



Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London SW1A 2AH

6 July 1987

Dear Charles,

CALL BY THE TURKISH FOREIGN MINISTER: 8 JULY

The Prime Minister has agreed to receive Mr Vahit Halefoglou, the Turkish Foreign Minister, at 10 am on Wednesday 8 July. Mr Halefoglou will be accompanied by the Turkish Ambassador, Rahmi Gumrukcuoglu, and by a Special Adviser at the MFA, Mr Gunden. I hope that it will be possible for Timothy Daunt, our Ambassador in Ankara, to be present.

I attach a personality note on Mr Halefoglou. He is an effective and impressive interlocutor who can be relied upon to convey back to his colleagues, including Mr Ozal, what he is told here.

The Turks attach considerable importance to official visits of this kind as an indication of their acceptability within Europe. Much will be made in the Turkish press of the reception accorded to Mr Halefoglou by the Prime Minister. Mr Halefoglou will also have two sessions of talks with the Foreign Secretary and will be calling on the Secretaries of State for Defence and Trade and Industry.

Our Aims for the Visit

Our relations with Turkey are probably as good as they have ever been. We have no serious bilateral problems or foreign policy differences. We see Mr Halefoglou's visit as an opportunity to:

- a. underline the importance we attach to Turkey as a partner and NATO ally;
- b. press for an increased share of the Turkish market and to lobby on behalf of British companies bidding for projects in Turkey;



- c. avoid any formal commitment of support for Turkish membership of the EC but to encourage the Turks, while waiting for the Commission opinion, to work for progress under the Association Agreement;
- d. acknowledge Turkey's continued progress on human rights and towards full democracy, and press for further efforts;
- e. urge flexibility and the need for progress on the Cyprus dispute;
- f. ensure continued dialogue with Greece over Aegean problems.

Bilateral Relations

The Prime Minister might like to concentrate on our bilateral relations, and in particular refer to the interest of British companies in securing a greater share of the Turkish market. The Turkish government make no secret of the fact that political considerations weigh heavily in the award of major contracts to foreign firms. In the light of the support we have given the Turks in European bodies in recent years, they now owe us a few contracts, eg GKN (armoured personnel carriers) and AMEC (Ankara natural gas project).

Turkey/EC

We would expect Mr Halefoglu to press Turkey's case for eventual membership of the EC. This should provide an opportunity for the Prime Minister to urge the Turks to maintain and build on the progress that has been made on human rights. This subject continues to attract public and parliamentary attention, particularly in the European Parliament.

Mr Halefoglu can be expected to thank the Prime Minister for the UK's help in ensuring that, despite Greek objections, the April Foreign Affairs Council referred Turkey's EC membership application to the Commission for an opinion in accordance with normal procedure. He may lobby for further UK support for Turkey's application, but is unlikely to press too hard, since the Turks accept that the Commission will need time to produce their opinion. When the Council do come to consider the Commission opinion, most member states will clearly have reservations. Turkish membership



alongside that of Greece could virtually paralyse Community decision-taking; it would open up difficult problems over freedom of movement within the Community for Turkish workers; and it would impose a heavy additional burden on the EC budget. In the circumstances, the Foreign Secretary considers that we should avoid giving any commitment to support Turkey's application.

It will be worth underlining the hard work which the UK has put into the normalisation of EC/Turkey relations over the past 18 months, especially during our Presidency, when, despite Greek objections, we held the first Association Council meeting at Ministerial level. While their membership application is being considered, we want to encourage the Turks to work with the EC to make greater use of the provisions of the existing Association Agreement. Mr Halefoglu may argue that the prospect of Customs Union offered by the Association Agreement would not be to Turkey's advantage, with none of the (mainly financial) benefits from full membership to offset the effects on the Turkish economy of European competition. But the Agreement also offers scope for industrial cooperation, investment promotion, and cooperation on research and development.

Mr Halefoglu may also ask that the UK disassociate itself from the European Parliament's recent Armenian resolution (attached) which the Turkish Government have seen as an active encouragement to terrorism (it was passed shortly before the massacre of 30 villagers by Kurdish separatists). The Prime Minister will wish to express sympathy and understanding and explain that the UK sees no sense in trying to apportion blame for the events of 1915. We recognise the progress which has been made in establishing democracy and improving human rights under the current Turkish Government and are confident that this progress will continue. But we should say that it is not our practice to comment publicly on resolutions of the European Parliament. The EP's views cannot be taken to reflect those of member states: we have not commented even on resolutions critical of us eg on Northern Ireland and Sellafield.

Visits

If Mr Halefoglu raises again the question of an invitation for the Prime Minister to visit Turkey, the Foreign Secretary hopes the Prime Minister, who would be assured of a warm welcome, might say that she hopes to be



able to take up the invitation soon. If asked about the possibility of a State Visit by President Evren, the Prime Minister could say that we will keep this very much in mind. You should know that we hope to arrange this for next year but are not yet in a position to confirm this to the Turks.

Cyprus

On Cyprus, we remain concerned at the lack of progress. We hope that once next year's Presidential elections are over, the Secretary General will be able to make progress on his initiative. Both sides will need to cooperate actively with him. It is not too early to start thinking about how to make the most of this opportunity. Mr Halefoglou may raise the FAC report on Cyprus, published on 2 July. The government will respond formally in due course. But Mr Halefoglou may seek reassurance that we shall not accept the FAC's recommendations that consideration of Turkey's EC application should be frozen until significant moves are made towards a settlement in Cyprus. The Prime Minister could say that we have no intention of establishing such a linkage, not least because progress depends as much, if not more, on the willingness of the Greek side to make concessions. But clearly member governments are bound to have the situation in Cyprus in mind when they are to consider the Commission's opinion.

Aegean

The Prime Minister might welcome the continuing dialogue between Mr Ozal and Mr Papandreou on the Greek/Turkish Aegean disputes, which began in the wake of last March's crisis.

Powell,

L Parker
c

(L Parker)
Private Secretary

C D Powell Esq
10 Downing Street

HALEFOGLU, VAHIT

Minister of Foreign Affairs

Born Antakya in 1919. Member of a very prominent Hatay family. Graduated from the Faculty of Political Sciences, Ankara University in 1942. Entered the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1943. Military service from 1944-46. Various diplomatic posts in Vienna and Moscow until from 1953-59 he was first secretary, then counsellor, then chargé d'affaires in the Turkish Embassy in London. Turkish Ambassador to Beirut (1962-65) and the Hague (1966-70). From 1970-72 he was Deputy Secretary General in charge of political affairs at the MFA. He was special escort to the Queen during her visit in 1971 and made an honorary KCVO. From 1972-82 Ambassador to Bonn, and from 1982-83 to Moscow. He was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs on the formation of the Ozal government in December 1983. He won a parliamentary seat in the September 1986 by-elections.

Halefoglou is a polite and personally charming man with a quieter, more measured style than his predecessor, Turkman. Although now also a parliamentarian he retains more the air of a diplomat. He has no power base within the Motherland Party and has not sought one. He accepted his position as Minister for Foreign Affairs more from a sense of national duty than for any other reason. Gives impression of great sincerity, particularly as regards his wish to see a real improvement in Turkey's relations with the West. At same time he is a strong defender of Turkey's policies and positions. Because of this aloof and rather detached approach to political life, there have been many rumours of his imminent dismissal but so far he has outlived them all. His expertise in foreign relations is a rare commodity for the government and although he does not always see eye to eye with Ozal, Halefoglou is thought to enjoy the support of President Evren. His family own considerable amounts of land in the Hatay and Halefoglou enjoys returning to his farm in Antakya to relax in the countryside.

He is married with two children and speaks French, English, German and Arabic.

10. Armenian question

Doc. A2-33/87

R. H. copy to PW in Armenia (2) via Mr D. Chilcott Ankara

RESOLUTION

2 other recipients of the tel of today.

*Div/L
7/6*

on a political solution to the Armenian question

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Saby and others on behalf of the Socialist Group on a political solution to the Armenian question (Doc. 2-737/84),
- having regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Kolokotronis on the Armenian question and the declaration of 24 April as Armenian Genocide Day (Doc. B 2-360/85),
- having regard to the report of the Political Affairs Committee (Doc. A 2-33/87),

A. having regard to:

- the motion for a resolution by Mr Jaquet and others on the situation of the Armenian people (Doc. 1-782/81),
- the motion for a resolution by Mrs Duport and Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group on a political solution to the Armenian question (Doc. 1-735/83), and
- the written question by Mrs Duport on the Armenian question¹,
- the resolution of the Ministers with responsibility for Cultural Affairs, meeting within the Council of 13 November 1986 on the protection of Europe's architectural heritage,² including that outside the territory of the Community,

B. convinced that recognition of the identity of the Armenian people in Turkey as an ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious minority follows on from recognition of its own history,

C. whereas the Armenian side regards these events as planned genocide within the meaning of the 1948 UN Charter,

D. whereas the Turkish State rejects the charge of genocide as unfounded,

E. whereas, to date, the Turkish Government, by refusing to recognize the genocide of 1915, continues to deprive the Armenian people of the right to their own history,

*cc. D. Lawrence, SED
A. Gillon, Research
M. Hatfull, ECDA(E)*

- F. whereas the historically proven Armenian genocide has so far neither been the object of political condemnation nor received due compensation,
- G. whereas the recognition of the Armenian genocide by Turkey must therefore be viewed as a profoundly humane act of moral rehabilitation towards the Armenians, which can only bring honour to the Turkish Government;
- H. profoundly regretting and condemning the mindless terrorism by groups of Armenians who were responsible between 1973 and 1986 for several attacks causing death or injury to innocent victims and deplored by an overwhelming majority of the Armenian people,
- I. whereas the obdurate stance of every Turkish Government towards the Armenian question has in no way helped to reduce the tension,
1. Believes that the Armenian question and the question of minorities in Turkey must be resituated within the framework of relations between Turkey and the Community; points out that democracy cannot be solidly implanted in a country unless the latter recognizes and enriches its history with its ethnic and cultural diversity;
 2. Believes that the tragic events in 1915-1917 involving the Armenians living in the territory of the Ottoman Empire constitute genocide within the meaning of the convention on the prevention and the punishment of the crime of genocide adopted by the UN General Assembly on 9 December 1948; Recognizes, however, that the present Turkey cannot be held responsible for the tragedy experienced by the Armenians of the Ottoman Empire and stresses that neither political nor legal or material claims against present-day Turkey can be derived from the recognition of this historical event as an act of genocide;
 3. Calls on the Council to obtain from the present Turkish Government an acknowledgement of the genocide perpetrated against the Armenians in 1915-1917 and promote the establishment of a political dialogue between Turkey and the representatives of the Armenians;
 4. Believes that the refusal by the present Turkish Government to acknowledge the genocide against the Armenian people committed by the Young Turk government, its reluctance to apply the principles of international law to its differences of opinion with Greece, the maintenance of Turkish occupation forces in Cyprus and the denial of the existence of the Kurdish question, together with the lack of true parliamentary democracy and the failure to respect individual and collective freedoms, in particular freedom of religion, in that country are insurmountable obstacles to consideration of the possibility of Turkey's accession to the Community;

(5)

- Conscious of those past misfortunes, supports its desire for the development of a specific identity, the securing of its minority rights and the unrestricted exercise of its people's human and civil rights as defined in the European Convention on Human Rights and its five protocols;
6. Calls for fair treatment of the Armenian minority in Turkey as regards their identity, language, religion, culture and school system, and makes an emphatic plea for improvements in the care of monuments and for the maintenance and conservation of the Armenian religious architectural heritage in Turkey and invites the Community to examine how it could make an appropriate contribution;
 7. Calls on Turkey in this connection to abide faithfully by the provisions for the protection of the non-Muslim minorities as stipulated in Articles 37 to 45 of the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne which, moreover, was signed by most Member States of the Community;
 8. Considers that the protection of monuments and the maintenance and conservation of the Armenian religious architectural heritage in Turkey must be regarded as part of a wider policy designed to preserve the cultural heritage of all civilizations which have developed over the centuries on present-day Turkish territory and, in particular, that of the Christian minorities that formed part of the Ottoman Empire;
 9. Calls therefore on the Community to extend the Association Agreement with Turkey to the cultural field so that the remains of Christian or other civilizations such as the ancient classical, Hittite, Ottoman, etc., in that country are preserved and made generally accessible;
 10. Expresses its concern at the difficulties currently being experienced by the Armenian community in Iran with respect to the Armenian language and their own education in accordance with the rules of their own religion;
 11. Condemns the violations of individual freedoms committed in the Soviet Union against the Armenian population;
 12. Condemns strongly any violence and any form of terrorism carried out by isolated groupings unrepresentative of the Armenian people, and calls for reconciliation between Armenians and Turks;
 13. Calls on the Community Member States to dedicate a day to the memory of the genocide and crimes against humanity perpetrated in the 20th century, specifically against the Armenians and Jews;
 14. Commits itself to making a substantial contribution to initiatives to encourage negotiations between the Armenian and Turkish peoples;
 15. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Commission, the European Council, the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, the EEC/Turkey Association Council and the Turkish, Iranian and Soviet Governments and the UN Secretary General;

