
TÜRKİYE-AB KPK EŞ BAŞKANI ÇONKAR'DAN AVRUPA PARLAMENTOSU'NA TÜRKİYE RAPORUYLA İLGİLİ MEKTUP (ENGLISH)

-

13.04.2016

12.04.2016

AB Haber

Türkiye-AB Karma Parlamento Komisyonu KPK Eş Başkanı Ahmet Berat Çonkar Avrupa Parlamentosu AP Türkiye Raportörü Kati Piri ,Karma Parlamento Komisyonunun AP Kanadı Eş Başkanı Manolis Kefalogiannis,Hristiyan Demokratlar Grubu Başkanı Manfred Weber, Sosyalist Grup Başkanı Gianni Pitella, Avrupalı Muhafazakârlar ve Reformcular Grubu Başkanı Syed Kamall, Liberaller Grubu Başkanı Guy Verhofstadt,Yeşiller Grubu Eş Başkanları Rebecca Harms ve Philippe Lambertse taslak AP 2015 Türkiye raporuyla ilgili mektup gönderdi.

ABHaber,Ahmet Berat Çonkarın APye gönderdiği mektupları yayımlıyor:

Mr. Manfred WEBER

Chairman of the EPP Group

European Parliament

7 April 2016, Ankara

Dear Chair,

I am writing to you with regard to the motion for resolution 2015/2898(RSP) on the Turkey Progress Report 2015 that has been adopted at the Foreign Affairs Committee (AFET) on 15 March 2016 and expected to be voted in the plenary session of the European Parliament on 13 April. I would like to share some of my views and concerns with you.

Each year, the European Commission publishes its Turkey Progress Report taking into account the state of play in the accession process. In turn, the European Parliament reflects its own position both regarding the report and the progress in the accession process with a resolution prepared by the AFET.

Until recently, the reports and resolutions prepared by the rapporteurs of the European Parliament have taken up many issues within the context of Turkey-EU relations and beyond. However contentious and critical they might be, it was difficult to agree with many of conclusions and assessments in these reports, we chose to draw lessons from constructive criticisms out of the expectation that reason, not fear, would prevail in the course.

Since the beginning of the 8th European legislature, especially with the advent of the refugee

crisis and worsening security in the Near East however, this phenomenon has taken to new heights, hysteria almost. The last example has been the resolution adopted in the AFET. I had the chance to observe the drafting process, beginning with the preliminary stages, debates in the committee and amendments given, and unfortunately witnessed that it was marked with blatant accusations, outright prejudices or deliberate misrepresentations towards Turkey, which leaves no space for a coolheaded exchange or an informed discussion. I have to say that I am further disappointed to hear from the European Parliament benches such arguments that evoke narrow national agendas, escaping from which in my opinion was the EUs greatest achievement. I have decided to bring this matter to your attention because it runs the risk of demeaning the reputation that the European Parliaments word carries in the Turkish audience.

The second point I want to draw your attention is about the references to the 1915 events in the European Parliament resolutions. In 2015, the European Parliament expressed its opinion on the 1915 events with a resolution that we strongly disagreed with its substance and its form. We disagreed with its substance because contrary to the resolution painted as, it is an ongoing historical debate. As the ECHR ruled in the *Perincek v. Switzerland*, it is still a matter within the realm of freedom of expression and thought, Armenian interpretation does not equal to the truth itself. Though ignored by MEPs at that time, alternative interpretations of the events exist and until proven otherwise by academic scholarship it has equally legitimate validity. We disagree with its form because the unilateral approach exhibited by the European Parliament was not the right attitude to broker reconciliation between two peoples. Resolutions based on one-sided narratives will not reinforce the spirit of dialogue between Turks and Armenians, which we need urgently today. And yet we have our differences of opinion, we respect the European Parliaments right to form its own opinion, but that opinion cannot be forced on Turkey.

The third point that I would like to mention is the concern raised by several MEPs regarding the escalation of PKK terrorism and concomitant operations of security forces in Turkey. At the moment we are at a point where the security of our citizens is threatened due to escalated PKK terrorism. It should be noted that Turkey is intent on keeping the critical balance between security requirements and the need to protect the freedoms. Turkey will continue to take all necessary measures and carry out operations to make sure Turkish citizens lives are safe and secure in line with the principles of fundamental rights, freedoms and international law. In the meantime, it is only natural that we expect the support of our partners and the solidarity of our allies, by maintaining a resolute stance towards acts of terror and activities of the PKK and affiliated groups, as well as of DAESH, manifesting a uniform approach against all terrorist organizations without discrimination.

On the other hand, in some cases, we saw unfortunately that we have to deal not with concern, but with a naked expression of support for the PKK, exemplified by this irresponsible campaign of signature by certain MEPs demanding to delist the PKK from the EU list of designated terrorist groups. Let me remind you that PKK is a terrorist organization because it employs terror for its political goals, it targets civilians and non-combatants, and it does not hesitate to cause large scale destruction in any spheres of life. It was designated as terrorist organization *ex post facto*. No signature or resolution can wash up this fact.

Concluding my letter, I would like to reiterate my support for the Turkey-EU Agreement reached at the Summit on 18th March regarding the irregular migration at the Aegean Sea and I hope that it will help end the drama unfolded on Turkish and Greek shores. It is obvious that the cooperation

between Turkey and the EU is essential to bring stability and promote peace in our region. I believe that the European Parliament is an indispensable actor in this cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Ahmet Berat ÇONKAR

Co-Chair

Mr. Gianni PITTELLA

President of the S&D Group

European Parliament

7 April 2016, Ankara

Dear Chair,

I am writing to you with regard to the motion for resolution 2015/2898(RSP) on the Turkey Progress Report 2015 that has been adopted at the Foreign Affairs Committee (AFET) on 15 March 2016 and expected to be voted in the plenary session of the European Parliament on 13 April. I would like to share some of my views and concerns with you.

Each year, the European Commission publishes its Turkey Progress Report taking into account the state of play in the accession process. In turn, the European Parliament reflects its own position both regarding the report and the progress in the accession process with a resolution prepared by the AFET.

Until recently, the reports and resolutions prepared by the rapporteurs of the European Parliament have taken up many issues within the context of Turkey-EU relations and beyond. However contentious and critical they might be, it was difficult to agree with many of conclusions and assessments in these reports, we chose to draw lessons from constructive criticisms out of the expectation that reason, not fear, would prevail in the course.

Since the beginning of the 8th European legislature, especially with the advent of the refugee crisis and worsening security in the Near East however, this phenomenon has taken to new heights, hysteria almost. The last example has been the resolution adopted in the AFET. I had the chance to observe the drafting process, beginning with the preliminary stages, debates in the committee and amendments given, and unfortunately witnessed that it was marked with blatant accusations, outright prejudices or deliberate misrepresentations towards Turkey, which leaves no space for a coolheaded exchange or an informed discussion. I have to say that I am further disappointed to hear from the European Parliament benches such arguments that evoke narrow national agendas, escaping from which in my opinion was the EUs greatest achievement. I have decided to bring this matter to your attention because it runs the risk of demeaning the reputation that the European Parliaments word carries in the Turkish audience.

The second point I want to draw your attention is about the references to the 1915 events in the European Parliament resolutions. In 2015, the European Parliament expressed its opinion on the 1915 events with a resolution that we strongly disagreed with its substance and its form. We

disagreed with its substance because contrary to the resolution painted as, it is an ongoing historical debate. As the ECHR ruled in the *Perincek v. Switzerland*, it is still a matter within the realm of freedom of expression and thought, Armenian interpretation does not equal to the truth itself. Though ignored by MEPs at that time, alternative interpretations of the events exist and until proven otherwise by academic scholarship it has equally legitimate validity. We disagree with its form because the unilateral approach exhibited by the European Parliament was not the right attitude to broker reconciliation between two peoples. Resolutions based on one-sided narratives will not reinforce the spirit of dialogue between Turks and Armenians, which we need urgently today. And yet we have our differences of opinion, we respect the European Parliaments right to form its own opinion, but that opinion cannot be forced on Turkey.

The third point that I would like to mention is the concern raised by several MEPs regarding the escalation of PKK terrorism and concomitant operations of security forces in Turkey. At the moment we are at a point where the security of our citizens is threatened due to escalated PKK terrorism. It should be noted that Turkey is intent on keeping the critical balance between security requirements and the need to protect the freedoms. Turkey will continue to take all necessary measures and carry out operations to make sure Turkish citizens lives are safe and secure in line with the principles of fundamental rights, freedoms and international law. In the meantime, it is only natural that we expect the support of our partners and the solidarity of our allies, by maintaining a resolute stance towards acts of terror and activities of the PKK and affiliated groups, as well as of DAESH, manifesting a uniform approach against all terrorist organizations without discrimination.

On the other hand, in some cases, we saw unfortunately that we have to deal not with concern, but with a naked expression of support for the PKK, exemplified by this irresponsible campaign of signature by certain MEPs demanding to delist the PKK from the EU list of designated terrorist groups. Let me remind you that PKK is a terrorist organization because it employs terror for its political goals, it targets civilians and non-combatants, and it does not hesitate to cause large scale destruction in any spheres of life. It was designated as terrorist organization *ex post facto*. No signature or resolution can wash up this fact.

Concluding my letter, I would like to reiterate my support for the Turkey-EU Agreement reached at the Summit on 18th March regarding the irregular migration at the Aegean Sea and I hope that it will help end the drama unfolded on Turkish and Greek shores. It is obvious that the cooperation between Turkey and the EU is essential to bring stability and promote peace in our region. I believe that the European Parliament is an indispensable actor in this cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Ahmet Berat ÇONKAR

Co-Chair

Mr. Syed KAMALL

Chairman of the ECR Group

European Parliament

7 April 2016, Ankara

Dear Chair,

I am writing to you with regard to the motion for resolution 2015/2898(RSP) on the Turkey Progress Report 2015 that has been adopted at the Foreign Affairs Committee (AFET) on 15 March 2016 and expected to be voted in the plenary session of the European Parliament on 13 April. I would like to share some of my views and concerns with you.

Each year, the European Commission publishes its Turkey Progress Report taking into account the state of play in the accession process. In turn, the European Parliament reflects its own position both regarding the report and the progress in the accession process with a resolution prepared by the AFET.

Until recently, the reports and resolutions prepared by the rapporteurs of the European Parliament have taken up many issues within the context of Turkey-EU relations and beyond. However contentious and critical they might be, it was difficult to agree with many of conclusions and assessments in these reports, we chose to draw lessons from constructive criticisms out of the expectation that reason, not fear, would prevail in the course.

Since the beginning of the 8th European legislature, especially with the advent of the refugee crisis and worsening security in the Near East however, this phenomenon has taken to new heights, hysteria almost. The last example has been the resolution adopted in the AFET. I had the chance to observe the drafting process, beginning with the preliminary stages, debates in the committee and amendments given, and unfortunately witnessed that it was marked with blatant accusations, outright prejudices or deliberate misrepresentations towards Turkey, which leaves no space for a coolheaded exchange or an informed discussion. I have to say that I am further disappointed to hear from the European Parliament benches such arguments that evoke narrow national agendas, escaping from which in my opinion was the EUs greatest achievement. I have decided to bring this matter to your attention because it runs the risk of demeaning the reputation that the European Parliaments word carries in the Turkish audience.

The second point I want to draw your attention is about the references to the 1915 events in the European Parliament resolutions. In 2015, the European Parliament expressed its opinion on the 1915 events with a resolution that we strongly disagreed with its substance and its form. We disagreed with its substance because contrary to the resolution painted as, it is an ongoing historical debate. As the ECHR ruled in the *Perincek v. Switzerland*, it is still a matter within the realm of freedom of expression and thought, Armenian interpretation does not equal to the truth itself. Though ignored by MEPs at that time, alternative interpretations of the events exist and until proven otherwise by academic scholarship it has equally legitimate validity. We disagree with its form because the unilateral approach exhibited by the European Parliament was not the right attitude to broker reconciliation between two peoples. Resolutions based on one-sided narratives will not reinforce the spirit of dialogue between Turks and Armenians, which we need urgently today. And yet we have our differences of opinion, we respect the European Parliaments right to form its own opinion, but that opinion cannot be forced on Turkey.

The third point that I would like to mention is the concern raised by several MEPs regarding the

escalation of PKK terrorism and concomitant operations of security forces in Turkey. At the moment we are at a point where the security of our citizens is threatened due to escalated PKK terrorism. It should be noted that Turkey is intent on keeping the critical balance between security requirements and the need to protect the freedoms. Turkey will continue to take all necessary measures and carry out operations to make sure Turkish citizens lives are safe and secure in line with the principles of fundamental rights, freedoms and international law. In the meantime, it is only natural that we expect the support of our partners and the solidarity of our allies, by maintaining a resolute stance towards acts of terror and activities of the PKK and affiliated groups, as well as of DAESH, manifesting a uniform approach against all terrorist organizations without discrimination.

On the other hand, in some cases, we saw unfortunately that we have to deal not with concern, but with a naked expression of support for the PKK, exemplified by this irresponsible campaign of signature by certain MEPs demanding to delist the PKK from the EU list of designated terrorist groups. Let me remind you that PKK is a terrorist organization because it employs terror for its political goals, it targets civilians and non-combatants, and it does not hesitate to cause large scale destruction in any spheres of life. It was designated as terrorist organization ex post facto. No signature or resolution can wash up this fact.

Concluding my letter, I would like to reiterate my support for the Turkey-EU Agreement reached at the Summit on 18th March regarding the irregular migration at the Aegean Sea and I hope that it will help end the drama unfolded on Turkish and Greek shores. It is obvious that the cooperation between Turkey and the EU is essential to bring stability and promote peace in our region. I believe that the European Parliament is an indispensable actor in this cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Ahmet Berat ÇONKAR

Co-Chair

Mr. Guy VERHOFSTADT

President of the ALDE Group

European Parliament

7 April 2016, Ankara

Dear Chair,

I am writing to you with regard to the motion for resolution 2015/2898(RSP) on the Turkey Progress Report 2015 that has been adopted at the Foreign Affairs Committee (AFET) on 15 March 2016 and expected to be voted in the plenary session of the European Parliament on 13 April. I would like to share some of my views and concerns with you.

Each year, the European Commission publishes its Turkey Progress Report taking into account the state of play in the accession process. In turn, the European Parliament reflects its own position both regarding the report and the progress in the accession process with a resolution prepared by

the AFET.

Until recently, the reports and resolutions prepared by the rapporteurs of the European Parliament have taken up many issues within the context of Turkey-EU relations and beyond. However contentious and critical they might be, it was difficult to agree with many of conclusions and assessments in these reports, we chose to draw lessons from constructive criticisms out of the expectation that reason, not fear, would prevail in the course.

Since the beginning of the 8th European legislature, especially with the advent of the refugee crisis and worsening security in the Near East however, this phenomenon has taken to new heights, hysteria almost. The last example has been the resolution adopted in the AFET. I had the chance to observe the drafting process, beginning with the preliminary stages, debates in the committee and amendments given, and unfortunately witnessed that it was marked with blatant accusations, outright prejudices or deliberate misrepresentations towards Turkey, which leaves no space for a coolheaded exchange or an informed discussion. I have to say that I am further disappointed to hear from the European Parliament benches such arguments that evoke narrow national agendas, escaping from which in my opinion was the EUs greatest achievement. I have decided to bring this matter to your attention because it runs the risk of demeaning the reputation that the European Parliaments word carries in the Turkish audience.

The second point I want to draw your attention is about the references to the 1915 events in the European Parliament resolutions. In 2015, the European Parliament expressed its opinion on the 1915 events with a resolution that we strongly disagreed with its substance and its form. We disagreed with its substance because contrary to the resolution painted as, it is an ongoing historical debate. As the ECHR ruled in the *Perincek v. Switzerland*, it is still a matter within the realm of freedom of expression and thought, Armenian interpretation does not equal to the truth itself. Though ignored by MEPs at that time, alternative interpretations of the events exist and until proven otherwise by academic scholarship it has equally legitimate validity. We disagree with its form because the unilateral approach exhibited by the European Parliament was not the right attitude to broker reconciliation between two peoples. Resolutions based on one-sided narratives will not reinforce the spirit of dialogue between Turks and Armenians, which we need urgently today. And yet we have our differences of opinion, we respect the European Parliaments right to form its own opinion, but that opinion cannot be forced on Turkey.

The third point that I would like to mention is the concern raised by several MEPs regarding the escalation of PKK terrorism and concomitant operations of security forces in Turkey. At the moment we are at a point where the security of our citizens is threatened due to escalated PKK terrorism. It should be noted that Turkey is intent on keeping the critical balance between security requirements and the need to protect the freedoms. Turkey will continue to take all necessary measures and carry out operations to make sure Turkish citizens lives are safe and secure in line with the principles of fundamental rights, freedoms and international law. In the meantime, it is only natural that we expect the support of our partners and the solidarity of our allies, by maintaining a resolute stance towards acts of terror and activities of the PKK and affiliated groups, as well as of DAESH, manifesting a uniform approach against all terrorist organizations without discrimination.

On the other hand, in some cases, we saw unfortunately that we have to deal not with concern, but with a naked expression of support for the PKK, exemplified by this irresponsible campaign of signature by certain MEPs demanding to delist the PKK from the EU list of designated terrorist

groups. Let me remind you that PKK is a terrorist organization because it employs terror for its political goals, it targets civilians and non-combatants, and it does not hesitate to cause large scale destruction in any spheres of life. It was designated as terrorist organization ex post facto. No signature or resolution can wash up this fact.

Concluding my letter, I would like to reiterate my support for the Turkey-EU Agreement reached at the Summit on 18th March regarding the irregular migration at the Aegean Sea and I hope that it will help end the drama unfolded on Turkish and Greek shores. It is obvious that the cooperation between Turkey and the EU is essential to bring stability and promote peace in our region. I believe that the European Parliament is an indispensable actor in this cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Ahmet Berat ÇONKAR

Co-Chair

Mr. Philippe LAMBERTS

Co-President of the Greens/European Free Alliance

European Parliament

7 April 2016, Ankara

Dear Chair,

I am writing to you with regard to the motion for resolution 2015/2898(RSP) on the Turkey Progress Report 2015 that has been adopted at the Foreign Affairs Committee (AFET) on 15 March 2016 and expected to be voted in the plenary session of the European Parliament on 13 April. I would like to share some of my views and concerns with you.

Each year, the European Commission publishes its Turkey Progress Report taking into account the state of play in the accession process. In turn, the European Parliament reflects its own position both regarding the report and the progress in the accession process with a resolution prepared by the AFET.

Until recently, the reports and resolutions prepared by the rapporteurs of the European Parliament have taken up many issues within the context of Turkey-EU relations and beyond. However contentious and critical they might be, it was difficult to agree with many of conclusions and assessments in these reports, we chose to draw lessons from constructive criticisms out of the expectation that reason, not fear, would prevail in the course.

Since the beginning of the 8th European legislature, especially with the advent of the refugee crisis and worsening security in the Near East however, this phenomenon has taken to new heights, hysteria almost. The last example has been the resolution adopted in the AFET. I had the chance to observe the drafting process, beginning with the preliminary stages, debates in the committee and amendments given, and unfortunately witnessed that it was marked with blatant accusations, outright prejudices or deliberate misrepresentations towards Turkey, which leaves no space for a coolheaded exchange or an informed discussion. I have to say that I am further

disappointed to hear from the European Parliament benches such arguments that evoke narrow national agendas, escaping from which in my opinion was the EU's greatest achievement. I have decided to bring this matter to your attention because it runs the risk of demeaning the reputation that the European Parliament's word carries in the Turkish audience.

The second point I want to draw your attention to is about the references to the 1915 events in the European Parliament resolutions. In 2015, the European Parliament expressed its opinion on the 1915 events with a resolution that we strongly disagreed with its substance and its form. We disagreed with its substance because contrary to the resolution painted as, it is an ongoing historical debate. As the ECHR ruled in the *Perincek v. Switzerland*, it is still a matter within the realm of freedom of expression and thought, Armenian interpretation does not equal to the truth itself. Though ignored by MEPs at that time, alternative interpretations of the events exist and until proven otherwise by academic scholarship it has equally legitimate validity. We disagree with its form because the unilateral approach exhibited by the European Parliament was not the right attitude to broker reconciliation between two peoples. Resolutions based on one-sided narratives will not reinforce the spirit of dialogue between Turks and Armenians, which we need urgently today. And yet we have our differences of opinion, we respect the European Parliament's right to form its own opinion, but that opinion cannot be forced on Turkey.

The third point that I would like to mention is the concern raised by several MEPs regarding the escalation of PKK terrorism and concomitant operations of security forces in Turkey. At the moment we are at a point where the security of our citizens is threatened due to escalated PKK terrorism. It should be noted that Turkey is intent on keeping the critical balance between security requirements and the need to protect the freedoms. Turkey will continue to take all necessary measures and carry out operations to make sure Turkish citizens' lives are safe and secure in line with the principles of fundamental rights, freedoms and international law. In the meantime, it is only natural that we expect the support of our partners and the solidarity of our allies, by maintaining a resolute stance towards acts of terror and activities of the PKK and affiliated groups, as well as of DAESH, manifesting a uniform approach against all terrorist organizations without discrimination.

On the other hand, in some cases, we saw unfortunately that we have to deal not with concern, but with a naked expression of support for the PKK, exemplified by this irresponsible campaign of signature by certain MEPs demanding to delist the PKK from the EU list of designated terrorist groups. Let me remind you that PKK is a terrorist organization because it employs terror for its political goals, it targets civilians and non-combatants, and it does not hesitate to cause large scale destruction in any spheres of life. It was designated as terrorist organization *ex post facto*. No signature or resolution can wash up this fact.

Concluding my letter, I would like to reiterate my support for the Turkey-EU Agreement reached at the Summit on 18th March regarding the irregular migration at the Aegean Sea and I hope that it will help end the drama unfolded on Turkish and Greek shores. It is obvious that the cooperation between Turkey and the EU is essential to bring stability and promote peace in our region. I believe that the European Parliament is an indispensable actor in this cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Ahmet Berat ÇONKAR

Co-Chair

Ms. Rebecca HARMS

Co-President of The Greens/European Free Alliance

European Parliament

7 April 2016, Ankara

Dear Chair,

I am writing to you with regard to the motion for resolution 2015/2898(RSP) on the Turkey Progress Report 2015 that has been adopted at the Foreign Affairs Committee (AFET) on 15 March 2016 and expected to be voted in the plenary session of the European Parliament on 13 April. I would like to share some of my views and concerns with you.

Each year, the European Commission publishes its Turkey Progress Report taking into account the state of play in the accession process. In turn, the European Parliament reflects its own position both regarding the report and the progress in the accession process with a resolution prepared by the AFET.

Until recently, the reports and resolutions prepared by the rapporteurs of the European Parliament have taken up many issues within the context of Turkey-EU relations and beyond. However contentious and critical they might be, it was difficult to agree with many of conclusions and assessments in these reports, we chose to draw lessons from constructive criticisms out of the expectation that reason, not fear, would prevail in the course.

Since the beginning of the 8th European legislature, especially with the advent of the refugee crisis and worsening security in the Near East however, this phenomenon has taken to new heights, hysteria almost. The last example has been the resolution adopted in the AFET. I had the chance to observe the drafting process, beginning with the preliminary stages, debates in the committee and amendments given, and unfortunately witnessed that it was marked with blatant accusations, outright prejudices or deliberate misrepresentations towards Turkey, which leaves no space for a coolheaded exchange or an informed discussion. I have to say that I am further disappointed to hear from the European Parliament benches such arguments that evoke narrow national agendas, escaping from which in my opinion was the EUs greatest achievement. I have decided to bring this matter to your attention because it runs the risk of demeaning the reputation that the European Parliaments word carries in the Turkish audience.

The second point I want to draw your attention is about the references to the 1915 events in the European Parliament resolutions. In 2015, the European Parliament expressed its opinion on the 1915 events with a resolution that we strongly disagreed with its substance and its form. We disagreed with its substance because contrary to the resolution painted as, it is an ongoing historical debate. As the ECHR ruled in the *Perincek v. Switzerland*, it is still a matter within the realm of freedom of expression and thought, Armenian interpretation does not equal to the truth itself. Though ignored by MEPs at that time, alternative interpretations of the events exist and until proven otherwise by academic scholarship it has equally legitimate validity. We disagree with

its form because the unilateral approach exhibited by the European Parliament was not the right attitude to broker reconciliation between two peoples. Resolutions based on one-sided narratives will not reinforce the spirit of dialogue between Turks and Armenians, which we need urgently today. And yet we have our differences of opinion, we respect the European Parliaments right to form its own opinion, but that opinion cannot be forced on Turkey.

The third point that I would like to mention is the concern raised by several MEPs regarding the escalation of PKK terrorism and concomitant operations of security forces in Turkey. At the moment we are at a point where the security of our citizens is threatened due to escalated PKK terrorism. It should be noted that Turkey is intent on keeping the critical balance between security requirements and the need to protect the freedoms. Turkey will continue to take all necessary measures and carry out operations to make sure Turkish citizens lives are safe and secure in line with the principles of fundamental rights, freedoms and international law. In the meantime, it is only natural that we expect the support of our partners and the solidarity of our allies, by maintaining a resolute stance towards acts of terror and activities of the PKK and affiliated groups, as well as of DAESH, manifesting a uniform approach against all terrorist organizations without discrimination.

On the other hand, in some cases, we saw unfortunately that we have to deal not with concern, but with a naked expression of support for the PKK, exemplified by this irresponsible campaign of signature by certain MEPs demanding to delist the PKK from the EU list of designated terrorist groups. Let me remind you that PKK is a terrorist organization because it employs terror for its political goals, it targets civilians and non-combatants, and it does not hesitate to cause large scale destruction in any spheres of life. It was designated as terrorist organization ex post facto. No signature or resolution can wash up this fact.

Concluding my letter, I would like to reiterate my support for the Turkey-EU Agreement reached at the Summit on 18th March regarding the irregular migration at the Aegean Sea and I hope that it will help end the drama unfolded on Turkish and Greek shores. It is obvious that the cooperation between Turkey and the EU is essential to bring stability and promote peace in our region. I believe that the European Parliament is an indispensable actor in this cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Ahmet Berat ÇONKAR

Co-Chair

Taslak AP Türkiye raporu için:

www.abhaber.com/avrupa-parlamentosu-turkiye-raporu-14-nisanda-kabul-edilecek-rapor-sert-english/

Kaynak/Source: