



File
bced
Wm Kirkham W10 SLU 12:30
WMA W10N + DORWIN
via com -

5 November 1996

Dear Ken,

HUME/ADAMS INITIATIVE

We spoke following my letter of last night recording what Hume told me about what the IRA would be prepared to say in the event of a new ceasefire. The Prime Minister agrees with the view of your Ministers that the suggested IRA wording does not take us much further, and that we now need to get on with the exercise. I have therefore sent Paddy Teahon this morning the revised text we propose to send to Hume, together with a covering letter. I attach copies. I have also written to Lake to put him in the picture. Again, a copy is attached.

You will see that, as discussed on the telephone, the Prime Minister has made a couple of small changes to the text to be given to Hume, particularly in the second paragraph.

I also attach a revised draft letter to Hume from the Prime Minister, to go with the revised text. As you will see, the tone is adjusted, but not the content. I would be grateful for any rapid comments on this draft. We may of course need to look at it further, once we have the Irish reaction to our text.

We also need to have firmly in mind the requirement to keep up to date both NI and Trimble. We have undertaken to give Trimble the text before we publish anything. In my view, we will need to circulate NI colleagues as soon as we send anything to Hume. We will also need to brief Trimble shortly thereafter.

I am copying this to Jan Polley (Cabinet Office), and by fax to Sir John Kerr in Washington and Veronica Sutherland in Dublin.

JOHN HOLMES

Ken Lindsay Esq
Northern Ireland Office

CONFIDENTIAL



10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA

File

From the Private Secretary

5 November 1996

Dear Paddy,

Following our discussion last night, I attach the revised text we plan to send to John Hume and subsequently to publish. As I said, we now wish to move fast and would like to give Hume the text as soon as possible. Publication could follow shortly afterwards.

You will see that we have adjusted the text we last received from Hume in various ways to ensure it continues to reflect our policies, but have tried to keep changes to a minimum. There is a new paragraph on what would happen after a ceasefire, to replace the one discussed between us earlier. Your concerns have been taken into account. I trust you will be able to support the result.

In sending the text to John Hume, we would accompany it with a letter explaining further our position, making clear again that the timing of Sinn Fein's entry into negotiations in the event of a ceasefire is dependent on the words used and the actions which follow. We are bound to take time to evaluate any new ceasefire - paragraph 8 of the Groundrules makes that clear in any case.

You should be aware that this text is the product of much consideration here and represents just about the limits of what we are prepared to say, given our overall approach, and the present circumstances. As we discussed, the kind of words Hume has suggested might be used by the IRA/Sinn Fein in the event of a ceasefire, on the question of "permanence", do not seem to us to change the position. And there is no indication of any move forward on other issues such as parallel decommissioning or the consent principle.

Yours ever

JOHN HOLMES

Paddy Teahon, Esq.

CONFIDENTIAL

Text in response to Hume text of 10 October

This Government has made clear its approach to the search for peace in Northern Ireland on many occasions. But we continue to be asked about this or that aspect, particularly about the multi-party negotiations which started on 10 June in Belfast. There has been continued speculation about a new IRA ceasefire, despite the no-warning attack on Thiepval barracks, Lisburn and various arms finds, including the huge find in London. This has renewed questions about what effect this would have on the negotiations, and our approach to these negotiations. It may therefore be helpful to spell out our position again.

The purpose of the negotiations is to achieve a new beginning for relationships within Northern Ireland, within the island of Ireland and between the peoples of these islands. The negotiations have one overriding aim: to reach an overall political settlement, achieved through agreement and founded on consent.

They will therefore address all the issues relevant to a settlement. Inclusive in nature, they involve both the British and Irish Governments and all the relevant political parties with the necessary democratic mandate and commitment to exclusively peaceful methods.

It is important to emphasise that all parties are treated equally in the negotiations, in accordance with the scale of their democratic mandate and the need for sufficient consensus. But no one party can prevent the negotiations continuing by withdrawing from them. No party has an undemocratic advantage. Both Governments intend that the outcome of these negotiations will be submitted for democratic ratification through referendums, North and South.

The prospects for success in these negotiations will obviously be much greater if they take place in a peaceful environment. The loyalist ceasefire has made an important contribution. It made it possible for the loyalist parties to join the negotiations. They are now playing their part in shaping Northern Ireland's future, as I acknowledged when I met their leaders in July.

Under the legislation setting up the talks, if there was an unequivocal restoration of the IRA ceasefire of August 1994, Sinn Fein would be invited to nominate a team to join the negotiations.

In the light of recent events, unless there were some incontrovertible developments supporting it, a dependable judgement that any restoration was indeed genuinely unequivocal could not be formed at once. Each atrocity deepens the credibility gap which Sinn Fein must address. Much would turn on whether words, actions and all the circumstances were consistent with the declared ceasefire. For example, whether or not any paramilitary activity, including surveillance, targeting and weapons preparation, continued would be relevant. Sufficient time would be taken to ensure that a well founded judgement could be made.

Beyond the unequivocal restoration of the IRA ceasefire, the British and Irish Governments are agreed that these negotiations are without preconditions.

It is equally clear that, to be successful, the negotiations must be based on exclusively democratic and peaceful means. There must be no recourse to the threat (actual or implied) or use of violence or coercion. So, on entering the negotiations, each participant needs to make clear their total and absolute commitment to the principles of democracy and non-violence set out in the Report of the International Body chaired by Senator George Mitchell. The parties in the talks have all done just that already.

The range of issues on which an overall agreement will depend means that the negotiations will be on the basis of a comprehensive agenda. This will be adopted by agreement. Each participant will be able to raise any significant issue of concern to them, and to receive a fair hearing for those concerns, without this being subject to the veto of any other party. Any aspect can be raised, including constitutional issues and any other matter which any party considers relevant. No negotiated outcome is either predetermined or excluded in advance or limited by anything other than the need for agreement.

Among the crucial issues is decommissioning. So the opening plenary will address the International Body's proposals on decommissioning of illegal arms. In their report, the International Body said the parties should consider an approach under which some decommissioning would take place during the process of all-party negotiations. We and the Irish Government support this compromise approach. Agreement needs to be reached on how to take it forward, so that the process of decommissioning is not seen as a block to progress in the negotiations, but can be used to build confidence one step at a time during them. So both Governments have already said they will be looking for the commitment of all participants to work constructively during the negotiations to implement all aspects of the International Body's report.

It is essential that all participants negotiate in good faith, seriously address all areas of the agreed agenda and make every effort to reach a comprehensive agreement. For their part, the two Governments are committed to ensure that all items on the comprehensive agenda are fully addressed. They will do so themselves with a view to overcoming any obstacles which may arise.

For our part, we are wholly committed to upholding our responsibility to encourage, facilitate and enable agreement over a period through the negotiations.

This must be based on full respect for the rights and identities of both traditions. We want to see peace, stability and reconciliation established by agreement.

We are also determined to see these negotiations through successfully, as speedily as possible. This is in line with the hopes and aspirations of people in both the United Kingdom and the Irish Republic. These have already given momentum to a process which will always have difficulties. We will encourage the adoption by the participants of an agreed indicative timeframe for the conduct of the negotiations. We have already proposed that a plenary meeting should be held in December to take stock of progress in the negotiations as a whole. The two Governments will also review progress at regular intervals. Progress in the negotiations will be reviewed again in May 1997, before we decide whether or not to extend the forum's one-year life which expires then.

Meanwhile we are committed to raising confidence, both through the talks and through a range of other measures alongside them. The International Body's report itself proposes a process of mutual confidence-building.

So we will continue to pursue social and economic policies based on the principles of equality of opportunity, equity of treatment and parity of esteem irrespective of political, cultural or religious affiliation or gender. We support, with equal respect, the varied cultural traditions of both communities. We are also committed to developing policing arrangements so that the police service should enjoy the support of the entire community.

It is worth recalling that, in response to the ceasefires of Autumn 1994 and the changed level of threat, we undertook a series of confidence-building measures. These included changed arrangements for release of prisoners in Northern Ireland under the Northern Ireland (Remission of Sentences) Act 1995, security force

redeployment, a review of emergency legislation and others. If the threat reduces again, the opportunity for further confidence-building measures returns.

But confidence-building is a two-way street. Support for the use of violence is incompatible with participation in the democratic process. An end to punishment beatings and other paramilitary activities, including surveillance and targeting, would demonstrate real commitment to peaceful methods and help build trust.

The opportunity for progress has never been greater. The process of peace and reconciliation has received valuable economic support from the United States, the European Union and through the International Fund. The negotiations are widely supported internationally and benefit from independent chairmen from the USA, Canada and Finland. They also have the overwhelming support of the people throughout these islands. They want them to take place in a peaceful environment, free of all violence. That is our aim too.

f\text.sm

IN CONFIDENCE



10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA

From the Private Secretary

5 November 1996

Dee Tany,

NORTHERN IRELAND

You will be interested to see the attached letter I sent to Paddy Teahon this morning, covering a further text we propose to send to John Hume. We are anxious to bring this exercise to a conclusion as soon as possible, not least following the leaks over the weekend.

Hume told me yesterday that, on the question of the permanence of any new ceasefire, the IRA/Sinn Fein would probably be prepared to say that the ceasefire was unequivocal, and that they believed that the statement by the Prime Minister provided the basis for an ending to the conflict and a lasting peace. This would be helpful as far as it goes, but that is not far, frankly.

I will keep you in close touch with developments, and am meanwhile happy to discuss with you further.

Yours ever

JOHN HOLMES

The Honorable Anthony Lake

IN CONFIDENCE