



2009 EUROPEAN ELECTIONS

HOW DID MEPS HANDLE ISSUES OF ARMENIAN INTEREST DURING 2004-2009 LEGISLATURES

INTRODUCTION	3
THE TURKISH ACCESSION ISSUE	3
General Analysis	4
The European People's Party (EPP)	4
The Party of The European Socialists (PES)	5
The Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE)	6
Union for Europe of the Nations (UEN)	7
The Greens and Regionalists group (GREENS/ALE)	7
European United Left group (EUL)	8
RELATIONS BETWEEN THE EU AND ARMENIA	8
Resolution on a more effective European policy for south caucasus (17.01.2008)	9
Urgent resolution on Armenia (13.03.2008)	10
THE CONDEMNATION OF THE DESTRUCTION OF JULFA BY AZERBAIJAN	10
General analysis of the positions	11
Resolution on the European Neighbourhood Policy (19.01.2006)	11
Urgent resolution on the Armenian Heritage in Azerbaijan (16.02.2006)	12
APPENDIX : DETAILED VOTE OF THE MOST ACTIVE MEPS ON SOME CRITICAL POINTS	15
2004 – Camiel Eurlings' report on Turkey's progress toward accession	15
2005 – Elmar brok's REPORT on The opening of negotiations with Turkey	16
2006 – Camiel Eurlings' report on Turkey's progress toward accession	16
2006 – Urgent resolution on the cultural heritage in Azerbaijan	17
Votes of the most active MEPS on these issues	17



THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

28 May 2009



2009 EUROPEAN ELECTIONS

HOW DID MEPS HANDLE ISSUES OF ARMENIAN INTEREST DURING 2004-2009 LEGISLATURES

INTRODUCTION

During the legislature 2004-2009, the European Parliament considered many issues which concern first the European citizens with Armenian origin: the European Neighbourhood Policy and the Eastern Partnership, the reinforcement of relations with Armenia and the South Caucasus, but also the destruction of the Armenian heritage in Julfa by Azerbaijan. However, it is undeniably the Turkish issue which held centre stage during this legislature, with consequence the recognition of the Armenian Genocide.

These various questions and their treatment by the European Parliament constituted the heart of the European Armenian Federation's action which did not stop defending on each one of these issues the ethical positions of the partisans of the European project.

This short document presents the role that the main political groups or some of their most active members played on these issues so that, before the European elections, the European citizen could make his choice based on factual and objective information.

This document is based on the political positions observed and registered by the European Armenian Federation throughout the 6th legislature and also on the data provided on the website votewatch.

THE TURKISH ACCESSION ISSUE

The issue of Turkey's accession to the European Union had been directly tackled on six occasions by the European Parliament by the adoption of Parliamentary resolutions:

- Resolution of March 12th, 2009 on the report on Turkey's 2008 progress report (P6_TA (2009) 0134)



- Resolution of May 21st, 2008 on the report on Turkey's 2007 progress report (P6_TA (2008) 0224)
- Resolution of October 24th, 2007 on the EU-Turkey relations (P6_TA (2007) 0472)
- Resolution of September 27th, 2006 on Turkey's progress toward EU accession (P6_TA (2006) 0381)
- Resolution of September 28th, 2005 on the opening of the negotiations with Turkey (P6_TA (2005) 0350)
- Resolution of December 14th, 2004 on the 2004 regular report and the recommendation of the European commission on Turkey's progress towards accession (P6_TA (2004) 0096)

For each one of these resolutions, the report initially prepared by a rapporteur was submitted to a vote in the Foreign affairs committee then followed by a vote in a plenary session. Mr. **Camiel Eurlings** (EPP, Netherlands) was rapporteur in 2004 and 2006. The 2005 extraordinary report on the opening of the negotiations was prepared by Mr. **Elmar Brok** (EPP, Germany). The last three reports (2007, 2008 and 2009) were prepared by Mrs. Ria Oomen-Ruijten (EPP, Netherlands).

GENERAL ANALYSIS

THE EUROPEAN PEOPLE'S PARTY (EPP)

As a rule, the European People's Party (EPP) which has the relative majority in the European Parliament adopted a line rather hostile to the Turkey's accession. This position led several members of this political group to get hold of the minorities issue in general and the Armenian genocide issue in particular. This was particularly striking at the beginning of the legislature when fast accession of Turkey seemed probable. Some of these members, such as **Mr. Jacques Toubon** (France), **Mr. Patrick Gaubert** (France), **Mr. Ioannis Kasoulides** (Cyprus), **Mr. Bernd Posselt** (Germany) or **Mr. Charles Tannock** (the United Kingdom) were particularly active on the Armenian issue by tabling many amendments, by mentioning the question on several occasions during the debates and by encouraging their colleagues to vote in favour of the recognition by Turkey of the Armenian Genocide. **Mr. Camiel Eurlings** (Netherlands), the rapporteur at the beginning of the legislature, gave more or less explicit support to its colleagues. This tendency culminated in 2005 when the report of **Mr. Elmar Brok** (Germany) was adopted: the Parliament reiterated its call on Turkey to recognize the Genocide and "considered this recognition as a precondition to accession". Thereafter, the



position of the EPP group got worse considerably, in particular under the influence of **Mrs. Ria Oomen-Ruijten** (Netherlands) which showed a singular leniency towards Ankara in general and was resolutely hostile to any clear mention of the Armenian issue in particular. **Mrs. Ria Oomen-Ruijten** notably said publicly offensive remarks about the Armenians on several occasions. Her attitude pleased some EPP members who continuously supported the idea of Turkey's accession and who always showed reluctance to mention the Armenian Genocide such as **Mr. Geoffrey Van Orden** (the United Kingdom), **Mr. Vitautas Landsbergis** (Lithuania) or **Mr. Jose Salafranca Sanchez-Nera** (Spain).

THE PARTY OF THE EUROPEAN SOCIALISTS (PES)

The party of the European socialists has a political line clearly in favour of the Turkey's accession to the European Union. Its various MEPs are characterized by the relative importance that they are giving to the explicit or implicit criteria of accession. For some who support a quasi unconditional and immediate adhesion, the conditions put on the Turkish accession are considered only as awkward obstacles that it is advisable to sweep and their posting concern only a policy of communication which intends to reassure the European citizens. On the contrary, others consider that it is about fundamental preliminary requirements on which they are not ready to compromise.

The various points related to the Armenian issues, such as the Turkish blockade on Armenia or the necessary recognition of the Armenian Genocide by Turkey were continuously supported by the French delegation within the socialist group. In particular, MEPs such as **Mrs. Marie-Arlette Carlotti**, **Mr. Harlem Desir**, **Mr. Pierre Moscovici**, **Mrs. Martine Roure**, **Mrs. Beatrice Patrie**, **Mr. Pierre Pribetich** tabled, supported and helped to the adoption of many amendments in this direction. They were supported by some of their colleagues from other delegations such as **Mrs. Alexandra Dobolyi** (Hungary), **Mr. Giulietto Chiesa** (Italy) or **Mrs. Maria-Eleni Koppa** (Greece).

A special mention must be allotted to **Mr. Pierre Moscovici**, to **Mr. Harlem Desir**, to **Mrs. Marie Arlette Carlotti** and to **Mrs. Martine Roure** who tabled, supported and made adopted the famous amendment of September 28th, 2005 per which the European Parliament "invites Turkey to recognize the Armenian genocide", and "considers this recognition as a prerequisite for accession to the European Union". They also tabled the same amendment the following year and managed to get it adopted in the Foreign Affairs Committee. However



the volte-face of the socialist group (in particular that of **Mrs. Veronique De Keyser**) impeded the adoption of this paragraph in the plenary session.

This primarily French support was not able to make the difference in the socialist group: the head of the PSE, and singularly the MEPs in charge of the Foreign affairs, always showed themselves resolutely hostile to the Armenian questions and even often supported the denial of Turkey. That was the case in particular of **Mr. Jan Marinus Wiersma** (Netherlands), of **Mr. Hannes Swoboda** (Austria), of **Mr. Kristian Vigenin** (Bulgaria) and to a lesser extent of **Mrs. Pasqualina Napoletano** (Italy) and **Mrs. Veronique De Keyser** (Belgium).

The especially-astray role played by **Mr Wiersma** and **Swoboda** led them to issue in April 2009 a controversial book where **Mr Wiersma** use the words “so-called Armenian Genocide”, a highly denialist expression that even the Turkish State does not dare to use anymore. This new allegiance to Ankara’s expectations led the European Armenian Federation to send a protest letter to Mr **Martin Schulz**, the president of the Socialist group in the European Parliament.

It is also necessary to mention the harmful role of **Mr. Michel Rocard** (France) who behaved like a true lobbyist of Turkey within the PSE. The presence within the group of **Mr. Vural Öger** (Germany), an MEP with Turkish origin who professed the racial visions¹ of his country of origin completed to turn the PSE group as a whole into a group hostile to mention the Armenian questions in the EP reports on Turkey.

THE ALLIANCE OF LIBERALS AND DEMOCRATS FOR EUROPE (ALDE)

The ALDE group is a bipolar group gathering a minority of parties favourable to a federal and social design of Europe (like the French MoDem group or the Italian Margherita group) and liberals. This group was created in order to give an expression to political forces which did not characterize themselves as EPP members nor PSE members.

This natural tension within the ALDE is naturally declined on the Turkish issue where the federalists remain generally firm on the Union’s ethical principles; contrary to the liberals who see Turkish accession only in the context of the single European market.

¹ Just before being elected, Mr Öger stated “What Sultan Soliman started with the siege of Vienna [which failed], we are going to achieved it in term of population, thanks to our vigorous men and to our healthy women. In 2100, In Germany, there will be 35 millions Turks and 20 millions Germans”.



In this context, the support for the Armenian issues mainly came from the ALDE federalist forces and in particular from **Mrs. Marielle de Sarnez** (France), **Mr. Bernard Lehideux** (France) or **Mrs. Frederique Ries** (Belgium). However, as for the PSE, these MEPs do not constitute the majority of the group, and especially, they do not weigh at the important authorities level in the Foreign Affairs Committee which are headed by the British and Scandinavians who are in favour of the Turkish accession and *ipso facto* against any mention of the Armenian Genocide. We can notice the harmful role of **Mr. Andrew Duff** (the United Kingdom), who supports Ankara's denialist thesis.

UNION FOR EUROPE OF THE NATIONS (UEN)

This group is composed of "souverainistes", hostile to federal Europe and located on the right of the political chessboard. The UEN is rather opposed to Turkey's candidature for the European Union but this is masked by its total hostility towards Europe.

The group has never been at the forefront of the Turkish issue and even less about that of the respect of Human rights or democracy by this country. On the Armenian issues, we note however some isolated initiatives from **Mr. Konrad Szymański** (Poland) or from **Mr. Francesco Speroni (Italy)**.

THE GREENS AND REGIONALISTS GROUP (GREENS/ALE)

Following the example of the ALDE or EUL groups, this composite group gathers the ecologists and leftist regionalists. This group is the favourite group of the Turkish communities living in Germany and in Northern Europe. This group started defending the Turkish immigrants from discrimination and progressively moved to a position of unconditional facilitation of Turkey's policy by erasing or covering the justifiable obstacles which impedes the follow-up of its accession process. Consequently, it constitutes today a real lobby of Turkey within the European Parliament.

The Greens party militates in practice for an immediate and unconditional accession of Turkey and even takes up the denialist theses of Ankara. This position was supported by the President of the Interparliamentary delegation EU-Turkey, **Mr. Joost Lagendijk** (Netherlands) which will leave its functions at the end of the 6th legislature to go to settle in its country of adoption, Turkey. These thesis are also constantly supported by **Mr. Cem Özdemir** (Germany) as well as the controversial MEP **Daniel Cohn-Bendit** (Germany).



The Greens MEPs bared witness the character of Hrant Dink to oppose the Diaspora and to present Diaspora's claims for Justice as extremist acts.

In addition, it is ironical to note that in its unconditional support and its promotion of Turkey and its candidature, the group of the Greens even supports projects of transportation of dirty energies (gas and hydrocarbons), such as BTC, with the reason that this reinforces the Ankara's position of negotiation with respect to the Union.

EUROPEAN UNITED LEFT GROUP (EUL)

This group gathers the whole of the radical left forces (Communists and Trotskyites). It is in principle in favour of Turkish accession in Europe but also states forcefully a strict preliminary respect of the explicit and implicit criteria of adhesion.

Consequently, the EUL has always been a big supporter for the recognition of the Armenian Genocide. This position resulted in the table and the vote of many amendments on this issue as well as on the blockade of Armenia, on article 301 and on the respect of the minorities.

This position was supported by the President of the group, **Mr. Francis Wurtz** (France) and also by other members of the group such as **Mr. Kyriacos Triantaphyllides** (Cyprus) and even by a deputy originating in Turkey, **Mrs. Feleknas Uca** (Germany).

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE EU AND ARMENIA

These relations were not tackled as such in the 2004-2009 legislature. They were however addressed twice² through:

- Resolution of 17 January 2008 on a more effective European policy for South Caucasus: from promises to action
- Urgent Resolution of 13 March 2008 on Armenia (in the aftermath of the post-electoral turmoil in this country)

None of these two reports were submitted to roll-call votes and it impedes detailed analyses of the politic positions defended by groups and MEPs.

² Strictly speaking, the 2006 resolution on the European Neighbourhood Policy should be mentioned too. However, Armenian and South Caucasus are only marginally mentioned in this report and a specific point of this resolution is addressed in the next chapter.



Globally speaking however, the EU policy toward Armenia is consensual, moderated and rather well-intentioned. Despite the turmoil and violence that occurred after President Sarkissian's election, Armenia continues to be considered as the good pupil of Caucasus compared to dictatorial Azerbaijan or problematic Georgia. Armenia is especially seen both as the most committed country in its process of integrating the European structures (through the European Neighbourhood Policy or the recent Eastern Partnership) and as the most reasonable country regarding its expectations about this rapprochement process.

This actuality directly impacts the formerly mentioned resolution but, paradoxically, the attention paid to Armenian as well as the incentives sent in its direction are rather smaller than the ones for its two neighbours, the Azeri "Emirates", wealthy of energy resources and the stormy Georgia which faces Russian hostility.

RESOLUTION ON A MORE EFFECTIVE EUROPEAN POLICY FOR SOUTH CAUCASUS
(17.01.2008)

Despite that its democratic records are rather better than those of its neighbours (especially for a country submitted to a double blockade by Turkey and Azerbaijan), Armenia was subjected to unfavourable treatment by **Mrs Lydie Polfer** (ALDE, Luxemburg) when she prepared her report: On the Karabakh issue, the rapporteur referred only to the territorial integrity principle, favourable to Azerbaijan, "forgetting" the principle of self-determination which is however also recognized as a basis for the settlement of the conflict by the OSCE's Minsk group in charge of its resolution. In her defence, we have to note that **Mrs Polfer** stigmatized in her report the militaristic statements and the instrumentalisation of refugees but without explicitly the only country practising these techniques: Azerbaijan.

Last, in this report dating of 2006, we experienced the semantic and semiotic shift which substituted the call for recognition by Turkey of the Armenian Genocide by a simple invitation to "a frank and open discussion on past events" in the prospect of a "process of reconciliation" based on the acceptance of the denial of the Turkish State.

The first of these two points was fortunately corrected by an intervention of **Mr Charles Tannock** (UK) in the plenary session. He was supported by most of the MEPs of the EPP group. The recorded [debates](#) reliably figure out the political positions of the most active MEPs on these issues.



URGENT RESOLUTION ON ARMENIA (13.03.2008)

This resolution seems to be the evidence that the more a State leads contestable policies or is a problem for the International community, the less it is criticized.

Turkey which regularly infringes all the European norms is virtually never questioned. In our case, the severe suspension of State of Law which occurred in Armenia led to a particularly indulgent urgent resolution. Formally, Armenia was not condemned in the final resolution. Curiously, among the resolutions prepared by the political groups, the most severe stemmed from EPP, ALDE and UEN which included a formal condemnation.

However, it disappeared in the final resolution which moreover includes, thanks to the EPP, a recital stating that “the Armenian economy and regional stability are still being harmed by the border closure with Turkey”.

Clearly, the Parliament voted this resolution with responsibility and with the clear concern to avoid heating up a destabilization process which could have fired the whole region. This concern appeared also in paragraph 7 related to the simultaneous resumption of fighting with Azerbaijan on the Karabakh frontline.

Paragraph 7 modestly tries to calm down the process in deploring “the recent loss of life on the "line of control" during fighting between Armenian and Azerbaijani forces” and in calling “calls on both sides to refrain from further violence and to return to the negotiating table”.

THE CONDEMNATION OF THE DESTRUCTION OF JULFA BY AZERBAIJAN

In December 2005, the government of Azerbaijan ordered and executed the destruction of the Armenian medieval site of Julfa, in the area of Nakhitchevan that it has administered since 1922 under the terms of an arbitrary decision by Stalin. The objective of this destruction was to eradicate the last traces of the Armenian presence in this area, where the Armenians still constituted 80% of the population at the beginning of the 20th century (continuation of a preceding policy of systematic de-armenisation, there is no more Armenian's today).

The destruction of the 6000 last khatchkars (carved stone cross) of Julfa started in 2002 and was temporarily stopped following the protests of UNESCO. In December 2005, the 2000 last khatchars were destroyed with the pickaxe by the Azerbaijani army and were carried like rubble or throw in the Arax river near the border.



This destruction similar to the policy carried out by the Talibans against the Bouddhas of Bamiyan was however performed in the quasi-general indifference. However, the European Parliament constituted the exception by tackling the issue twice:

- in a marginal way in its resolution of 19 January 2006 on the European Neighbourhood policy (P6_TA (2006) 0028)
- in a principal way in its urgent resolution of 16 February 2006 on the cultural heritage in Azerbaijan (P6_TA (2006) 0069)

In a general way, and at the time of these two resolutions in particular, Azerbaijan used all of its diplomatic recourse to try “to balance” the condemnation that it was going to be charged with the alleged destruction by Armenia of elements of the Azeri heritage in Nagorno-Karabakh³.

Thus, the vote of an amendment condemning this destruction, and even more the adoption of the second resolution, a “urgent resolution on the serious cases of the Human rights violations” (Article 115 of the Parliament rules) forced an intense lobbying by Azerbaijan and its relays in the European Parliament.

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF THE POSITIONS

RESOLUTION ON THE EUROPEAN NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICY (19.01.2006)

In the framework of this general resolution, no roll-call votes have been performed and this impedes an in-depth analysis of the groups’ and MEPs’ votes. However, the tabled amendments and the debates allow making some extrapolations.

Hence, very unusually and in opposition with their traditional political line, **Mrs H  l  ne Flautre, Mr Cem   zdemir, Mrs Marie-Anne Isler-B  guin et Mr Milan Horacek** tabled on

³ For instance, when alerted by the European Armenian Federation on the 15 February 2006, the **European Commission** replied on the 14 March 2006 in mentioning “alleged destructions” and in saying that “it doesn’t have any first-hand or independent information on such allegations”. The **Commission** adds that the protection of cultural heritage in non EU countries is not within the scope of its competencies and that such “episodes, if confirmed par independent sources, have a direct link with the Karabakh conflict which has been the source of mistrust, destructions and victims both on the Armenian and Azeri sides”



behalf of the Greens group a amendment calling “on the Azerbaijani authorities to put an end the demolition of medieval Armenian cemeteries and historic carved stone crosses in southern Nakhichevan, which is in breach of the terms of its 1993 ratification of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention”.

This amendment was explicitly supported by **Mrs Marie-Anne Isler-Béguin** who declared during the debates that “demolitions of Armenian historical monuments in Nakhichevan are not acceptable”. The amendment was adopted.

The report prepared by **Mr Charles Tannock** (PPE, Royaume-Uni) and amended by the EP Commission for Foreign Affairs was also problematic in the second half of its paragraph 58 which urged Armenia, and only Armenia, “to find ways to permit the gradual return of refugees on the basis of minority rights to the occupied territories

An oral amendment of the rapporteur himself was adopted and balanced this bias in urging “all parties concerned to find ways to permit the gradual return of refugees on the basis of minority rights

URGENT RESOLUTION ON THE ARMENIAN HERITAGE IN AZERBAIJAN (16.02.2006)

This resolution was far more critical for Azerbaijan since the monument’s destruction it was responsible for constituted the core of the resolution and was threatening to banish Azerbaijan from the international community.

Paragraph 1 was condemning the destruction of the Armenian cemetery of Julfa. Paragraph 5 asked Azerbaijan to allow missions dedicated to surveying and protecting archaeological heritage, in particular Armenian heritage.

Recital G added by the **Greens** was balancing these testified destruction by imaginary destruction of Azeri monuments in Karabakh⁴.

Therefore, the **European Popular Party** (EPP), hostile to this dishonest recital, and the **Greens** group, favourable to it, both asked for a roll-call vote on it for exactly opposed reasons.

Last, these two groups and the **Party of European Socialists** (PES) asked also a roll-call vote on the resolution as a whole.

⁴ On can note the inconsistency of the Greens between two resolutions on the same point in less than a month: support to the mention of Julfa destruction in the report on the Neighbourhood policy; hostility in this report.



Finally, Recital G was rejected (60 Against, 29 For) and the whole resolution was adopted (85 For, 5 Against).

Logically, the four Greens MEPs present during the vote and the majority of Socialist MEPs voted for Recital G, whereas all the EPP MEPs and the Leftist ones (EUL) voted against, as well as the six French of French-speaking MEPs.

However, nearly all the MEPs (including the majority of Socialist that voted for Recital G) voted for the resolution as a whole, but the four Greens MEPs close to the Azeri and Turkish lobbies.

The [debates](#) give a instructive perspective on this vote, and especially the statement of Mrs **Isler-Beguïn** (Greens, France) who explained the ideological stance of her group by stating *“In this context, ladies and gentlemen, do you really think, in your heart of hearts, that now is the time to throw oil on the fire by deleting, as the amendments propose, the sections that quite rightly allow a balanced approach to the joint resolution that we all negotiated together the day before yesterday? We have already condemned the destruction of the cemetery in Julfa, in Mr Tannock's report from January, and we continue to condemn it. However, ladies and gentlemen, we cannot leave out the global context of the frozen conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan, which has been responsible for thousands of deaths and refugees; the wounds are still raw. Can we also ignore the fact that 20% of Azerbaijan's territory is considered by Armenia to be a buffer zone for Nagorno-Karabakh and that various elements of the cultural and religious heritage of these occupied territories have also been destroyed? It is high time to stop this dangerous escalation. It would be irresponsible to deny the shared responsibility of the parties to a conflict and to refer only to the destruction caused by one side, and it would also be contrary to our commitment to support our Armenian and Azerbaijani friends in the desire to resolve their differences.*

Finally, this resolution comes at a time of increased tensions between the Muslim world and the western world. A weak text could reduce these events to a simple clash between the Christian and Muslim worlds. I therefore ask you not to give arguments to the extremists of all sides by voting for a resolution which, if it were amended in line with certain proposals, would be unfairly partisan. It is a question of personal conscience, but it is also the credibility of the European Parliament and, more broadly, the activities of the European Union in the region that are at stake.”



This for the Greens group, a testified and universally condemnable act – exactly similar to the destruction of Bamiyan’s Buddhas by the Talibans – must be tolerated if not concealed because of external religious consideration et according to the idea that one should keep the “balance” between an aggressor and its victim.



APPENDIX : DETAILED VOTE OF THE MOST ACTIVE MEPS ON SOME CRITICAL POINTS

2004 – CAMIEL EURLINGS' REPORT ON TURKEY'S PROGRESS TOWARD ACCESSION

- AM6 tabled by Mr Toubon (EAFJD Request : For)

« Demande l'annulation immédiate de l'article 305 du code pénal turc qui sanctionne « les menaces sur les intérêts nationaux fondamentaux » dont les commentaires explicatifs visent explicitement l'expression des opinions contraires à la présence de l'armée turque à Chypre et de celles favorables à la reconnaissance du génocide des Arméniens »

- AM18 tabled by GUE/NGL Group (EAFJD Request : For)

“Calls on Turkey to promote the reconciliation process with the Armenian people by recognising the genocide perpetrated against Armenians as required in its precedent resolutions regarding Turkey's statute of candidate (June 1987 and April 2004)”

- AM38 tabled by IND/DEM Group (EAFJD Request : For)

“Whereas Turkey did not recognize yet persecutions perpetrated against its non-Muslim minorities, such as, for example, the persecution of the Jews of Turkey, the genocide of the Armenians, the genocide of the Pontus Greeks, the “ethnic cleansing” of the Greek minorities of Minor Asia (1922) and Constantinople (Istanbul, 1955) or the not yet elucidated disappearance of 1619 people in Cyprus during the Turkish invasion of 1974”

- AM46 tabled by IND/DEM Group (EAFJD Request : For)

Reaffirm the terms of its resolution of July 18th, 1987, in which the opening of any negotiation of adhesion with Turkey depends on the public recognition by the government and the Turkish National Assembly of the genocide whose Armenian population was victim between 1915 and 1922”

- AM80 tabled by Mr Poignant and others (EAFJD Request : For)

“Whereas the Turkish authorities also still did not satisfy the requests relating to other Armenian issues as expressed by the European Parliament in its resolution of June 18th, 1987”

- AM83 tabled by M. Toubon and others (EAFJD Request : **For**)

“Calls on the Commission and the Council to demand Turkish authorities the formal recognition of the historical reality of the genocide of the Armenians in 1915 and the opening within a fast time of the border between Turkey and Armenia; in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the European Parliament from 1987 to 2004”

2005 – ELMAR BROK’S REPORT ON THE OPENING OF NEGOTIATIONS WITH TURKEY

- AM5 tabled by Mr Moscovici and others (EAFJD Request : **For**)

1. *Calls on Turkey to recognise the Armenian genocide*
2. *Considers this recognition as a prerequisite for accession*

2006 – CAMIEL EURLINGS’ REPORT ON TURKEY’S PROGRESS TOWARD ACCESSION

- AM9 tabled by Mr Andrew Duff on behalf of ALDE and AM50 tabled by Jan Marinus Wiersma, Hannes Swoboda and others on behalf of PES (EAFJD Request : **c**)

***Suppression** of the paragraph which « calls again on Turkey to recognise the Armenian genocide; considers this recognition as a prerequisite for accession”*

- AM51 tabled by Jan Marinus Wiersma, Hannes Swoboda and others on behalf of PES (EAFJD Request : **Against**): **Suppression of the second part (in bold letters)**

*Takes note of the proposal by Turkey to establish a bilateral committee of experts in order to overcome the tragic experience of the past, and the position of Armenia regarding that proposal; urges both the Turkish Government and the Armenian Government to continue their process of reconciliation leading to a mutually acceptable proposal; welcomes that, with the recent debates in Turkey, at least a start has been made with the discussion on the painful history with Armenia; stresses that, although the recognition of the Armenian genocide as such is formally not one of the Copenhagen criteria, it is indispensable for a country on the road to membership to come to terms with and recognise its past; calls in this respect on the Turkish authorities to facilitate the work of researchers, intellectuals and academics working on this question, ensuring them the access to the historical archives and providing them with all the relevant documents; **urges Turkey to take the necessary steps, without any preconditions, to establish diplomatic and good neighbourly relations with Armenia, to withdraw the economic blockade and to open the land border at an early date, in accordance with the resolutions adopted by Parliament between 1987 and 2005, thereby fulfilling the Accession Partnership priorities and the requirements of the***

Candidature de la Turquie à l'Union européenne

Negotiation Framework on 'peaceful settlement on border disputes' which are both mandatory for EU accession; a similar position should be adopted for the cases of other minorities (e.g. the Greeks of Pontos and the Assyrians);

2006 – URGENT RESOLUTION ON THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN AZERBAIJAN

Recital G (EAFJD Request : Against)

“Whereas the Nagorno Karabakh conflict already led the Armenian forces to directly or indirectly destroy numerous precious elements of the cultural, religious or historical Azerbaijani heritage in the occupied territories, in Nagorno-Karabakh and on the Armenian territory”

Resolution as a whole (EAFJD Request : For)

VOTES OF THE MOST ACTIVE MEPS ON THESE ISSUES

EAFJD Request		For	For	For	For	For	For	For	For	Against	Against	Against	For
Nom	Groupe Politique	AMD06-EUR04	AMD18-EUR04	AMD38-EUR04	AMD46rev-EUR04	AMD80-EUR04	AMD83-EUR04	AMD05-1-BRO05	AMD05-2-BRO05	AMD49-EUR06	AMD50-EUR06	ConsG-AZE06	WholeG-AZE06
Camiel EURLINGS	EPP	Against	For	Against	Against	For	For	For	For	Abstention	Against	Absent	Absent
Elmar BROK	EPP	For	For	Against	Against	For	For	For	For	Against	Against	Absent	Absent
Jacques TOUBON	EPP	For	For	Abstention	Against	For	For	For	For	Against	Against	Absent	Absent
Ria OOMEN-RUIJTEN	EPP	Against	For	Against	Abstention	For	For	For	For	For	Against	Absent	Absent
Patrick GAUBERT	EPP	For	For	Abstention	Against	For	For	For	For	Against	Against	Absent	Absent
Ioannis KASOULIDES	EPP	For	For	For	Abstention	For	For	For	For	Against	Against	Against	For
Bernd POSSELT	EPP	For	For	Against	For	For	For	For	For	Against	Against	Against	For

18 Appendix : Detailed vote of the most active Meps on some critical points

EAFJD Request		For	For	For	For	For	For	For	For	Against	Against	Against	For
Nom	Groupe Politique	AMD06-EUR04	AMD18-EUR04	AMD38-EUR04	AMD46rev-EUR04	AMD80-EUR04	AMD83-EUR04	AMD05-1-BRO05	AMD05-2-BRO05	AMD49-EUR06	AMD50-EUR06	ConsG-AZE06	WholeG-AZE06
Charles TANNOCK	EPP	Against	For	For	Against	Against	For	For	For	Against	Against	Against	For
Geoffrey VAN ORDEN	EPP	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Abstention	Against	For	For	Absent	Absent
José Ignacio SALAFRANCA SÁNCHEZ-NEYRA	EPP	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	For	Against	Absent	Absent
Vytautas LANDSBERGIS	EPP	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Abstention	For	Abstention	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Marie-Arlette CARLOTTI	PSE	For	For	Against	Against	For	For	For	For	Against	For	Against	For
Harlem DÉSIR	PSE	For	For	Against	For	For	For	For	For	Against	For	Absent	Absent
Martine ROURE	PSE	For	For	Against	Against	For	For	For	For	Against	For	Against	For
Pierre MOSCOVICI	PSE	For	For	Against	Against	For	For	For	For	Against	For	Absent	Absent
Béatrice PATRIE	PSE	For	For	Against	Against	For	For	For	For	For	For	Absent	Absent
Alexandra DOBOLYI	PSE	Against	For	Against	Against	For	Against	For	Abstention	Against	For	Absent	Absent
Giulietto CHIESA	PSE	Abstention	For	For	For	For	For	For	For	For	For	Absent	Absent
Hannes SWOBODA	PSE	Against	Abstention	Against	Against	For	Against	For	Against	For	For	Absent	Absent
Jan Marinus WIERSMA	PSE	Against	Abstention	Against	Against	For	Against	For	Against	For	For	Absent	Absent
Pasqualina NAPOLETANO	PSE	Against	Against	Against	Against	For	Against	For	Against	For	For	Absent	Absent
Véronique DE KEYSER	PSE	Against	For	Against	Against	For	Against	For	For	For	For	Absent	Absent
Vural ÖGER	PSE	Against	Against	Against	Against	For	Against	For	Against	For	For	Absent	Absent
Michel ROCARD	PSE	Against	Didn't vote	Against	Against	For	Against	For	Abstention	For	For	Absent	Absent
Marielle DE SARNEZ	ALDE	For	For	Abstention	For	For	For	For	Against	Against	Against		
Bernard LEHIDEUX	ALDE	For	For	Abstention	For	For	For	Absent	Absent	Against	Against		
Frédérique RIES	ALDE	Against	For	Against	Against	For	Didn't vote	For	For	Against	Against		
Andrew DUFF	ALDE	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	For	For	Absent	Absent
Lydie POLFER	ALDE	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	For	For	Absent	Absent

Candidature de la Turquie à l'Union européenne

EAFJD Request		For	For	For	For	For	For	For	For	Against	Against	Against	For
Nom	Groupe Politique	AMD06-EUR04	AMD18-EUR04	AMD38-EUR04	AMD46rev-EUR04	AMD80-EUR04	AMD83-EUR04	AMD05-1-BRO05	AMD05-2-BRO05	AMD49-EUR06	AMD50-EUR06	ConsG-AZE06	WholeG-AZE06
Konrad SZYMAŃSKI	UEN	For	Against	For	For	For	For	Didn't vote	Didn't vote	Against	Didn't vote	Absent	Absent
Francesco Enrico SPERONI	UEN	For	For	For	For	For	For	For	For	Against	For	Absent	Absent
Marie Anne ISLER BÉGUIN	GREENS	Abstention	For	Against	Against	For	For	For	For	Against	For	For	Against
Joost LAGENDIJK	GREENS	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	For	For	Absent	Absent
Cem ÖZDEMİR	GREENS	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	Against	For	Against	For	For	Absent	Absent
Daniel COHN-BENDIT	GREENS	Against	Abstention	Against	Against	Abstention	Didn't vote	For	Against	For	For	Absent	Absent
Hélène FLAUTRE	VERTS	Against	For	Against	Against	Against	Against	For	Against	For	For	Absent	Absent
Kyriacos TRIANTAPHYLIDIS	EUL	For	For	Against	Against	For	For	For	For	Against	Abstention	Absent	Absent
Francis WURTZ	EUL	For	For	Didn't vote	Against	For	For	For	For	Against	For	Absent	Absent
Feleknas UCA	EUL	For	Abstention	Abstention	Against	For	Abstention	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent