

THU 11 JUL 96 07:16

PG. 02

CONFIDENTIAL



British Embassy
Washington

9 August 1996

3100 Massachusetts Ave. N.W.
Washington D.C. 20008-3600

Telephone: (202) 588 6521

Facsimile: (202) 588 7859

John Holmes Esq
No 10 Downing Street
London
SW1

Dear John,

CALL BY LAKE: MARCHES AND SMYTH

1. Tony Lake (on his last day in the office before a holiday) telephoned today. He had two subjects:

The Derry Marches

2. Lake said that he had been in contact with Nationalists to urge restraint this weekend. He had also spoken to "people on the Hill" in this sense, and, based on the reaction he got there, told his Nationalist interlocutors that his views represented those of "Irish America". We discussed the present situation in familiar terms. I said that it was a great pity that the Nationalists now planned a march; there was no precedent for this.

Smyth

3. Lake prefaced his remarks by emphasising that the decision on extradition was for Christopher. The White House was not bringing pressure to bear. (His subsequent comments belied this.) Lake thought that Christopher would take his decision before long; the domestic political schedule pointed in this direction. If and when Christopher authorised extradition, the Administration hoped that we would consider credit for time served in US jails, both in Smyth's and in other cases. Such a move by HMG would have the objective of either "encouraging or rewarding" new confidence-building measures in the peace process. I said that we had previously emphasised to the White House the unacceptability of linkage between Smyth's extradition and the peace process. We regarded Smyth's extradition as a matter of legal process pure and simple. I hoped Lake was not suggesting otherwise. Lake said there was no linkage

CONFIDENTIAL

THU 11 JUL 96 07:17

FG.03

CONFIDENTIAL



with the extradition decision. But, once it had been taken, the Administration hoped that we would look at the issue of time served by extraditees in American jails.

4. I subsequently spoke to Mary Ann Peters (NSC). It became clear that Lake's reference to new confidence-building measures was intended as a code phrase for an IRA ceasefire and that the Americans intended to comment publicly in the sense trailed by Lake. I said that this was unacceptable. Both we and the Administration regarded the IRA's breaking of the ceasefire as unjustified. There could be no question of either rewarding its re-establishment or of offering something on extradited prisoners (a matter which was, in any case, for the parole board) as a carrot for renewal. Peters retreated. There was, as Lake had said, no question of making extradition conditional; nor would there be any request to HMG after extradition had taken place. However, the Mitchell report had addressed the issue of prisoners in the context of the peace process. A reference to time served by IRA prisoners in the United States ought, therefore, to be acceptable in that context. Perhaps the Administration could say, when the extradition is announced, that they hoped future developments in the peace process would allow HMG to look at this.

5. I recounted the position on Smyth's prison sentence. Peters repeated that there was no question of the Administration making a specific request in connection with Smyth's prison term. They envisaged a general comment on future possibilities. She asked whether Smyth was likely to be charged in connection with the Maze break-out. Finally, she said that she expected Christopher to take a decision when he returned from his visit to Bosnia, probably on 16 August.

Comment

6. Smyth's extradition will inevitably attract publicity here. Administration spokesmen are bound to comment. Hence this (unacceptable) Lake idea. Peters retreated a good deal; we can hardly object to them saying that the Administration hope that, in the context of the peace process and the implementation of the Mitchell report, HMG would consider taking into account time spent in American jails in determining remission policy for IRA prisoners. On the other hand, it is not an area in which we can get into negotiation with the Americans, given the risk of the Americans suggesting that the language they eventually use had our approval. But I can readily speak again to Mary Ann Peters (or Nancy Soderberg if she is back from South America

CONFIDENTIAL

THU 11 JUL 96 07:18

PG.04

CONFIDENTIAL



next week). Let me know if you would like to do so early next week, given the likely timetable for Christopher's decision. Seen from here, the essential point is that any request to us to look at this issue should be made in the context of progress in the peace process, not of a renewed ceasefire disguised as confidence-building measures.

It will be one of the items
looked at in the all-party
talks.

Yvonne Ever.

David S

David Logan
Chargé d'Affaires

REPUBLICAN PARTY PLATFORM: IRELAND

1. In my letter of 7 August, I reported the latest version of the Republican Platform language on Ireland.

cc: Martin Howard Esq, PS/SOSNI
Donald Lamont Esq, Head/RID, FCO
Jonathan Stephens Esq, TPL, NIO

of drafting the foreign policy
from San Diego. She
on all inclusive talks
Once alerted, she had
been a mistake. She (almost) apologized. She had
arranged for a sole delegate at the full Committee to propose a
qualification "she reject violence". She argued that the change
was helpful.

2. On 26.8.96, Baratta said there was "little or no scope" for
change. The full Committee had voted; to remove debate on this
(relatively innocuous) area would invite others to target
hard-war language in such more controversial areas. She said
the two (stacked up by Gilman, King and the National Assembly
of Irish-American Republicans) thought that Baratta was a woman
for the party. Irish America had been shocked by Gilman's
of the Foreign Operations Authorization Act in which
Baratta's language had been lost. So the Committee had been
prevented that there was electoral mileage (perhaps in the
states such as Pennsylvania, Illinois and Wisconsin) in support
the change in principle. That said, the vote was not being
available to the drafters; to "encourage" private legislation
"consistent with" the principles; is no requirement and no
support for legislation.

CONFIDENTIAL