

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Folder Title:

Correspondence From Various Organizations re: the Northern Ireland Peace Process:
[Research by Dominic Beggan and Rathnam Indurthy] [loose]

Staff Office-Individual:

European Affairs-Norland, Richard

Original OA/ID Number:

3434

Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:	Stack:
33	6	1	2	V

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. letter	Address (Partial) (1 page)	03/20/2000	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
European Affairs (Richard Norland)
OA/Box Number: 3434

FOLDER TITLE:

Correspondence from Various Organizations re: the Northern Ireland Peace Process:
[Research by Dominic Beggan and Rathnam Indurthy] [loose]

2006-1759-F
kh946

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

March 20, 2000

Dick -

For your spare time
(& reading pleasure) . . .

James B. Steinberg
Deputy National Security Advisor
National Security Council
Washington DC

Sueha

Dear Mr. Steinberg:

Along with other concerned citizens, I have a deep desire in seeing a speedy resolution to the current crisis in Northern Ireland. My firm belief is that the Clinton administration, which has guided and promoted the peace process, can contribute greatly to the re-establishment of the power-sharing Executive by encouraging a 'Flexible Compromise Approach' by all the parties concerned in achieving a lasting peace. I am writing to you because I would like your opinion on this possible solution to the current impasse which I have briefly outlined in this letter.

As you are quite aware, the longer the Executive remains suspended, the greater the probability of its resurrection diminishes. Therefore, as the marching season is about to resume, it is imperative that a swift solution be sought in order to alleviate further division and strain on the current situation. Mr. Mandelson's hasty decision to suspend the government before thoroughly examining the last minute proposals put forward by the Irish Republican Army (IRA) has cast an ominous shadow on the proceeding which can only be lifted by entering into a compromise. It is quite understandable why Mr. Mandelson felt that he had to take such action and he has stated the blame game does not solve the problem, but unless some form of immediate action is expedited the tremendous gains achieved in the last two years could be lost and replaced with a return to the violence of the past.

A brief outline of the flexible compromise necessary would include the following:

The British Strand

Disarmament would have to be linked to demilitarization. This idea has been promoted by the Irish government, but needs to be initiated by the British government. This could be achieved by the announcement of a gradual withdrawal of army garrisons beginning with one of the most controversial sites e.g. Crossmaglen, to coincide with the handing in of paramilitary weapons. The existing disarmament deadline would have to be extended from its original May date to include the amount of days the government has been suspended.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. letter	Address (Partial) (1 page)	03/20/2000	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
European Affairs (Richard Norland)
OA/Box Number: 3434

FOLDER TITLE:

Correspondence from Various Organizations re: the Northern Ireland Peace Process:
[Research by Dominic Beggan and Rathnam Indurthy] [loose]

2006-1759-F
kh946

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

The Irish Republican Strand

On the same day the British government announces its withdrawal policy, the IRA should be encouraged to relinquish a sizable cache of weapons and explosives. Upon the receipt of such weapons, the Executive should be restored within twenty-four hours.

The Protestant Paramilitary Strand

To encourage the Protestant paramilitaries participation on the same day these groups must also relinquish a sizable cache of weapons and explosives if they wish to remain a part of the political process and also to continue to benefit from the prisoner early release program.

This flexible compromise could be a reality by May 1, 2000, while at the same time amending the Good Friday Accords to enable disarmament and demilitarization to be achieved within three months from this date.

Re-deployment of British troops could be achieved rather swiftly if necessary, but this concession by the British government is the key to moving forward the disarmament issue. In order for this to work, all sides must be willing to stand down. Then and only then can we truly say that all the weapons have been removed from Northern Irish politics. Mr. Steinberg, I believe as American citizens, that we have a mandate and an obligation to finish what we have begun. The peace process was born in Northern Ireland, but cultivated by the Clinton administration.

I have a vested interest in seeing peace come to Northern Ireland because my family and many of my good friends live there. Above all, I believe as Americans we have a duty to uphold and promote democracy in any place in the world where the majority of its citizens yearn for it.

I have enclosed some research that I have conducted on the subject. My hope is that your office will endeavor to secure peace and reconciliation in that troubled land. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,



Dominic M. Beggan



[001]

Enclosure

Explaining Why the Good Friday Accords are Likely to bring a Lasting Peace in Northern Ireland

Dominic Beggan and Rathnam Indurthy

The thirty year conflict between the Irish Catholics and Protestants that had plunged Northern Ireland into a bloody cauldron costing more than 3,600 lives finally has given way to an new era of peace in the province following the establishment of a power-sharing government in Northern Ireland between the Catholics and the Protestants on December 3, 1999. Although this power-sharing government has been temporarily suspended it is our contention that once reinstated, this new government will ultimately succeed and flourish. This article first discusses briefly the conflict and the peace process leading to the formation of a power-sharing Executive Council, and its suspension, second, it presents institutional, ideological, political (both internal and external), social and economic explanations as to why peace is likely to become a reality in the province, and finally it suggests some imperatives needed to speed up the process. Let us first briefly examine the conflict and the peace process leading to the establishment of the coalition government.

A Brief History of the Conflict and Peace Process leading to the Establishment of a Power-Sharing Government

Deaglan de Bredun, the Belfast bureau chief of *The Irish Times*, eloquently described how Northern Ireland became predominantly Protestant stating, "Invasion, conquest, settlement, plantation migration: the process by which British Irish became a fixed and immovable element of the island's population had different names at different times".¹ It is ironic that the invasion of Ireland began when an Irish chieftain, Dermott MacMurrough, invited an English King in 1172 to help him defend his lands against hostile invaders. Like an unwanted neighbor who will not leave, this English invitation turned into centuries of occupation. By the 17th century, a ruthless

English dictator, Oliver Cromwell, had made it quite clear that England would not tolerate anything but total obedience from the Irish. Ireland belonged to England and to reinforce this point, Cromwell killed thousands of Irish Catholic land owners and replaced them with English and Scottish Protestants. Successive attempts by the Irish to release themselves from this bondage were thwarted over the centuries. A decisive battle fought in 1690, the Battle of the Boyle, ultimately sealed the fate for subsequent generations and even until today still casting its dark shadow. The Catholics supported James II, while the Protestants supported King William of Orange. The subsequent victory by William of Orange is still celebrated over three hundred years later by the Protestant community on the 12th of July, which is the climax of what is referred to as the marching season or parades. These marches, which in some cases cut through the heart of Catholic areas, are still a source of bitter contention between the rival communities. Imagine the reaction felt by African-Americans if the Ku Klux Klan marched through the center of Harlem! Such is the outrage felt by Catholics who are penned in their homes by the police, while these marchers parade through their neighborhood.

By the beginning of the 1900s, the idea of giving Ireland Home Rule was building momentum in Westminster. This led to the mobilization and organization in Ireland of Nationalist and Unionist elements. After an unsuccessful uprising was carried out during the Easter week of 1916, by the pro-Catholic Irish Republican Army (IRA) in Dublin, the situation dramatically changed. What started off as an unpopular revolt turned into a Republican cause when the British government made the disastrous decision to execute the leaders of the uprising which instantly led to their immortality as martyrs for a cause. In 1921, after a civil war lasting two years, the Anglo-Irish Treaty divided the island into two separate entities. To appease both the Nationalist and Unionist demands Britain gave them a government, one in Belfast and

another in Dublin, this carving out a Catholic country called Ireland and a Protestant province called Northern Ireland. This creation of a Protestant dominated province in Northern Ireland made certain that the Catholic minority (which consisted of one-third of the population at that time) would not enjoy the rights and privileges guaranteed to an average British citizen because of religious bigotry and discrimination against them. This was not the case in Ireland as the Protestants constituted such a minute portion of the population. The British government failed in its obligation to protect this Catholic minority, which it had created and therefore was responsible for the hostile environment and inequalities which festered there ever since.

Meaningful reforms were gradually introduced in Northern Ireland in the late 1960s and early 1970s with the establishment of the Civil Rights Movement by Catholics determined to end the years of discrimination. This non-violent movement was branded, by the hard line Protestant militant groups, as being merely Nationalist Republicans with only one goal, and that was to destroy the union and replace it with a united Catholic Ireland. This type of tribal rhetoric led to sporadic violence and the rapid mobilization of paramilitary organizations in both camps.

Unable to control the spiraling situation, the British government sent British soldiers to Northern Ireland in 1969 to regain control. As the level of violence escalated, the British troops, who were originally seen by the Catholics as protectors from the rioting Protestant mobs, became the enemy as Britain imposed its own unique form of martial law in the province. Two acts by the British rejuvenated and reenergized the rebirth of the IRA, the introduction of Internment (arrest and confinement without due process), and the events which occurred on what would become known as Bloody Sunday. On Sunday January 30, 1972, fourteen unarmed civil rights marchers were murdered by British soldiers in Londonderry, which is Northern Ireland's second largest city. The soldiers said that they were fired upon and were returning fire. As the situation in the

province continued to deteriorate, the British government disbanded the government in Belfast and replaced it in July, 1972, with direct rule from London. An attempt was made the following year, (1973) by the British government to establish a power-sharing government in Belfast through the Sunningdale Agreement, but this collapsed as the hard line Protestant opposition brought the province to a stand still with a general strike, making direct rule a necessity again.

All through the 1980s, the British government, led by Conservative Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, attempted a variety of different strategies to defeat the IRA. The Conservative Party relied on the Protestant Ulster Unionist vote to maintain control in the British parliament and therefore did not want to alienate this ally by introducing legislation offensive to their tastes. The Thatcher government, at least publicly, chose to deal with the IRA militarily and not politically. A change of approach by the Conservatives occurred in 1985 when the British and Irish governments held talks and produced the Anglo-Irish Agreement. This established a joint Ministerial Conference of British and Irish Ministers. Its main function was to resolve political, security, and legal matters involving both nations and Northern Ireland. The ultimate goal of the Agreement was to establish a power-sharing government in Belfast, which would consist of all the parties to the conflict.² However, the Unionists being suspicious of any Dublin involvement in Northern Ireland adamantly opposed the Agreement. Ian Paisley, a hard line Unionist leader, and the Ulster Unionist Party saw the Agreement as a major threat to the Union and launched a massive AUlster Says No campaign across the province. As a result, the Anglo-Irish Agreement collapsed, but it nevertheless established vital links between the two governments and laid the groundwork for future talks, and the subsequent peace deal the Good Friday Accords in the late 1990s under the active role played by the Clinton administration.

The Good Friday Accords and their Implementation

The Peace Process in Northern Ireland was rejuvenated by the Clinton administration, the Blair administration, and the Ahern administration. President Clinton honored one of his pre-election campaign promises by appointing a peace envoy to Northern Ireland and by allowing Gerry Adams a visa to voice his opinion to the American people. When Clinton took office in 1992, one of his foreign policy goals was to try to resolve a settlement to the conflict in Northern Ireland. The selection for peace envoy to Northern Ireland, former Senator George Mitchell, was one of the best political judgments, which contributed to the success of the peace process. By giving the Northern Ireland situation a high priority and internationalizing the problem, the Clinton administration became the catalyst for a meaningful dialogue between the British and Irish governments and the Catholics and Protestants in the Province. By assuming this international leadership role, the United States projected its influence as a world leader in international conflict mediation. The efforts of these three governments led to the Good Friday Accords in 1998 and finally to a power sharing-government in 1999.³

By joining in this internationalization of the problem, the Blair and Ahern governments were able to see beyond their own national agendas and to champion the causes of the majority of the people in Northern Ireland. For the British this involved recognizing and politically negotiating with a known terrorist entity. This is the essence of the diplomatic process. Disputes are settled when both sides are willing to engage in a meaningful dialogue which addresses each others grievances. Unfortunately, the Spanish government and Euzkadi Ta Azkatasuna (ETA) are a prime example and a reflection of what the Northern Ireland situation resembled during the disastrous failure of diplomacy in the 1970s and 1980s. Diplomacy succeeded in the end because of the timing, a political will or desire by the people, and the emergence of dynamic, strong leadership, as demonstrated by Blair, Ahern, and Clinton who made it happen. All these factors

had to come together in order to create this recipe for peace among the combatants. Ironically, one of the external factors which contributed to the longevity of this conflict was the inability of the international community to circumvent the fundamental principles of state sovereignty and nonintervention. The vagueness of international law in suggesting situations where the international community may intervene combined with the international legal apparatus clearly favoring the sovereign state over the ethnosecessionists escalates the probability of intransigence. These pernicious flaws in the system needed to be addressed if conflict resolution efforts were to be more effective.⁴

The power-sharing government, which was created on December 3, 1999, in Belfast, Northern Ireland lasted seventy-two days before being suspended by the British government on February 11, 2000.. Protestants and Catholics for the first time in twenty-five years were members of a new power-sharing Executive. Mr. Michael McGimpsey, Northern Ireland's newest Minister of Culture, Arts, and Leisure, summed up the reality of this historic occasion by stating, "For the last 25 years it has been simple. If we didn't like a decision, we blamed the Northern Ireland Office (NIO) ministers, but from this day on if things go wrong, it will be our fault and we will pay the penalty as a collective".⁵ As noted earlier, over 3,600 have contributed to this penalty with their lives. Perhaps the people of Northern Ireland have finally found a formula for peace which both sides can accommodate, providing the suspension is temporary, and a adequate solution to the decommissioning issue can be found. Let us first briefly examine the birth of a new democratic era in the British Isles.

The British Direct Rule Devolves to Home Rule

A wave of devolution and reforms has been sweeping across the British Isles in the last year with Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland all establishing their own devolved assemblies. On December 17, 1999, a historical meeting of all the assembly heads was convened in Lancaster House in London, presided over by the Prime Minister of Britain Tony Blair and the Irish Taoiseach (President) Bertie Ahern. This first meeting of what would become known as the British Isles Council (BIC) was established to develop and enhance the idea of responsive government in the British Isles by a sharing and exchanging of ideas and philosophies. In the past many times groups have been brought together because of a crisis situation, but in this instance the BIC is a prime example of progressive reforms within a democratic context in order to engender greater responsiveness to its electorate. The devolution of direct rule to home rule in Northern Ireland became law when Queen Elizabeth formally approved the transfer of power from Westminster to Belfast after the British parliament voted by 328 to 10 in favor of a Northern Ireland Executive Government with the passage of the Northern Ireland Act of 1998, which repealed the Government of Ireland Act of 1920. The Northern Ireland Secretary, Peter Mandelson, stated, "After a quarter of a century, the curtain is coming down on direct rule and hence forward Northern Ireland's future will be decided by the consent of its people".⁶ Perhaps it could be said that Britain has found a mechanism which will allow it to gracefully reduce its responsibilities, but in this particular situation, everyone stands to gain except for those political and paramilitary extremists who may never be happy with any solution. The consensus of the people in the province was revealed in a referendum when 71.12% or 676,966 people in Northern Ireland voted yes for power sharing in 1998.⁷ Mr. Mandelson, will remain Britain's suzerain representative. He will be responsible for the security and communications of Northern Ireland. The dividing line between the role of the Executive and that of the Secretary of State will be

determined by delicate political negotiations and maneuvering in both camps. The definition of security may wear different hats. The reforming of the police force and the re-routing of hot spot parades will be issues confronting this mixture of home rule and suzerainty. This new creation planted in Northern Ireland needs time to take root, upon its reinstatement, in order to thrive and develop, and this will involve the continued efforts of the American, British, and Irish governments to remain committed to seeing the process flourish. Obviously, post conflict-peace building measures will have to be employed by all the governments involved to foster the continued growth and success of this new democracy.⁸

The Irish Government Relinquishes Suzerainty

The Irish government added momentum to the peace process by amending their constitution, specifically articles 2 and 3, which have removed their territorial claims to the province and instead concentrating on what was best for the people of Northern Ireland (See also Adams interview question 1, page 29). Henceforth, the Irish government receives marginal suzerainty privileges. Both the Irish and British governments have stated that total independence for Northern Ireland could only come about in the future at the behest of the majority of the people in the province. Northern Ireland's new Executive will enjoy a sample of home rule which will give them legislative and executive powers, which were once the domain of the NIO. The Executive will be responsible for the following six Northern Ireland government departments: education, health and social services, economic development and the environment, agriculture and finance, and personnel. However, the power-sharing Executive which was installed in December 1999, and which had aroused great hopes and dreams of a permanent peace at last among the citizens of Northern Ireland came crashing down in February 2000, when

the British government suspended it because of the noncompliance of the decommissioning by the IRA. Let us look at the issue briefly.

The Suspension of the Executive and the Prospects for its Speedy Restoration

The power-sharing government faced its toughest hurdle on February 11, 2000, when Mr. Mandelson temporarily suspended its duties due to the decommissioning impasse. Suspension was selected over the alternative option of total collapse, which may have been the case if Mr. Trimble had resigned and the UUP withdrawn from the Executive. This suspension crisis situation arose because of three major points of contention. Firstly, the decommission report filed by Mr. de Chamberlin, did not show significant movement by the IRA, in the form of actual weapons or explosives being turned in. Secondly, Mr. Trimble had placed himself and the whole peace process in a precarious situation, stating that he would resign as first minister by February 12, 2000, if significant inroads on decommissioning by the IRA had not begun. In reality, although at the time he had to do this for political survival and to get the Unionists to support the new Executive, he along with the Unionists were giving the IRA an ultimatum. Therefore, in essence, he and the Unionists were trying to dictate or control the peace process. The Good Friday Accords and subsequent agreements, have stated the deadline for decommissioning was to be May, 2000. Thirdly, the wording in the Accords states 'to decommission,' and according to the IRA, they have decommissioned, as their guns have remained silent and cease-fire holds on. The issue is one of disarmament not decommissioning. The disarmament issue poses a major internal obstacle for the IRA because of the great likelihood of radical extremist groups wanting to break away. All the indications expressed by the IRA suggest that disarmament will be a slow and tedious process, but given time, the May 2000 deadline is still well within the realms of possibility. The peace process will still remain intact as long as the Unionists remain in the

power-sharing government after this temporary setback is overcome, and the powers of the government are reinstated. In the mean time some dramatically effective shuttle diplomacy, over the next few weeks and months, will have to be exerted by all the parties involved, in order for the peace process and the power-sharing government reinstated and to survive. Although Mr. Trimble squarely places the responsibility on the IRA for this stalemate and insists that he stands behind his stance of decommissioning as a precondition to the restoration of the executive, he cannot ignore the pressure being put on him by the Clinton Administration, Prime Minister Blair and Taoiseach Ahern to find a way out, so that the Executive can be restored as soon as possible. Mr. Gerry Adams is furious with Britain's action, declaring it a negation of the democratic process. He wants the Executive restored immediately. One option being considered is to link decommissioning to the withdrawal of British troops in Northern Ireland. Therefore, the prospects of the restoration of the Executive in our view are quite sanguine. In a recent opinion poll conducted in Northern Ireland, seventy-five percent of those polled stated that the chances of peace are better now than at any other time since the beginning of the Troubles.^{8a} We present the following explanations why the Good Friday Accords will bring a lasting peace.

Some Explanations

The Institutional: Power-Sharing Government is based on the d'hondt System, No Losers All Winners

The formation of a power-sharing government is based on the d'hondt system developed by a Belgian political scientist Vincent d'hondt in the 19th Century. The selection of the electoral system used was perhaps a major component to the likely success or failure of the new Executive in Northern Ireland. The choice of a proportional system adopted had to be tailored to

the specific needs and demands of the situation. For example, Australia uses a modified version of the d'Hondt system, but opponents of the system argue that it is too complex and too time consuming. Other systems such as the Ste-Lague, used in Sweden and the Hare-Clark system used in Tasmania, suggest these systems may be fairer to smaller parties in a coalition government. This reiterates the importance of the selection of the quintessential ingredients to attain the desired outcome, namely responsive government.⁹ The d'Hondt system was chosen for the Northern Ireland situation because it forces, in the words of Dr. Sidney Elliott, a specialist on Northern Ireland who teaches at Queen's University in Belfast, "An involuntary power sharing coalition whose members have no say so in its makeup and therefore cannot easily manipulate it." This system is a power sharing method which establishes an egalitarian government where the aspirations of the majority as well as the minority are adequately addressed and represented. Dr. Elliott further notes, "that this system uses the highest average method to calculate how many seats a party should have in the executive. This system does not use a quota or formula to allocate seats. In this system each gains a number of seats related to its level of popular support, but not at the expense of other parties. It is a form of proportional representation as a built-in counterbalance to evenly distribute the representative power sharing process. Under this system the Ulster Unionist Party (UUP) being the biggest assembly party would get first pick of the ministerial portfolios followed by the Socialist Democratic Labor Party (SDLP), the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) and Sinn Fein, until all the ministerial positions were filled. In this system each party's vote total is divided by a certain amount which increases as it wins more seats. The key to this system is that as the division becomes bigger, the party's total in succeeding rounds becomes smaller, thus enabling parties with lower beginning totals to win seats. The divisor in the first round is one. Round one would give each party the

total number of seats plus one. Therefore, it encourages power sharing by negating the dominance of one party".¹⁰ This unique model of government by removing the domination of a particular dominant group will give all the parties a sense of fairness, justice and accountability. Of course like any other model one can recognize certain short comings. For example, in this mechanism of choosing the Executive Ministers, the most capable person for the position does not necessarily get the post. For instance, as the UUP won the first round they therefore get to choose any ministerial post. Subsequently, as the rounds continue one's choices become more limited, but this is a small price to pay in order to achieve the larger goal of peace.

The ten ministers on the Executive are proportionally shared by the four largest parties: the UUP, which represents the largest moderate Protestant vote, has three seats; the SDLP, which represents the largest moderate Catholic vote, has three seats; the DUP, which represents the hard line Protestant vote, has two seats; and Sinn Fein which represents the hard line Catholic vote, also has two seats. The Executive Assembly is made up of 108 members. The members were elected by proportional representation-six in each of the 18 parliamentary constituencies on June 26, 1998. The UUP won 28 seats, followed by SDLP winning 24 seats, and the DUP and Sinn Fein won 20 and 18 seats respectively. The remaining 18 seats were won by the smaller political parties.¹¹

The following matrix (Table 1) is a representation of the d'Hondt system as used in the selection of the ten ministers of the new Northern Ireland Executive Council:

The d'Hondt System
Graphical Representation of the order in which Executive Posts were selected
Table 1

Rounds	UUP	SDLP	DUP	Sinn Fein
1	28 (1st)	24	20	18
2	14	24 (2nd)	20	18
3	14	12	20 (3rd)	18
4	14	12	10	18 (4th)
5	14 (5th)	12	10	9
6	8.4	12 (6th)	10	9
7	8.4	8	10 (7th)	9
8	7	8	5	9 (8th)
9	7	8 (9th)	5	4.5
10	7 (10th)	6	5	4.5
Total seats	3	3	2	2

The First Minister in the Executive is Mr. David Trimble (UUP), the Deputy Minister is Mr. Seamus Mallon (SDLP) both of whom were elected by the Assembly on July 1st, 1998. The following are the other ministers:

- | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------|---|
| 1. Sir Reg Empey (51) | UUP | Minister for Enterprise, Trade and Investment |
| 2. Sam Foster (65) | UUP | Environmental Minister |
| 3. Michael McGimpsey (53) | UUP | Culture, Arts and Leisure Minister |
| 4. Mark Durkan (39) | SDLP | Finance and Personnel Minister |
| 5. Sean Farren (59) | SDLP | Minister for Higher Education, Further Education, Training and Employment |
| 6. Brid Rodgers (62) | SDLP | Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development |
| 7. Peter Robinson (49) | DUP | Minister of Regional Development |
| 8. Nigel Dodds (40) | DUP | Minister of Social Development |
| 9. Martin McGuinness (49) | Sinn Fein | Minister of Education |

10. Bairbre de Brun (44) Sinn Fein Minister of Health and Social Services¹²

The mean age of the ministers is fifty; therefore, most of them would have been in their impressionable twenties and thirties when Northern Ireland experienced its previous attempt at power-sharing in 1973. The SDLP and Sinn Fein seem to be more liberal in their selection of nominees by appointing two female ministers. Although all the ministers were quite heavily involved in politics prior to becoming ministers, the balance or outward appearance of their abilities seem to be quite evenly matched. There are three economic degrees, one politics degree, and one law degree represented on the Executive Council. Previous occupations of the ministers included the following: teachers, businessmen, mayors, a lawyer (barrister), a realtor, a social worker and a university lecturer. The First Minister and Deputy Minister receive salaries of just over one hundred thousand pounds each, and the 108 Assembly members receive salaries of thirty-six thousand pounds plus sixteen thousand pounds for expenses.¹³ If this Executive Council is a reflection of the new Northern Ireland, then let us hope the image they cast leads to a bright and clear future. The parties involved in this new Executive had to be willing to compromise, and in some cases, reassess their ideological stances.

The Ideologies: A Movement from Maximalist to Minimalist Positions

Northern Ireland's new Executive, as noted above, is made up of what we have referred to as a 'involuntary coalition' of opposing ideologies. The two oldest parties in this political body are at opposite ends of the political spectrum in terms of being mutually hostile towards each other. Both the UUP and Sinn Fein were political creations founded to achieve their respective diametrically opposed political objectives. For example, at the beginning of the 1900s, Britain was poised to redefine its role in Ireland. The idea of Home Rule for the island

was gaining momentum in the British Parliament. This possible outcome for the Catholics, who made up the majority of the Island's population, was the answer to a long-awaited dream. However, for the Protestants, who were in the minority, this scenario was the worst possible nightmare. This was the root cause of the ideological struggle between these religiously-based ethnic groups.

After the end of World War I and the dismantling of imperial hegemony, Home Rule was now just a matter of time in becoming a reality for Ireland. The Ulster Unionists, having become well aware of the unfolding situation, were determined to remain part of the United Kingdom and therefore, rallied to this cause. At stake for the Unionists was the very survival of their culture, heritage and way of life. The only solution the Unionist leadership saw to this impending threat was the creation of Northern Ireland. The Unionists were prepared to achieve this goal politically or by force if necessary. The Unionist politicians achieved a tremendous victory by persuading the British government to pass the Government of Ireland Act 1920 which in effect created the state of Northern Ireland consisting of six counties with a predominantly Protestant population, while granting limited independence to the remaining twenty-six counties.

Sinn Fein, representing Republican aspirations in Ireland, was totally opposed to the passage of this Act and instead of Home Rule demanded national self-determination and total independence. From its very inception, the political dye of divergent nationalistic objectives was cast on this new enclave called Northern Ireland or Ulster by its Unionist creators. The Protestants (Unionists/Loyalists), who now constituted a two-thirds majority in Northern Ireland, were committed to the political nationalist objective of retaining Northern Ireland as an integral part of the United Kingdom. The Catholic (Nationalist/Republican) minority in Northern Ireland was committed to the politically nationalistic objective of making Northern Ireland part of a

united Ireland. These divergent hostile ethnic ideologies festered and deepened between these two groups. It was primarily the social, economic and political inequalities, that produced these mutually antagonistic ideologies perpetuated by the Protestant majority on the Catholic minority.

The following brief discussion examines the ideological evolution of the four main political parties which constitute the new Executive and the Assembly: This information is primarily culled out of their official web sites.

Sinn Fein

Sinn Fein, which literally means 'We Ourselves or Ourselves Alone' in Irish Gaelic was founded in 1905 during the pre-Home Rule era in Ireland at the turn of the last century. Sometimes referred to as a Republican labor party by its leader, Gerry Adams. Its objectives include the following:

- To end the partition between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland;
- To end British rule in Ireland;
- To achieve national self-determination, and see all of Ireland as a sovereign state;
- The release of all political prisoners;
- A redistribution of wealth to all in the community; and
- The establishment of a democracy based on justice, freedom and equality.¹⁴

However, over time Sinn Fein modified its maximalist policy of struggling for a united Ireland and has evolved in order to be part of the Irish and United Kingdom governmental bodies. Hence it has not only been able to seat eighteen members in the new assembly but also gained two ministerial posts. At the same time it seems to be employing a multi-pronged diplomatic strategy to increase its political weight on the Northern Irish Executive, as well as on the Irish Parliament (Dail) and the British Parliament. Sinn Fein's wave of success can be

attributed to three main factors. Firstly, it has revised its previous stance on abstentionism in the British parliament despite winning two seats as it refused to pledge allegiance to the United Kingdom, but now that the new Executive eliminated this requirement, Sinn Fein has decided to participate in the House of Commons. Secondly, by giving birth to the peace process along with John Hume of the SDLP, as well as encouraging and promoting an end to the armed struggle of the IRA, Sinn Fein has garnished the respect of many voting nationalists north and south of the border, as well as among the British, Irish, and American governments. Sinn Fein is wasting no time in capitalizing on this public relations peace coup. Thirdly, Sinn Fein has used its political leverage by participating in the peace process, and furthermore it broadened its voter base by appealing to more potential voters in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. Sinn Fein has been able to achieve this leverage by backing away from some of its egregiously 'hard line' stances (See also Adams interview question 6, page 30).

Furthermore, the art of diplomacy is being played skillfully by Sinn Fein's politicians and its theorists in order to appeal to more voters. For example, by eschewing violence as a legitimate tool of its struggle by its (military wing), the Irish Republican Army (IRA), Sinn Fein has now moved away from its previous pernicious shadow and its association with terrorism, as it concentrates, at least for the moment, less on the Republican objective of achieving a united Ireland, and more on addressing the needs and aspirations of its voters on the Island. This has helped Sinn Fein gain political legitimacy. Its main goals have not changed, but its strategies for achieving them has. Sinn Fein hopes to achieve its long range goal of a united Ireland by strengthening its position in Belfast, Dublin and London through the democratic process.¹⁵

However, not everyone is elated with the apparent successes by Sinn Fein. The hard line Unionist members belonging to the DUP refuse to work or even acknowledge the Sinn Fein

members of the Executive although this stance defeats the whole purpose of the power sharing mechanism. Subsequently, the suspension of the power-sharing government was welcomed by the DUP, who no doubt will likely double their efforts to see its demise. Sinn Fein along with many in the nationalist community, were outraged by the decision by the British government to suspend the Executive, and will probably assume a more hard-line stance if the Unionists attempt to re-negotiate more concessions during this cryonic period. Sinn Fein has also come under attack from extreme elements within the Republican camp. Some of its radical extremist elements consider Sinn Fein's shift in ideology and strategy as a betrayal of the cause. One of these extremist groups the Continuity IRA, which has not signed on to the peace process has stated, "Those who for 30 years fought the crown forces are now paid crown agents".¹⁶

Gerry Adams has purposely chosen not to seek a position in the new Executive perhaps, because he has his eyes set on a seat in the Dail, the Irish parliament, because this would likely increase Sinn Fein's strategic power play. Sinn Fein is walking a precarious tight rope in order to expand its voter base. Sinn Fein has to soften its controversial positions on unification with Ireland without alienating its core constituency or the new prospective voters by shifting too far or too fast in one direction. How Sinn Fein manages these obstacles will however, determine the success of this multipronged approach.¹⁷

The Unionist Party

As noted earlier, the UUP headed by David Trimble was also formed in 1905 as a response to the threat to the union posed by the possibility of the British home rule act becoming a reality. The Unionists in Northern Ireland mobilized their resources in order to protect what they saw as an imminent attack on their British heritage and way of life. The UUP is the fourth largest party represented in the British Parliament and also holds a seat representing Northern

Ireland in the European Parliament. This is the largest Unionist party in the Northern Ireland Assembly holding twenty-eight seats, three Executive posts and the First Minister position. The UUP objectives include the following:

- For Northern Ireland to remain part of the union (United Kingdom) and British subjects;
- To oppose any form of republican nationalism, which it views as 'exclusive and confrontational';
- It is opposed to violence; and is
- Committed to democratic and constitutional politics for all the Protestants and Catholics in the province who want Northern Ireland to remain part of the United Kingdom.¹⁸

This party, similarly to Sinn Fein, has modified its policies. In the past, it was opposed to negotiating with Sinn Fein which it considered a terrorist group. It opposed any role for the Republic of Ireland in the domestic affairs of Northern Ireland. Even after it had agreed to negotiate with Sinn Fein initially, it linked decommissioning of the IRA's weapons as a pre-condition to sharing power with Sinn Fein (See also Adams interview, question 5, page 29). However, in the interests of peace and under political pressure from the Blair government and the Clinton administration, it modified some of its positions and formed a power-sharing government in December, 1999. Mr. Trimble has stated that he would resign as First Minister if the IRA have not begun serious efforts in decommissioning by February, 2000. Mr. Trimble's resignation was avoided by the British government suspending the power-sharing government. The IRA has appointed a go-between to begin the decommissioning but has requested two concessions one: that paramilitaries both Catholic or Protestant be allowed to keep a certain amount of handguns for personal protection and two, that IRA weapons and explosives be placed in special sealed dumps equipped with alarms linked to local police stations.¹⁹ Both of these suggestions have

been met with stiff opposition in the British parliament and in the Unionist camps, particularly the DUP. Mr. Trimble has stated that the IRA disarmament report, which became public on January 30, 2000, did not show significant progress, and therefore, the new government had to be temporarily suspended.²⁰ Mr. Trimble has backed himself into a corner and the IRA hold the key to the door, which we believe they will open by beginning the disarmament process once power is returned to the Northern Ireland Executive. The UUP is constantly under attack from the DUP. The Rev. Ian Paisley quotes a passage from the bible when he is chastising moderate Unionists, who engage in compromise with the Catholic community, referring to them as contaminated saying, "Come ye out from among the unclean and be ye separate." Such radical extremism will continue to threaten and plague the new government and ultimately the whole peace process.²¹

The Social Democratic Labor Party

Modeled after the American civil rights movement, the SDLP headed by John Hume, is the largest moderate nationalist party in Northern Ireland. It holds three seats in the new Executive, three seats in the British Parliament and one seat on the European Parliament. The SDLP disavows violence. Founded in the 1970s, it started as a civil rights movement to fight rampant inequalities imposed on the Catholic community in the areas of voting rights, housing and employment. The objectives of the SDLP are as follows:

- To establish and promote social justice, equality civil and political rights for all the people of Northern Ireland;
- To promote democracy through peaceful and non-violent means; and
- To up hold the constitutional status of Northern Ireland until the majority of the people democratically decide otherwise.²²

Unlike the above mentioned two parties, this party holds on to their principles with no changes, despite attacks by both the Republicans and the Unionists. The SDLP and its civil rights movement were seen by hard line Unionists as nationalist republicans with only one goal and that was to destroy the state of Northern Ireland and replace it with a united Irish state.²³ These national Republican inroads combined with disillusionment within the ranks of unionism had led to the creation of a new extreme hard line unionist party-the Democratic Unionist Party.

The Democratic Unionist Party

The DUP led by the Rev. Ian Paisley, was formed as a reaction to what was seen as a move towards “Liberalism and Treachery”²⁴ by the official Ulster Unionist Party. Rev. Paisley saw reforms proposed by Captain Terence O’Neill, the Unionist Prime Minister of Northern Ireland in the 1960s, as betrayal of the Unionist cause as they could only lead to the demise of the union.²⁵ Subsequently in 1971, the DUP was formed as a direct response to this “Flood of Appeasement” by the unionist politicians. A radical hard-line alternative was seen as a necessary solution to prevent the imminent decay of unionism. The objectives of the DUP include among others the following:

- To impose and maintain the rule of law in Northern Ireland;
- To promote social, economic and educational equality for all the people of Northern Ireland;
- and
- To establish a democratic government based on the Government of Ireland Act 1920.

The DUP is adamantly opposed to any changes or reforms to Northern Ireland’s security forces and the cross-border bodies which were adopted by the Good Friday Accords. Subsequently, the announcement by Mr. Mandelson, on January 19, 2000, that the government would introduce police reforms were met by stiff opposition. These reforms are based on the

findings of the Patten Commission.²⁶ The following changes will be implemented. The name of the police force will change from the Royal Ulster Constabulary to the Northern Ireland Police Force. The 13,000 strong force will be cut to 7,500 over the next ten years. Furthermore, an outside agency will be responsible for the recruit of equal numbers of Protestants and Catholics. Over 3,000 Reservists in the Royal Ulster Constabulary will be disbanded, and all police officers will have to undergo human rights training. Currently, the police force is 92 percent Protestant and therefore does not garnish the respect or trust of the Catholic community.²⁷ The DUP refuses to sit in the same room with the Sinn Fein representatives in the new Assembly, which poses a major obstacle for the new government. The DUP is of the opinion that the British government's replacement of the Government of Ireland Act 1920 by the Northern Ireland Act 1998 and the subsequent formation of the new Executive, is a smoke screen for its real intentions of a joint undertaking with the Irish government to finally create a united Ireland.²⁸ Despite this rigid stance it serves both in the Executive Council and the Assembly. The DUP will likely try to capitalize from the suspension crisis, by galvanizing Unionist opposition to the Good Friday Accords. Only time will tell if this party will go through any metamorphosis.

The Political: Internal and External Pressures on the Parties

Both Catholics and Protestants have been the victims of thirty years of mayhem. The Northern Irish population has been fed up and frustrated as the bloodshed foisted an unnerving psychological impact on them. The fragile peace and respite that came about after the parties had signed the 1994 cease-fire agreement was welcomed and wistfully longed for by all the citizens of the province. This longing eventually led to the 1998 Good Friday Accords. This break through was seen as manna from the heavens as it ushered in a movement for lasting peace.

Now that the citizens have begun to enjoy a greater degree of tranquillity and normality, they want to see this become a permanent reality in their lives. Therefore, as noted earlier through polls, the citizens consistently by an overwhelming majority not only support the peace process, but also want their political leaders to seek a compromise so to achieve a lasting peace.

Therefore, politicians are compelled to respond to the wishes of the 'citizens' as the act of ignoring them may result in their political peril. There are also constant external pressures being brought on the parties from the United States, Britain and Ireland. President Clinton and Prime Ministers Blair and Ahern invested a great deal of their time, energy, and resources in goading the parties to seek out a compromise solution to the conflict. They are not likely to let the peace process be derailed. The three leaders are united with determination and with one voice want peace to become a reality. They have a great stake in this process as they would like to be remembered with a legacy associated with bringing about peace. President Clinton is scheduled to visit Northern Ireland again in the near future. In addition, one must consider Irish Americans who account for nearly 60 million United States citizens, and Irish American politicians who constitute a powerful bloc in American politics also have a stake in fostering this peace process. They are not likely to allow the process to go down the drain.

The Social

The citizens of the province, who have been victims of this religious-based ethnic conflict, seem to have realized the futility of this narrow minded conflict when both groups are Christians worshipping the same God and believing in the same scriptures. The Unionists perhaps recognize that the church of England and the Vatican have today, come closer together as never before, as they begin to exchange priests and pulpits. They are also becoming closer theologically. Even the Vatican and the Lutheran denominations which have been doctrinally

divided for over five hundred years, have recently agreed that faith in Jesus Christ is the only source of salvation. When this is happening, one wonders how the Protestants can stick to stressing their separate identity and separateness from the Catholics when their patron England is getting closer to the Vatican. Moreover, the fact that the Catholic population is likely to overtake the Protestants sometime in the near future, this should perhaps compel them to accept the Good Friday Accords as this is a much better deal than they can hope to have when the Catholics become the majority. They will be the loser if they wreck the peace process. Little wonder that homogeneity and integration of the people is already taking place as inter-religious marriages increase and as interdenominational church services spring up and the number of integrated schools steadily increases. When one sees no conflict between Catholics and Protestants in the United States and west European states, both groups in the province may soon discover, they are better off as one people, as part of the European Union, emulating the above examples rather than divided based on religion. This religious conflict is the last vestige of the ugly past.

The Economic

The cease-fire and Good Friday Accords which ensured a degree of political stability and predictability started bringing in foreign investment into the province especially from the United States. Ireland, which has emerged as the most vibrant economy in Europe, has been already taken note of by the citizens of the province. The Catholics who have been historically deprived of economic well being, can raise their standard of living to a level with anyone in western Europe only when there is peace. It is only then that provinces like Northern Ireland can attract foreign investments on a mass scale. Little wonder that Mr. Mandelson has recently invited all those who had left the province because of the conflict to come back and help rebuild the province into a prosperous state. Therefore, peace ensures political stability, this brings in

investments and subsequently creates jobs, improves education, and social security. This is what the citizens of Northern Ireland dream about and hope for. These are the possible explanations why lasting peace will result in the new millennium.

The creation of the democratic process seems to have ushered in the beginning of the end of hundreds of years of discriminatory practices and oppression endured by the Catholics and the ensuing mistrust and tensions that indangered between the Catholics and the Protestants because of the latter's said behavior. The resolution of this conflict has brought forth a triumph for the democratic process in a meaningful realpolitik. This new realpolitik is simply 'Acceptance' by the parties to live in peace at last. America has accepted its responsibility and role as world leader in international conflict resolution; the Irish government accepted the inalienable rights of the people of Northern Ireland to decide their own future free from constitutionality claims, and the British government accepted the political fortitude and tenacity to see the process through to its conclusion and broker an agreement acceptable to the vast majority living in the province. Finally, the people of Northern Ireland accepted peace. The major paramilitaries on both sides of the political divide have confirmed a commitment to decommission, when, where and how are the only remaining points of contention, which will have to be addressed before the peace process can be complete. The rogue paramilitary splinter factions on either side, are likely to disappear with the passage of time, and hopefully increased public alienation in their communities. Perhaps, the most significant acceptance is the notion that Protestants and the Catholics are more concerned about peaceful coexistence and addressing social issues than to nationalistic claims to the land they share, but to speed up the process of realizing this reality, upon its reinstatement the Executive council, and the Executive Assembly in particular, and the citizens in general ought to consider fulfilling certain imperatives.

The Imperatives Needed to Speed up the Realization of Peace

1. The Executive Council and the Executive Assembly when reinstated must work collectively with tenacity of purpose and dedication to make laws and implement them within the mandate of the home rule to meet their citizens' aspirations and expectations in the areas of jobs, education and health so that they can gain political legitimacy and support for their leadership and institutions. They should make special efforts to attract foreign investments in order to realize the peoples' expectations in the above sited areas in a short span of time.

2. They have to facilitate and encourage the process of decommissioning-disarmament of weapons, and not allow it to remain a stumbling block to the peace process. In order to gain popular support for the Good Friday Accords, both Catholic and Protestant politicians have to redouble their efforts in speeding up the implementation of the Accords. Sinn Fein especially, has to play an active role in this area in order to gain the confidence of the Protestants. The Protestant politicians need to take upon themselves the responsibility of dissuading their followers from taking provocative parades, in order to demonstrate their bona-fide dedication that they are leaders of all the citizens.

3. All politicians should emphasize the importance of establishing an integrated school system and policing system which would encourage the sharing of beliefs, traditions and trust.

Integrated schools will help both Catholic and Protestant children not only to allay fears of each other because of interaction, but will also help them to be acculturated as one people. Parents have to play an active role in achieving this goal. This is a must to shape the destiny of the province in order to become one people in the future.

4. The government and citizens need to work together to build and encourage the development of an integrated housing system so that the barriers that separate these, particularly hard core

communities can be torn down, which would help them to discover how similar they are in their attitudes, beliefs, hopes, and dreams than they are different. Segregated school and housing systems only, as they did in the United States, contribute to mutual distrust, tensions, and hostilities.

5. Church groups, especially the Catholic hierarchy, and citizens should encourage inter-religious marriages among their people, in order to create an integrated society. This is already occurring in greater numbers in Northern Ireland, and when this happens there is very little potential for religious-based divisions and strife.

6. Finally, the government and the citizenry should openly condemn the fringe terrorist groups whose interests may not be peace but only strife and bloodshed. These groups thrive on this at the expense of others and therefore should be delegitimized by isolating them so that they may disappear on the ashes of history.

Conclusion

We have discussed the conflict and the peace process leading to the creation of power-sharing. Although temporarily in suspension, we believe direct rule from Westminster will be withdrawn and the new power-sharing Executive in Northern Ireland will ultimately succeed because the people of Northern Ireland want it to. We have offered possible explanations as to why peace is likely to become a reality. Finally, we also propose the imperatives that the government and the citizens have to initiate in order to help realize a lasting peace in Northern Ireland. When Europe is moving towards political and economic integration, the religious-based conflict in this province is not only anti-historical, and antithetical to pluralist democracies, but it is also primitive, primordial and anachronistic. Let us hope the people of Northern Ireland will learn to emulate the United States and many other countries so that the province may emerge as a

vibrant, dynamic, prosperous and an exemplary democratic province. This can happen if they put into practice the biblical injunction “Love thy neighbor as thyself.” Like the saying goes, “Where there is a will there is a way,” and if the Protestants and Catholics have the will and the vision, which they seem to have demonstrated so far, it is not unreasonable to predict a lasting peace in the province. For further discussion on the power-sharing government we recommend viewing our article, *The Conflict in Northern Ireland and the Clinton Administration’s Role*, Deaglean de Breadun’s article, *Northern Ireland: An End to the Troubles*. We highly recommend for any-one visiting Northern Ireland or doing research on the topic, to visit The LinenHall Library 17 Donegall Square North, Belfast BT1 5GD, Northern Ireland.

Notes

1. de Breadun, Deaglan. Northern Ireland: An End to the Troubles? *Current History A Journal of Contemporary World Affairs*. Vol. 98, No.627. 1999: 153-158
2. Beggan, D. Indurthy, R. The Conflict in Northern Ireland and the Clinton Administration's Role. *International Journal on World Peace*. Vol. XVI. No. 4. 1999: 4-12
3. Ibid.
4. Ganguly, R. Taras, R. *Understanding Ethnic Conflict The International Dimension*. New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc, 1998: 101-114
5. N. Ireland's Second Act, 1999-
http://www.seattletimes.com/cgi_bin/texis/web/vortex/display?storyID=3869598350&query=N.+Ireland%27s+new+government. Available online: December 20, 1999.
6. The Assembly Explained, 1999-
http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/uk_politics. Available online: December 18, 1999.
7. Elliott, S. Flackes, W.D. *Northern Ireland A Political Directory 1968-1999*. Belfast: The Blackstaff Press, 1999. 596-597
8. Ganguly, R. Taras, R. *Understanding Ethnic Conflict The International Dimension*. New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc, 1998: 101-114
- 8a. MacLeod, A. Belfast waits, impatiently, for new impasse to end . *The Christian Science Monitor*. Feb 29, 2000.
9. Electoral Change Coalition British Columbia, 1999. Elections 101 and A Survey of Election Systems-<http://ecco.bc.ca/maps/scots118.html>. Available online: December 21, 1999.
10. Elliott, S. Flackes, W.D. *Northern Ireland A Political Directory 1968-1999*. Belfast: The Blackstaff Press, 1999. 605-630
11. Bonner, K. Elliott, S. Rea, D. Special Feature: Governance, Demographic And Economic Facts And Statistics For Northern Ireland. *Outlook & Business Review*. Vol. 14.3 1999. 33-50
12. The d'hondt System Explained, 1999-
<http://www.northernirland.gov.uk/> Available online: December 22, 1999.
13. *The Economist*. Parking the Process. July 17, 1999.

14. Sinn Fein Website, 1999-
<http://www.sinnfein.ie/history> Available online: December 19,1999
15. *The Economist*. Sinn Fein's all-Ireland strategy. December 18, 1999.
16. Elgood, Giles. Northern Irish Renegades Still Hover in Shadows-
www.cnn.com/1999/WORLD/europe/bc.irishrenegades/index.html.
17. Sinn Fein Website, 1999-
<http://www.sinnfein.ie/history> Available online: December 19,1999
18. Ulster Unionist Party Website, 1999-
<http://www.uup.org/history/html>. Available online: December 19, 1999.
19. MacLeod, A. Nearing a deal on IRA arms hand over in N. Ireland. *The Christian Science Monitor*. Jan 10, 2000.
20. *The American Press*. Ulster Unionists: Belfast Government Could Be Suspended. January 23, 2000.
21. *The Economist*. Northern Ireland: Carry on Talking. October 30, 1999.
22. The Social Democratic and Labor Party Website, 1999-
<http://www.sdlp.ie/history90s.htm> Available online: December 20. 1999
23. Bartlett, Jonathan. *The Reference Shelf: Northern Ireland*. New York: The H.W. Wilson Company, 1983.
24. The Democratic Unionist Party Website, 1999-
<http://www.dup.org.uk/manifesto/> Available online: December 20, 1999.
25. Bartlett, Jonathan. *The Reference Shelf: Northern Ireland*. New York: The H.W. Wilson Company, 1983.
26. Beggan, D. Indurthy,R. The Conflict in Northern Ireland and the Clinton Administration's Role. *International Journal on World Peace*. Vol. XVI. No. 4. 1999: 18-19
27. Kelland, K. Northern Ireland Police Change Angers Unionists
www.cnn.com/2000/WORLD/europe/01/19/bc.irishpolice.reut/index.html.
28. The Democratic Unionist Party Website, 1999-
<http://www.dup.org.uk/manifesto/> Available online: December 20, 1999.
29. Adams, Gerry. Interview Belfast, Northern Ireland. Sep 2, 1999.

Interview with Gerry Adams regarding the Northern Ireland Peace Process September 2, 1999²⁹

Questions developed by Rathnam Indurthy, Ph.D. and Dominic Beggan

1. What are your views on the Republic's withdrawal of its constitutional claim to Northern Ireland?

The withdrawal of the constitutional claim by the Dublin Government is part of the balanced constitutional change which was contained in the Good Friday agreement. It is a very difficult question for many Republicans particularly for the Republicans living in the south. For people in the north it probably has less value because despite this claim the Irish government has made little or no real impact, until recent times, on the lives of ordinary citizens in the six counties. So, at a pragmatic level, and on the basis that the British Government have now changed all previous legislation and are stating that they are quite prepared to leave Ireland if a majority of people of the north decided to do so. It is as important obviously from the Irish Republic and the democratic position but they have no right to be in Ireland whatsoever and clearly the Republic and strategic and primary political objectives are around getting the people of the island the self-determination and independence, which means an end to British rule in our country, and an end to partition.

2. If you become a member of the new assembly, will you concede to the demands of the majority to remain part of the United Kingdom?

In response to question two, Sinn Fein remains deeply opposed, in fact our entire reason existence as a political party is around opposition to British involvement Irish affairs, so Sinn Fein remains deeply opposed to the union and while we do recognize the reality that a large number of people in the northern part of the island, the partitioned area, want to maintain the union, we believe that no citizen or section of citizen should have a right to a veto. So we will work to try and persuade those who want to remain part of the union that their future is best served with the rest of us on the island and with a new relationship with the British. We are seeking to persuade the British government to change its policy from its current one to one of embracing a strategy for Irish unity and independence.

3. As the leader of Sinn Fein, do you think you can get the Irish Republican Army to agree to disarmament by the terms set out by the Blair administration?

In response to question three, it isn't up to me or up to Sinn Fein to persuade the IRA to agree to disarmament in the terms set out by the Blair Administration. It's up to all parties to the agreement. To use their influence to try and bring about disarmament by all the armed groups as far as Sinn Fein is concerned this means a total demilitarization of the situation and the removal of all of the guns from Irish politics.

4. A new era of politics has developed in Northern Ireland. Do you see the utility of the continuation of the armed struggle by the IRA?

Well, as in response to question four, the peace process and the Good Friday Agreement, which is a product of that process is predicated upon three issues. One is that politics is and can be and is meant to be an instrument of change. Two, that there has to be equality within the six county area, and three, that any institution has to be part of an all Ireland interlocking and interdependent network of structures. The question of armed struggle therefore for those who espouse armed struggle can only be dealt with if we make politics work, and so far the Good Friday agreement has not been seen to work and politics have not been seen to work as an instrument of change. Sinn Fein, and I as a member of Sinn Fein, are totally wedded to peaceful democratic means in this struggle. We see the conflict resolution aspect, of the peace process which is what we are going through at the moment, as the main focus of all our efforts and we want to make sure that armed actions or armed struggle becomes a thing of the past. Of course that's a question or a challenge not so much for us but for those who have spent political careers, whether it is in church leaderships, in leadership of labor movements or political establishments or the broad media condemning armed actions instead of building an alternative to it. We now have a chance with the IRA cessation and the cessation of other paramilitary groups, to actually show that politics work. So the big challenge is to them.

5. Do you believe there were any pre-conditions regarding disarmament in the Good Friday Agreement?

Question 5, the response to question five. The disarmament, I'm not sure I understand the question. Disarmament is not a pre-condition, the only pre-condition contained for political parties or for voters in the Good Friday agreement is that the parties they vote for, receive sufficient mandate to warrant either, representation in the new Assembly or through the Assembly into the Executive and the all Ireland Ministerial Council and so on. So there isn't any pre-condition in the agreement and so therefore there isn't any pre-condition in the agreement and therefore there isn't any pre-condition. I would imagine regarding disarmament, that disarmament is a matter for the armed groups to decide. Building a real future and developing politics is basically the main matter and the challenges, as I've said before, for the political leaderships.

6. In every Compromise, concessions have to be made. What concessions do you believe your party has made in this compromise?

Answer to question 6. The concessions which Sinn Fein have made include changing our party's constitution so that we could take part in an Assembly. That part of our party's constitution has been in place since partition and this took a special Ard Fheis to change (This was a meeting of the party to vote on the issue). We also, in terms of supporting the agreement itself, campaigned for it. We reflect this change, by embracing these concepts which were totally alien to the Republican activists in the past. In terms of being all apologetically and totally committed to British withdrawal from this island, but by accepting even in the interim, as a part of transition the different concepts which are part of the agreement, this was also major concession by our party in terms of just trying to make the agreement work. The party has taken a series of initiatives in which we have stretched ourselves considerably and in which we have tried to

provide space for our opponents, on the British and Union side, so that the agreement can be advanced.

7. What has to happen for the Peace Process to move forward?

Response to question 7 If the peace process is to move forward, it has to have a political context. At the moment it doesn't have a political context. The political framework which the agreement represents has been prevented from coming into being by the Unionist stance and also by the British government, not making it absolutely clear that there is going to be changes anyway. So there needs to be in first instance a political context. Tony Blair holds the key in bringing that about. The Unionists cannot be blamed if they refuse to negotiate or if they tactically maneuver, if and when they're given space to do so. We cannot blame David Trimble, if he is availing of these opportunities, to protect as he sees it, the interest of Unionism. It is up to Mr. Blair to make it absolutely clear that these changes are coming, and that his government is going to bring them about so that the Unionists can be persuaded that the best type of change is managed change.

8. What kind of Northern Ireland would you like to see emerge five years from now?

Response to question 8. I'm not interested in Northern Ireland as a political entity at all, so I would envision five years up the road that at least we would have put the conflict behind us. If the peace process seems to work or if it may not work, let's hope we do not revisit the awfulness of the last 30 years, but God willing and with political changes on behalf of the governments and the political parties, we will see the peace process work through the conflict and will have been put behind us. We will then have the political center of gravity on this island, and being on the island, with the administration in the north interlocked and interdependent upon the all Ireland, structures, Ministerial Council and implementation bodies, and so on..... and the whole era of cooperation between both parts of the island and will begin moving I hope, to a position where a healing process can begin. But all those who have been hurt as a result of the conflict and all of the families who have had loved ones killed or seriously injured have the most difficulties to overcome. But in general the people of the island need to be part of a healing process, where we will think, I think, we will find we have more in common than has divided us in the past.

9. In your political career what achievement would you say you are most proud?

Well it's difficult for me to answer question nine. Obviously, the peace process has not delivered the peace, so I feel it's an ongoing job of what peace demands- justice and we have a long way to go before we bring that about, and also we're living in very active, dangerous and risky times. So any of the achievements that I am pleased with and proud of are much more of a localized kind. I would like to think that the role I played, in terms of the housing improvements, in West Belfast made a huge change for people in that area, where we successfully brought about the demolition of Divis (apartment complex) which was a large block of slum tenements. We achieved the same results in Spring Hill, which was another insult to ordinary people, at Moyard, Unity Flats, and in Turf Lodge. At the more local level the establishment of Feile Fleadhs, which is the largest community festival of these islands and where the people of West Belfast

and increasingly the people of Belfast celebrate our survival and our culture and our sense of what we are.

10. What reforms need to be carried out on the RUC to satisfy the needs of the Nationalist community?

In response to question ten. The people everywhere and the Nationalist people deserve a policing service. We pay taxes, we pay rates (utilities) and we want to be policed. It's totally understandable how the RUC became the armed wing of Unionism. It's totally understandable as the armed wing of Unionism, why they deemed non-Unionists or anti-Unionists to be disloyal and to be the enemy. So let's put all of that behind us. There's no longer a role, if the peace process is to work, for a force like the RUC, so therefore we need a force or more correctly a service which would be decent and which would be accountable and in control, and which people can join. Martin McGuinness was once asked, "What sort of policing force do you want?" and he said, "A policing service where young people from Crossmaglen, the Bogside, Derry, and Ballymurphy are from, and one that they could join, where they could have peer approval and support for joining."

11. Would you support Catholics joining the Police?

Would I support Catholics joining the police? It's more important that Republicans and Nationalists would be able to join a proper policing service. There is no question that any democrat could be part of the RUC. We hope that the Patten Commission, that is to be published around the..... about a week from now (September 10), that it will open up opportunities for Nationalists and Republicans to join a new policing service. This depends very much on what the Patten Commission report says on all these matters.

Dominic Beggan MA, who grew up in Northern Ireland, is a High School Social Studies teacher in the Calcasieu Parish school system Iowa, Louisiana. He plans to pursue his doctoral studies in Political Science beginning in the near future. Rathnam Indurthy Ph.D. who grew up in India, is an Associate Professor of Government at Mc Neese State University, Lake Charles, Louisiana.

Clinton Presidential Records Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a publication.

Publications have not been scanned in their entirety for the purpose of digitization. To see the full publication please search online or visit the Clinton Presidential Library's Research Room.

"The Conflict in Northern Ireland and the Clinton Administration's Role"

International Journal on World Peace, Vol. XVI, No. 4, December 1999

[pages 3-26]

THE CONFLICT IN NORTHERN IRELAND AND THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S ROLE

Dominic Beggan
and
Rathnam Indurthy

Department of Social Sciences
P.O. Box 92335
Lake Charles, LA 70609-2335
USA

Dominic Beggan, who grew up in Belfast and moved to the US at age 15, has a master's degree in political science, and is a Social Studies high school teacher in Louisiana. Rathnam Indurthy is an associate Professor of Government at McNeese State University, Lake Charles, Louisiana. He has published articles on India, Pakistan, the Persian Gulf War, and UN sanctions. This is a revised version of a paper presented at the Summer Institute for Louisiana Teachers held in Jennings, Louisiana in July, 1999. The institute was founded by the Louisiana Endowment for Humanities.

The article examines the factors leading to the 800 year conflict in Northern Ireland and the rise of terrorism in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. Second, it discusses various attempts made by the Thatcher/Major governments to help resolve the conflict and the reasons they failed. Third, it discusses the peace-making role of the Clinton Administration, which by internationalizing the situation and giving it a high priority has opened the door to a lasting peace in the Province. Peace has come about due to the emergence of strong, effective leadership in all the parties involved. The desire for peace, accompanied by a re-energized economy stimulated by considerable American investment has laid the groundwork for peaceful co-existence and has been a major boost to one of President Clinton's main foreign policy goals.

An anonymous Elizabethan author wrote, "They (the Irish) live like beasts, void of law and all good order; They were more uncivil, more uncleanly, more barbarous and more brutish in their customs and demeanor, than any other part of the world that is known. There was only one thing to do with such a people and that was to replace them with loyal settlers." The settlement of Ulster began in 1609 when King James I set aside four-fifths of the Province exclusively for the English and Scottish settlers. The Irish inhabitants were forced out, killed, or driven to the remaining one-fifth poorest land. This is how the Irish Province of Ulster came to have a Protestant majority. This is how the Troubles began (Bartlett, 1983).

To provide a context, this article will first present a brief discussion of the creation of Northern Ireland, and the ensu-