find the most irritating part about the Europeans at the moment is that they are making countries chose between us and them. That is completely unnecessary, and I think damaging. It certainly is a problem that I saw in Central and Eastern Europe of countries that were EU aspirants and were mainly kind of trying to be told, well, you know, if you chose America on an economic deal, we won't have anything to do with you or questions about support during the Iraq War.

I think it is an unnecessary choice for people to make, and it goes back to the question that I just answered about that it is to the benefit of countries within the EU and NATO and the United States to see that we are better off together and not put countries like Turkey into trying to make a false--you know, a Hobson's Choice that is difficult.

MR. GORDON: Thanks. Istanbul, another questioner?

DR. TERZIOGLU: Yes, we have one more question.

MR. : Good morning, Ms. Albright. How do you comment the current Turkish [inaudible] on the issue of the Islamic terror and the democratization process of the Middle East? Thank you from Istanbul.

[Laughter.]

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I made some general comments about the fact that I think that there is not an incompatibility between Islam and democracy, and one of the last times that I was in Istanbul actually--I'm chairman of the board of the National Democratic Institute, and we held a conference in Istanbul of a number of countries that were primarily Islamic to talk about democracy, and I do think that there is compatibility. It is a false--I'm the last one to talk about how to interpret Islam, but I think that one has to look at the truth and of many of the writings in the Koran to see that there is not an incompatibility and that the basis of all of this needs to be tolerance, which is the basis of the great religions, and I would hope that it would not be viewed as a clash of civilizations, something that I have not believed in.

MR. GORDON: Thanks. We have time for a few more questions. I'd like to take a couple from here, and then

maybe, Istanbul, we'll give you the last word after two or three from here.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay. Yes.

MS. ZEGUN: Rehata Zegun [ph.] with the Turkish Public Television.

Madam Albright, you said Prime Minister Erdogan's upcoming visit to Washington, you hoped that it would clear the air, and you said put it on sound footing.

What, in your opinion, do you expect from Washington? From the Bush Administration to improve the relations? What steps would you like them to take?

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I think that what has--there has to be an approach to look towards the future and not the past, and I would hope that there would be an understanding that we are partners in dealing with a whole host of issues in the Middle East; that we don't spend time going over why Turkey was not available for the military aspect of this; and that we talk about the importance of economic cooperation, energy cooperation, and also I think it would be very helpful if this Administration would recognize the fact that we can have democratic partners in our work in the Middle East. And I think that the Prime

Minister's trip to Israel has been very important, and whatever additional work can be done together on the Israeli-Palestinian issue would be very useful.

I know that when I was in the Carter Administration, Turkey was very helpful in terms of a number of issues in the Middle East. So I think to really stress some of the prospects for partnership, both in the economic, political, and military sphere. And obviously, I would like it very much if somebody actually talked about Afghanistan again. Not a lot of people are paying attention to the fact that people are dying there, continue to die there. It's in little items in the newspaper occasionally, and we forget that this is how this all began.

MR. GORDON: Another question from here?

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: How about right there?

MR. ZAMBRAS: Hello, Madam Secretary. My name is Alex Zambras [ph.] from Georgetown University.

A few weeks ago in France, the Armenian population gathered to remember the 90th anniversary of the genocide. It's another issue in France. Do you think that Turkey would or should recognize as genocide of the Armenian

population, because it could be a main issue for its integration into the European Union?

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I know very much that this is a question of some sensitivity all these many, 90, years later and continues to be a source of irritation.

I--this is my personal view--there are many advantages to no longer being Secretary of State--and that is one that you can have a personal view--that I think it would not hurt that the relationships that Turkey needs to have with its neighbors and in the region would strengthen it.

And one of the things that has happened in the world in the last years are people understanding that tragedies and terrible acts have a consequence, even many years later. And great nations can apologize. I don't think that it is an issue, but I know that it's a very sensitive issue. I know what has happened in Europe as countries have talked about the Germans being the best example of taking responsibility for things that happened.

Now, granted the history with the Armenians is very complicated, and each side has its own version of what happened. But I do think that it is very, very important to

try to improve relationships between countries, and I think that one of the things that we found with the accession to NATO was that countries actually got over some of their very old rivalries that didn't have quite the same numbers of dead people or implications, but, you know, the Romanians and the Hungarians got over it, and a number of others.

So I am somebody who does believe that we have to put the past behind us and move on to very important future relationships. And Turkey for me is such an important country that it would be better that it have a completely leading role in its region and if this would help, I personally think it's a good idea.

MR. GORDON: We have time for one more from Washington and one more from Istanbul.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes?

MS. CONGAR: [Off mike.] Madam Secretary, I--

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Can you wait for the microphone?

MR. GORDON: Yasmin.

MS. CONGAR: Madam Secretary, my name is Yasmin Congar. I am with the Turkish newspaper Milliyet, and also TV News Network, CNN Turk.

I would like to ask you a question on Cyprus and not least because the country is very well represented here with its able diplomat [inaudible] able diplomats.

Do you think there's anything the Bush Administration can do to get the Greek Cypriots interested in a solution?

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I have to say that this is an issue that I have spent many, many years on, and it's one of those issues that I've decided is you never have the countries all at the same level at the same time. It's like some evil demon is there so that you can never, you know, the Rubik's Cube. You can never get it all lined up.

And I know that we thought that the idea of EU membership would really be a help towards moving this forward. I hope that with the change in leadership in northern Cyprus that there could be some changes, and I would hope that the Bush Administration, as we tried in a number of ways to find a solution, and had special envoys and saw it as an important issue and not one that you can just decide okay, well, let's just leave the status quo, and perhaps with Mr. Denktash's moving from the scene, there would be some possibilities for some discussions on this.

And I have to say, if I can here, and we had this discussion--I think people in the United States especially need to understand more about Turkey, and Turkish intentions because this issue, having worked on this during the Carter Administration and then later at the U.N., and as Secretary, these are issues that are not fully understood here. It is very important I think to know all the facts and to--and it's another one of those issues where the past is the past, and it would be very good to see some movement on both sides.

And I hope that with the change in northern Cyprus, that it's possible.

MR. GORDON: Istanbul, one more from your end.

MR. TERZIOGLU: One question from Mr. Erodun Ganet [ph.]. I'm just translating his question. He asks: The term strategic partners or strategic partnership is very much used for Turkey and the United States. What does it really mean--strategic partners? What are the minimum conditions to be strategic partners?

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, in the case of the U.S. and Turkey, it does mean membership within NATO and planning strategies together.

One of the things I have to tell you it's a good question because as one tries to develop relationships with countries throughout the world, you give them all kinds of names. We created non-NATO allies. It's very hard to figure out what that really is, and we talked about strategic partnerships with other countries and, you know, it's like having friends and trying to decide who's your best, best friend or your close friend or your personal friend. But specifically, in the case of Turkey, it is because of the NATO relationship and the strategic location of Turkey itself in terms of common goals.

And that's why it was very troubling to me that there was not a lot of diplomacy that took place in terms of trying to get Turkey to understand what was going on about Iraq. We might have disagreed, but I believe in a lot of diplomacy, and I didn't see a lot in this regard.

But I think the strategic relationship is one in which you consider each other as very important partners in deciding largely issues that matter to the vital interests of each of the nations involved, and NATO is the binding element in this.

MR. GORDON: Thank you so much, Secretary Albright, for that terrific presentation and engaging in all of these questions. I think everyone will want to join me in thanking you for that. Secretary Albright, or I should say Professor Albright, mentioned a number of books in this presentation. But there's one she didn't mention that I will permit myself to, which is called *Madam Secretary*.

And I really honestly can say it's one of the best--not only most interesting for sort of Brookings [inaudible] policy wonks, but human stories that you could read, and I highly encourage people to do so, and it's even out in paperback. It's the least we could do, even it wasn't true, but it happens also to be quite true.

Istanbul, thank you for being with us. The experiment worked and for all the doubters of the technology we hope we will see you again at future Sabanci lectures. Thanks to you all for coming. Guler Sabanci, thanks so much for doing this and for being here with us. And then, of course, most of all, thank you, Secretary, for being here.

[Applause.]

- - -