

NATIONAL ARCHIVES

IRELAND



Reference Code: 2006/133/435

Title: Briefing material in relation to Northern Ireland for visit by Taoiseach, Liam Cosgrave, TD, to the United States of America, 16-22 March 1976, referring to such matters as US and Irish American public opinion on Northern Ireland, the US Government's position and that of Congress on Northern Ireland, the Presidential campaign, the Irish Northern Aid Committee, the Irish National Caucus, other IRA (Provisional of Official) support groups, legitimate fund-raising groups, personalities and likely questions and suggested answers

Creation Date(s): February 1976

Extent and medium: 64 pages

Creator(s): Department of the Taoiseach

Access Conditions: Open

Copyright: National Archives, Ireland. May only be reproduced with the written permission of the Director of the National Archives.

VISIT OF TAOISEACH TO THE UNITED STATES

16-22 MARCH 1976

BRIEFING MATERIAL

THE UNITED STATES AND NORTHERN IRELAND

THE UNITED STATES AND NORTHERN IRELAND

CONTENTS

- | | |
|------------|---|
| PAPER NO.1 | U.S. PUBLIC OPINION AND NORTHERN IRELAND |
| 2 | IRISH AMERICAN OPINION |
| 3 | U.S. GOVERNMENT POSITION |
| 4 | U.S. CONGRESS |
| 5. | PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN |
| 6. | IRISH NORTHERN AID COMMITTEE |
| 7. | IRISH NATIONAL CAUCUS |
| 8. | OTHER IRA (PROVISIONAL OR OFFICIAL) SUPPORT
GROUPS |
| 9. | LEGITIMATE HUMANITARIAN FUND-RAISING GROUPS |
| 10. | PERSONALITIES |
| 11. | LIKELY QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTED ANSWERS |

United States Public Opinion and Northern Ireland

1. This note presumes to summarise some background considerations arising from the impact on U.S. public opinion of recent or possible future developments in Northern Ireland.

Looking at general public opinion in terms of both mass media coverage and impressions gained in conversation with editors, columnists and other opinion-makers in this category, the following would seem to be the salient features of the present situation from our viewpoint.

2. A basic and deepening pessimism about the future of Northern Ireland and, in a few cases, Ireland as a whole. Scenarios of doomsday, in some cases encompassing the Republic, are continuously canvassed in public and privately by newsmen who tend to see no non-violent solution on the horizon and increasingly to suspect the credibility and, in some instances, the relevance of the British commitment to remain in the North.

Coverage of events in Northern Ireland continues to consist mainly of reports of atrocities but editors regard such stories as being so commonplace at this stage that only the more horrific cases are featured. Atrocities in Britain, however, continue to be more prominently noticed, principally because the major U.S. networks and newspapers cover Irish affairs from a London base.

3. On the other hand, the extraordinary and sustained conversion of Mr. Craig to an acceptance of a measure of partnership in Government with the SDLP has been followed with fascination by a small number of well-informed newsmen and has been reported in outline in the quality press.
4. The role of the Republic. The editorialists of the

Public Opinion

quality press and the networks, on the one hand, universally appreciate the concern and good-will of Dublin and Dublin's efforts to contain and harass the Provisionals have been extensively reported particularly in the quality press. On the other hand, informed U.S. observers generally feel and have occasionally publicly asserted that our role is limited mainly by our military limitations but also by a growing reluctance among politicians and the public to undertake an overt role in Northern Ireland even in the event of a catastrophic breakdown in civic order. Remarks by the Minister for Defence in the course of a radio interview that we would in no event other than that of a natural catastrophe intervene actively in Northern Ireland were widely reported in the U.S. and this question will no doubt be raised by editors in discussion with the Taoiseach during his visit if an opportunity for such discussions develops.

5. Two events in the recent past reinforced the understanding of mass media editors of the forthright opposition of the Irish Government to the Provisionals. They were the handling of the Harrema kidnapping which was widely covered and for which the Gardai and the Defence Forces were highly praised for their management of the affair. The other event was, of course, the burial of Mr. Frank Stagg which was also widely reported. Some television news coverage of the fracas in Leigue Cemetery on Sunday, February 22, was somewhat unflattering to the Gardai but on the whole the mass media expressed understanding of the obligation of the Government to take the action it did. The incident served to remove dramatically any residual confusion there may have been on the part of mass media editors and, one can confidently presume, of a large section of the public about the

relationship between the Irish Government and the Republic of Ireland on the one hand and the Provisional IRA on the other. This incident also, of course, inflamed extreme nationalist elements in the Irish American community (see Paper No. 2).

6. Over the past three months the mass media have given an extraordinary amount of attention to allegations that Irish Americans are raising funds for the purchase of weapons to be used by Provisional IRA in Northern Ireland. Six leading newspapers (THE NEW YORK TIMES, THE WASHINGTON POST, BALTIMORE SUN, CHICAGO TRIBUNE, THE LOS ANGELES TIMES and THE PHILADELPHIA ENQUIRER) carried lengthy indepth investigations of these allegations. One of the nationwide television networks, ABC, carried a two-part investigation of the matter on its evening news broadcasts. The allegations were also examined in separate interviews in January with Mr. Stanley Orme and Mr. Paul O'Dwyer on the TODAY Show which is also broadcasted nationwide by the NBC network. The third and most powerful television commerical network, CBS, has conducted an investigation in Ireland, Britain and the United States for broadcasting on its evening news (which has the largest share of the nation's television news audience) during the next two weeks and which includes an interview with the Minister for Justice, Mr. Cooney. All in all, this has become a major news story and, as most reports have highlighted condemnations of Provisional IRA link fund-raising by Irish Government Ministers (including the former Taoiseach, Mr. Lynch during his term of office), it is likely to be ^{the} /question which American newsmen will wish to probe in greatest depth with the Taoiseach, if they have an opportunity.

of gun-running

The mass media investigations/which have either been

published or broadcasted to-date are agreed that while there is no substantial evidence linking fund-raising by groups such as NORAID (see Paper No. 5) - that is, while no weapons of U.S. origin seized in Ireland have been connected directly to dollars raised publicly in the U.S. by NORAID - there is no doubt that NORAID supports the cause and the campaign of violence of the Provisionals and there are serious circumstantial grounds to doubt the claims of some NORAID spokesmen (contradicted at least in part by others - see Paper No. 6) that NORAID funds are spent in Northern Ireland on humanitarian purposes alone.

7. ^{that,} It seems worth mentioning /as throughout the western world, there is considerable concern in the U.S. at all levels of public opinion about the problem of terrorism. It has been intensified by terrorism at home, particularly the bombing of the Fraunces Tavern in New York City last year by extremist Puerto Rican nationalists which caused ten deaths, the explosion at New York City's LaGuardia Airport in December 1975 (caused apparently by a demented person) causing thirteen deaths, as well as the violence being investigated in the highly publicised trial of Miss Patty Hearst. Most journals of news and opinion (e.g. TIME, NEWSWEEK, HARPER'S WEEKLY, ATLANTIC MONTHLY, NEW REPUBLIC, etc.) have carried continuing coverage of the debate on how to prevent acts of terrorism and the debate itself has helped to generate considerable public rejection of all terrorism and particularly random bombings. This general climate of opinion in the U.S. should prove a helpful factor in the background of the Taoiseach's visit and there is evidence that it has affected, to some extent at least, those minority circles of opinion in the Irish American community who have to-date taken an uncritical view of the Provisionals' campaign of violence.

Northern Ireland and Irish American Opinion

1. Americans of Irish descent number at least 13 millions, judging by U.S. census reports. The number is in fact probably much greater, possibly approaching 20 millions at least. The overwhelming majority of these people have little interest in the Northern Ireland problem and indeed some only show an awareness of their Irish descent on occasions like St. Patrick's Day.

There is, however, a very small element in the Irish American community who actively and continually engage in activities or organisations of a consciously Irish nature. For the most part they are Irish born or have Irish parents. In numbers, at a guess, they are unlikely to come to more than 100,000. Indeed with the radical decline of Irish immigration to the U.S., the numbers involved in this category are dropping seriously and their average age has risen considerably in recent years. It is in this group, however, that support for the Provisional IRA exists most strongly, to the point where it has created a serious problem both in terms of our Northern Ireland policy and our relations with this category of Irish Americans. On the one hand the Provisional IRA look to these Irish Americans for moral and financial support as well as weapons. On the other hand Irish Americans in this group (that is, those who belong to and actively engage in Irish organisations such as the AOH, the United Irish Counties, the Emerald Societies, etc.) are almost the only category of Irish Americans who continually parade themselves as such and, to that extent, vociferous support on their part for violence in Ireland can be and has been confused by American politicians and the public generally

as representative of an enormous Irish American constituency and/or of the feelings of the Irish in Ireland. (As remarked in the previous paper -- see para.5 - the position of the Irish Government has been greatly clarified by widespread news coverage of the Harrema and Stagg affairs).

2. If one may use the term "the Irish American Community" ^{this} in / restricted sense to signify the tiny minority of Irish Americans referred to above, it is true that the community has shown a good deal of concern with the situation in Northern Ireland particularly since 1972 and that this concern has been exploited quite successfully by the Provisionals and their U.S. front organisations, the Irish Northern Aid Committee (NORAID) and the Irish National Caucus (See Papers Nos. 6 and 7). Members of the community have in general a strong emotional attachment to Ireland and have demonstrated considerable loyalty to their country of origin especially as tourists. (It is the opinion of the Aer Lingus management in New York that they comprise a crucial proportion of transatlantic passengers to Ireland). Their loyalty does not, however, and never has, extended to Irish institutions of Government especially so far as the issue of Irish nationalism is concerned. It is not in most cases a question of active hostility to the Irish Government (although, in the case of many members of NORAID who emigrated after the Civil War or during the early thirties, it is), rather of an abiding Irish American tradition of hating Britain and of seeing in her the malevolent cause of their own or their parents' emigration. Violence in Northern Ireland which is seen to involve two protagonists only, i.e. Provisional IRA idealists and British Army thugs, is explained in terms of this tradition. Attempts, however rational or courteous, to debunk this myth are seen as attacks on Irish American values and as such on the community itself.

The myth is prized for its emotional rather than intellectual value and rational argument especially from a viewpoint which is not hostile to Britain seems only to consolidate its hold on the Irish-American imagination. For example, in the past three years few ^{speeches} / delivered in the U.S. by Irish Government Ministers which included a specific request not to support the Provisionals or NORAID or a specific condemnation of the Provisionals or NORAID were reported by the Irish-American media (press, radio or cable t.v.). The same applies to similar appeals from such persons as Bishop Daly of Derry. Furthermore, Irish-American spokesmen have frequently told consular officers that overt condemnation of NORAID is counter-productive, only drawing attention to NORAID and provoking Irish-Americans, who easily smart under criticism, into supporting that organisation. Semi-State bodies in frequent contact with the community at grass-roots level, Aer Lingus, Bord Failte and CIE, also report that statements by members of the Irish Government addressed to the community and critical of the Provisionals or NORAID cause resentment and are, if anything, counter-productive. Paul O'Dwyer, born in Mayo and now the President of the City Council of New York, a prominent NORAID supporter, is quoted in the Irish Times of 25 March 1975 as stating that on account of this resentment "the rift between Irish and Irish-Americans is becoming wider every week".

3. It would seem that in our relations with the Irish-American community, we should strive to promote the following objectives:

- (a) To minimise the damage that Irish-Americans do in the Northern Ireland situation, i.e. reduce the flow of funds to and the level of support for the Provisionals.

- (b) At the same time to promote good relations based on mutual respect with the community.

These two objectives are not necessarily mutually exclusive but they can only be achieved by taking account of the community's sensitivities and prejudices. It is more difficult in dealing with Irish-Americans to win results than arguments.

- 4. The Irish-American community exemplifies many of the attitudes and problems of an emigre community in the U.S.: many of its members (i.e. those who qualify under the definition suggested at the outset) feel socially and culturally insecure and yet they share a strong sense of their own history based on grievances, lost opportunities and hard-won achievements. To the present Government of their country of origin their attitude might be rationalised in these terms: "We owe you nothing. You could not even provide us with a job." They like, moreover, to affect an attitude of superiority in some matters to people "at home" and it irks many of them to hear of Irish economic development because that suggests that the personal and cultural sacrifice of emigration was pointless. Many of the Irish-born working-class emigrants feel that Irish State and semi-State activities in the U.S. are geared only to the white-collar middle-class Irish from whom they feel deeply separated and this carries over into their attitude to visiting Ministers who, they feel, shun them or despise them.

They tend to cling closely to a familiar system of historic myths of British repression and Irish failure which provides them with a history, an identity and a cause. Northern Ireland provides a heady focus for all of this. As rationalised by Paul O'Dwyer in the Irish Times interview referred to above, they see the Republic, its Government and to a lesser extent its people, as having betrayed their cause and as such they are not disposed to accept a didactic and prescriptive message from Dublin as to whom they should endorse or support.

5. It is suggested that our message on Northern Ireland to Irish Americans should, as far as possible, harness their assumptions and appeal to their concerns. That is not to say that we should not, for example, condemn the Provisionals but the emphasis of our message should be on other more positive and if possible more congenial (to them) aspects of the problem. There are in fact two aspects of the situation which are appropriate in this sense, i.e. (i) our concern for the survival of the exposed Catholic minority to which we might link the necessity of a continued British presence and (ii) the need for reconciliation between the communities in the North and the corresponding need for funds to promote projects in the reconciliation field. We should also if possible express an aspiration for long-term unity. This could be phrased in terms of reconciliation and the need for an end to violence.
6. There is moreover little doubt that Irish Americans (especially those in this category) like to be congratulated on their achievements in this country and to be told of the inspiration their success provides to those at home to solve their problems openly, democratically and rationally.

This could be tied in with our message about the survival of democratic institutions in Ireland and respect for the rule of law.

Recent Developments

7. The following events of the relatively recent past had considerable impact on Irish American opinion and they are still probably sufficiently alive to arise in discussions which the Taoiseach might have with the members of the community:

- a). A statement of the Minister for Defence, Mr. Donegan, last year was reported in the U.S. as amounting to a categorical rejection of the possibility under any circumstances that the Irish Army would intervene in Northern Ireland to save the minority community from destruction (a transcript of the Minister's ^{showed} remarks that he did not say this in fact but was careful to hedge on the question). Some Irish American spokesmen e.g. Paul O'Dwyer have stated that this reported assertion was tantamount to an abdication by the Irish Government of its right to have a say in the affairs of Northern Ireland and its corresponding right to advise Irish Americans on their attitude to the Northern problem.
- b) The Provisionals' campaign of random bombings of London restaurants, the near escape of Caroline Kennedy from destruction when Mr. Hugh Frazer's car was bombed in London and, more recently, the sectarian murders of Protestants and particularly the Bessbrook killing, not alone appalled American public opinion generally (including the overwhelming majority of Irish Americans), but had a noticeable affect on the ^{limited} category of the community who are of concern to us. The ^{which} leading ethnic newspaper, THE IRISH ECHO, had hitherto

7. b) cont'd

been at best ambivalent in its attitude to the Provisionals, condemn^{ed}/ their campaign of violence in forthright terms several times during the past year.

- c) The Minister for Foreign Affairs addressed a public meeting on the Northern Ireland problem at the Biltmore Hotel on October 1, 1975. Members of NORAID carried out organised heckling to an almost deafening pitch so that many in the audience missed a good deal of the Minister's statement. The Minister took questions afterwards but the hecklers heckled even their own supporters when they asked questions, again to the point where the exchanges were lost to many in the hall. Nevertheless our Consulate General in New York received many letters and telephone calls afterwards as well as personal approaches from acquaintances in the Irish American community to the effect that, while they (the correspondents, callers, etc.) did not necessarily agree with the Minister's position, they were outraged by the refusal of NORAID supporters to give him a hearing. A similar meeting took place in Chicago and, although heckling was considerable it was less intense and sustained than in New York. Again, however, the Minister's candour and willingness to engage in a public discussion was commented on favourably by many afterwards.
- d) The Government's intervention in the burial arrangements for the late Frank Stagg, while it was generally understood by the American public (as reflected in the mass media) was undoubtedly the cause of considerable emotional resentment by many Irish Americans including some who are not committed to the Provisionals.

NORAIID organised a picket at the Irish Consulate in New York and Irish offices throughout the U.S. received a number of telephone calls condemning the Government's actions. Although most of the calls were clearly primed by NORAIID, some callers were genuinely distressed by the situation.

The perception by concerned nationalists at the Stagg funeral, not alone created an atmosphere of hostility towards Dublin in those limited circles which will almost certainly affect the Taoiseach's visit, but has provided an opportunity for NORAIID to arouse emotions and increase support for its cause.

- e. During the past three months, British political leaders have been quoted frequently in the press and interviewed on television on the question of Irish American support for the Provisionals. Mr. Wilson, Mr. Rees and Mr. Orme have all condemned such Irish American support and have all invoked speeches made by Irish Ministers in a similar vein in the past. The high point of these activities was Mr. Wilson's speech in London on 17 December 1975 to the Association of American Correspondents in the course of which he accused Irish Americans of "drowning the shamrock in blood". He also distinguished between the patriots of 1916 and the "killers" of today's IRA. Such language proved quite provocative to Irish Americans in the category of concern to us. Newspapers which published Mr. Wilson's speech received letters in which the public were reminded that the men of 1916/^{were described} by the contemporary British Government as "killers". It appears that Mr. Wilson's speech had the effect of increasing the demand for places at the NORAIID annual dinner which was held shortly afterwards in New York. The affair was sold out and a number of quite different sources

informed our offices that NORAIID had previously been having difficulty in selling tickets. An Embassy official saw a personal letter from Mr. Paul O'Dwyer to a friend in which Mr. O'Dwyer said that he had decided not to attend the function in view of the London bombings, but that Mr. Wilson's speech "left me no choice".

It is understood that there was agreement at a meeting between Mr. Rees and the Minister for Foreign Affairs in early November 1975 that British leaders would not mount attacks on Irish Americans recognising that this was counterproductive. Unfortunately the affect of Wilson's speech and the intervention of his colleagues has not fully died down. It can be predicted that the Taoiseach, in the course of his visit, will be described by hostile elements as "Wilson's lackey", etc.

28.2.1976

United States Government Position on Northern Ireland

1. The U.S. Government has followed the situation in Northern Ireland closely through the State Department and its Embassies in Dublin and London and Consulate in Belfast.
2. In early 1972, the then Minister for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Patrick Hillery, appealed to the U.S. Secretary of State to use his good offices with the British authorities to improve their security polic^{ies} in Northern Ireland. Mr. Rogers agreed to consult the British authorities but would not agree that the U.S. should play a prominent role in the situation.
3. A quotation from a letter from Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Robert McCloskey, writing on behalf of Secretary Kissinger, to Congressman Lester Wolff, dated September 12, 1975, summed up very well the public position of the U.S. Government:-

"We completely understand and indeed share your concern about the tragic situation in Northern Ireland. As a nation, the United States has close ties of friendship and kinship to all those involved - Irish, British and the people of Ulster alike. Therefore, we have offered and will continue to offer moral support and encouragement to all those of good will among the parties directly concerned who are working to break the vicious circles of violence and to build a peaceful, just society in that area.

At the same time, the policy of the United States Government has long been and remains one of specifically avoiding direct involvement in Northern Ireland, since we do not believe that any such unsolicited involvement would serve a useful purpose. In our judgment, a solution to this centuries-old dispute can come about only through the efforts of the parties directly concerned. Inasmuch as those

parties are now engaged in delicate and difficult negotiations, we believe that outside efforts at this stage would be particularly inopportune and could have an unfavourable impact on the negotiations.

If all the parties directly concerned were to conclude that the United States Government could play a useful role, we would naturally consider what we might do to be helpful. To date, however, none of the parties concerned has requested that the United States take any active part in this matter. In the absence of requests from all parties, the Department is convinced that U.S. intervention would be both inappropriate and counterproductive."

4. Privately, the State Department has consulted the Irish Embassy on a number of points including pressure from a small number of Congressmen for Congressional Hearings on Northern Ireland which would probably turn out to be a Provisional IRA propaganda exercise if it took place (see Paper No. 4).

5. The U.S. authorities at federal, state and city level have investigated many cases of gun-running and have prosecuted in 13 cases. Our understanding is that these cases were for the most part instituted on the basis of weapons seized in Northern Ireland, the numbers of which were traced back by the U.S. police authorities to gun dealers and their customers in the U.S. The Irish police authorities have also cooperated e.g. the case in Cobh in 1971 were traced back to a New York gun dealer and a prominent member of NORCID, Jim O'Gara. (See paper no. 6 under Gun-running and also U.S. weapons control, etc., Appendix 111).

6. The State Department have refused entry visas to the U.S. to a number of prominent spokesmen for the IRA, e.g. Joe Cahill, Ruairi O Bradaigh and Seamus Loughran. In the cases of Cahill and O Bradaigh, visas were refused because of convictions against them of murder and attempted murder. In the case of Loughran, the grounds given were that he was advocating the overthrow of a friendly government. Our understanding is that the British authorities advocated the refusal of visas in these cases.

N.B.

The U.S. Embassy in Dublin consulted the Department of Foreign Affairs on the issue of particular visas. The Department briefed the Embassy on the persons concerned but refused to advise the Embassy on the issue of visas to them. The U.S. Embassy issued two statements to the effect that the Irish authorities had not in fact intervened with them on the question of visas.

28:2.1976

United States Congress and Northern Ireland

1. Congressional Hearings on Northern Ireland were held from February 28 to March 1, 1972 in a Sub-Committee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (as it was then called) of the House of Representatives. Testimony was heard from a number of American figures including Senator Kennedy and five members of the House of Representatives (including the then Congressman Hugh Carey, now Governor of New York State), also from a representative of the Irish Northern Aid Committee, Mr. Thomas Enright who in the course of his testimony admitted that NORaid funds could have been spent on weapons. Irish based witnesses included:-

Austin Curry, M.P.,

Michael Canavan (later a Member of the Northern Ireland Assembly and Convention representing Derry),
Fr. Denis Faul,

Anthony Hederman, S.C. (who spoke for the Government position), and

Mr. Bill Henderson, publisher of the BELFAST NEWSLETTER (who spoke for the Unionist position).

2. The title of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs was changed in 1975 to "Committee on International Relations" and the Sub-Committee on Europe, under whose aegis the 1972 Hearings had been held, became "The Sub-Committee on Future Foreign Policy" under the Chairmanship of Congressman Lester Wolff of New York.

Congressman Wolff has no Irish connections himself but for constituency reasons, in an attempt to establish an Irish "profile", has allowed himself for the past three years at least to be used by the Provisionals both in the U.S. and Ireland. He visited Ireland twice under

4
Congress

Provisional auspices most recently in November 1974 and, since taking up his new position as Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Future Foreign Policy, has been attempting to arrange Congressional Hearings on Northern Ireland. To do so he would need the approval in practice of the Chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, Congressman Morgan. So far, Congressman Morgan, under State Department influence presumably, has refused to name a date for the Hearings. The State Department fears - with reason - that the convening of Congressional Hearings under Congressman Wolff would probably prove to be

a platform for the Provisionals. The Embassy have maintained contact with Congressman Wolff and have insisted throughout that, while the Irish Government would regard a decision on Congressional Hearings as one for the U.S. Congress, our Government would insist that the witnesses heard would be elected representatives from North and South or their nominees and no others. In October 8, 1975, the Minister for Foreign Affairs met with Congressman Wolff in Washington, D.C., and made this point repeatedly to him. On October 10, 1975 the Minister wrote to Congressman Wolff to ensure that his views were on the record and a copy of the Minister's letter is attached. Incidentally, Congressman Wolff subsequently read the Minister's letter into the Congressional Record on December 4, 1975. The Minister's letter is, therefore, on the public record and can be referred to on our side if necessary.

3. On October 15, 1975 Congressman Wolff, having failed to secure from Congressman Morgan a date for official Congressional Hearings, held unofficial Hearings in New York. He was accompanied by a number of New York Congressmen:

Congressman Biaggi (even more overtly supportive of the Provisionals),

Congressman Rosenthal,
Congressman Zeferetti,
Congressman Lent,
Congressman Gilman.

(It is of interest to note that none of these gentlemen is of Irish descent.) Most of the witnesses called were supporters of the Provisional IRA. There was one exception, a supporter of the Official IRA. The Irish and British Governments refused participation. There was, of course, no Unionist participation. These hearings achieved very little publicity. Congressman Wolff arranged, however, to have all the testimony given read into the Congressional Record.

4. It is likely that if the Taoiseach meets with Members of the House of Representatives, some of them may raise with him the question of Congressional Hearings on Northern Ireland. It is suggested that the Taoiseach maintain the line outlined in the Minister's letter to Congressman Wolff (copy attached).

28.2.1976

Northern Ireland as Presidential Campaign Issue

1. The Northern Ireland issue is unlikely to arise in the current contest between President Ford and his main rival on the Republican side Governor Reagan. President Ford can be presumed to maintain the State Department policy of "non-intervention unless requested by all the parties" and it is very unlikely that Governor Reagan would take a more forward position on the issue.
2. Northern Ireland could be invoked, however, by a number of candidates (declared or undeclared) for the Democratic nomination. Senator Jackson, a declared candidate, sent a message to the last annual dinner of the NORAID. The message was in itself unobjectionable but involved a departure in current U.S. policy in envisaging a more active role for the U.S. Government in attempting to conciliate the conflicting factions in Ireland. The statement did, however, exclude the use of violence as a means to a solution. What was objectionable, from our standpoint was the fact that the message was delivered on that particular occasion and this (despite the fact that the policy enunciated was at variance with NORAID support for Provisional violence) was paraded by NORAID and their political lobbying group, the Irish National Caucus, as a victory for them. The Embassy approached Senator Jackson's Campaign Manager who, though at first hostile, was concerned to ^{learn of} statements being made by NORAID spokesmen to the effect that Senator Jackson supported them.

Senator Jackson also sent messages to the British Home Secretary in support of the late Frank Stagg and arranged to be represented at a memorial service for Mr. Stagg in New York. It might be useful if the Taoiseach or the Minister for Foreign Affairs (who had a brief meeting

- with Senator Jackson in Washington in October 1975) could meet with him while in Washington, D.C., on March 17 or 18. This has been suggested already to the Senator's Campaign Manager who is exploring the possibility from his end.
3. Mr. Fred Harris, a McGovernite Liberal, has, under the influence of Paul O'Dwyer of New York (who also may have influence with Senator Jackson) made a statement in support of Irish unification but not set out the means of achieving it. Mr. Harris is unlikely to prove a serious contender for the Democratic nomination.
 4. A number of pundits have suggested that in a tied Democratic Convention in July of this year, Governor Hugh Carey, who achieved national prominence through his financial rescue of New York City, might emerge as an agreed candidate and might even be nominated by Senator Kennedy in such circumstances. Governor Carey, one of whose parents is from Tyrone (the other from Galway), has shown interest in the Northern Ireland problem since 1969. He attended ^{in February 1972.} the Newry march of the Civil Rights Movement. In a recent speech at the American Irish Historical Society he advocated the unification of Ireland as a solution. He can confidently be counted upon not to support violence.
 5. The principal danger that the issue could emerge on the floor of the Convention derives from the fact that the Convention will take place in New York City where Mr. Paul O'Dwyer is Council President. O'Dwyer favours a much more active involvement of the U.S. and is himself at best ambivalent in his attitude to violence.

NORAIID (Irish Northern Aid Committee)

NORAIID is the main front organisation for the Provisionals in the U.S. According to statements furnished to the Federal authorities, NORAIID remittances to Ireland between July 1971 and July 1975 came to over \$1,150,000. The real figure from its foundation (in 1970 or perhaps earlier) to date is probably considerably greater but it is virtually impossible to say by how much. . . NORAIID have . . . repeatedly (i) supported the Provisionals campaign, (ii) boasted of the large amounts they were remitting to persons such as Joe Cahill, (iii) insisted that while the funds were intended for "relief" in Northern Ireland, it was up to "the people on the other side" to decide how to spend them, (iv) agreed that part of this money was used for the purchase of arms.

Irish Government leaders have repeatedly appealed to Irish-Americans not to support NORAIID and similar groups - see Appendix I.

Background

According to its statement of registration with the U.S. authorities under the Foreign Registration Act, NORAIID was founded in New York City in April 1970. Its principal officers were listed as Michael Flannery; John McCarthy and John McGowan. Mr McGowan died in 1974 and was replaced by Matthew Higgins. According to statements of Mr Flannery quoted in the Irish Press on 16 March 1972, he and his colleagues are old-school Republicans. He said that while he had some sympathy with Civil Rights agitation in Northern Ireland in the late sixties, he had not become deeply involved, taking the view that there could be no civil rights without a United Ireland. Mr McGowan was head of the Old IRA in the U.S. and it is understood that he and Messrs. Flannery and McCarthy fought on the anti-Treaty side during the Civil War. They were also deeply involved with the American IRA organisation Clan na Gael (sic.) and other IRA-

linked groups since their emigration to the U.S. in the twenties and thirties. Other prominent members, Messrs. Gilmartin, Higgins and Enright, have similar backgrounds. According to statements attributed to Mr Flannery, they were disenchanted with the leftward trend taken by the IRA in the sixties and only renewed their activity when the split occurred in the movement. Needless to say they are deeply opposed to the Official IRA which is represented in the U.S. by a miniscule organisation, the U.S. - Irish Republican Clubs and supported by the National Association for Irish Freedom which claims to speak for the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association.

Structure and Membership

NORAIID now claims to have 80 chapters. This is probably correct - in New York alone there are now 14 chapters. NORAIID spokesmen also claim to have 80,000 members throughout the U.S. - this is an absurd exaggeration and is probably a paper estimate of numbers attending social functions over a period. There are, however, several thousand active members, possibly upwards of 2,000, who are sufficiently numerous and active to have a considerable effect on most Irish-American organisations in the country.

The largest concentration of membership is in New York and the national headquarters is, in fact, in the Bronx. Otherwise the most important centres are Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Baltimore and in various towns in New Jersey and Connecticut.

The President Mike Flannery and Vice-Presidents Jack McCarthy and Matthew Higgins appear to devote most of their time to NORAIID activities. The organisation also has a full-time editor for its weekly paper the "Irish People". Its sister organisation the "Irish National Caucus" makes extensive use of the time and services of two Washington D.C. lobbyists Dr Fred Burns O'Brien and Sean Walsh. Mr Flannery has a telex machine in his home in the Bronx and, according to journalists who have visited him there, received continuous news reports on it from Provisional

sources in Ireland.

NORAIID appears to be organised regionally with an individual chairman in each area. Flannery the national president, is said to maintain tight control over the structure of the organisation. To judge by the level of visible coordination e.g. consistency in trying to influence and infiltrate local Irish-American organisations and activities, it is indeed a close-knit and disciplined group.

Fund-Raising

The organisation seems to have taken off with a fund-raising tour of the U.S. in March and April 1970 by Mr Sean Keenan of Derry (Daithi O Conaill took part in at least one event.) Statements issued by NORAIID at that time indicated that the trustees of NORAIID would be Mr Keenan and Mr Jimmy Steele of Belfast (later publicity material issued in June 1972 stated that they were Mr Keenan and Mr Joe Cahill of Belfast), while the sponsors would be Mr Joe Clarke (1916 veteran) and Des Ferguson, both of Dublin. The aim of NORAIID was "to provide financial assistance to the local defence committees who maintain defence patrols that protect innocent people against British imperialism."

In October, November and December 1970, Mr Keenan and Mr Joe Cahill toured the U.S. together on a fund-raising expedition, visiting the following areas mainly: New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Boston and Philadelphia. The most publicised subsequent fund-raising visits were: an attempted visit by Mr Cahill who was turned back by U.S. immigration authorities on 1 September 1971, & tours by Sean O Bradaigh in March 1972, by Billy Kelly in May 1972 and by Ruairi O Bradaigh in July 1973 (Mr O Bradaigh was refused a U.S. visa last year). Frank McManus has made several trips since 1971. Seamus Loughran visited the U.S. in January 1975 but his visa was revoked by the U.S. Consul in Belfast on the 5th March. 1975

The main means of fund-raising are dances and dinners sponsored

by NORAID and direct subscriptions. To judge by reports most contributors are working-class Irish-Americans. An attempt is usually made to have an active Provo present at major functions, e.g. a Mr Lyons of Derry was brought to San Francisco for a NORAID dinner on 4 March 1972 at which \$25,000 nett were raised. Copy of a handbill is attached (Appendix II) publicising a NORAID-dinner in San Francisco on 2 April 1972 - "Guest of Honours: Provisional IRA Representative". A number of Locals (Branches) of the Transport-Union and the Longshoremen's Union in New York are said to contribute fixed weekly amounts to the organisation (NORAID has close links with the national presidents of both unions). A small number of wealthy Irish-Americans, notably Bill Fuller the hotellier, are said to be contributors. A number of Irish-born owners of chains of bars in New York e.g. Gerry Toner and Terry O'Neill, contribute funds themselves and allow their bars to be used for collection purposes.

Following are the returns made to the U.S. Justice Department up to now.

<u>Period</u>	<u>Amount</u>
29/7/'71 - 29/1/72	\$128,099
29/1/'72 - 29/7/72	\$312,700
29/7/'72 - 29/1/73	\$150,437
29/1/'73 - 29/7/73	\$121,722
29/7/'73 - 29/1/74	\$ 99,966
29/1/'74 - 29/7/74	\$110,833
29/7/'74 - 29/1/75	\$102,647
29/1/'75 - 29/7/75	\$130,000

Few observers feel that these figures represent the full picture, indeed NORAID personnel boast privately of much greater sums - up to \$4 million per year (probably wishful thinking). It is said that larger contributors try to maintain anonymity and insist on their contributions being "laundered" secretly into Ireland. Nevertheless insofar as the figures reflect a level of contribution at public functions, and as such the intensity of popular Irish-American support for the Provisionals, they indicate considerable decline from the days of reaction to Bloody Sunday to a fairly constant half-yearly figure of about

\$100,000.

Control and Use of Funds

NORAIID was registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act in January 1971. In December 1972 after protracted legal argument (the organisation was represented by the prominent New York politician-lawyer Paul O'Dwyer and his juniors on this and other occasions), it was obliged to disclose details of its contributors' identities to the Attorney-General's Office. Information to be found in various registration documents includes a list of the organisations activities, viz., fund-raising and remittance; collection of used clothing and remittance; publicity on Northern Ireland conditions; engaging in political activity by informing interested individuals. Among the names of persons to whom remittances were conveyed are those of Joseph Cahill, Joseph Clarke and Kathleen White. Mr. Cahill, who was subsequently arrested at sea with 30 tons of arms and ammunition in his possession, personally received over \$90,000

While spokesmen for NORAIID sometimes pretend that their funds are used purely for relief, the following statements are more representative of the understanding of most members of the organisation:

"We're involved in supporting the activities of the Provisional IRA and that branch of Sinn Fein which supports the Provisional IRA. We provide what funds we can and the people on the other side have to decide what has to be used for what purpose".

(Matthew Higgins, Vice-President, NORAIID, quoted in Washington Post, 16/3/72).

"Our job is to get up the money and send it to the people over there. What they use it for is up to them. We attach no strings. Everything we do in this country is aimed at assisting the final phase of the struggle for freedom in Ireland".

(NORAIID Spokesman quoted in Irish Times, 20/10/71).

It is stated that Mr Enright of New York NORAIID, agreed that the

Major portion of the money would go on arms. (Irish Times 20/10/71).

Mr. Enright under questioning before the Congressional Hearings on Northern Ireland said that the money provided by NORAID "might allow them to purchase arms" (Congressional Hearings 1972).

Mr. Higgins is quoted in the Washington Post of 25th January 1976 as stating: "NORAID contributions free up our people on the other side to spend their money for arms. At least I hope it's so."

The Washington Star (22nd Nov. 1975) reported that, in reply to a question as to whether NORAID dollars could be spent on weapons and guns, Higgins replied: "Anything is possible."

The prosecution attorney in the Baltimore trial of four persons in May 1974 who were convicted of arms smuggling was reported in the New York Times (16th December 1975) as stating that a federal agent posing as an artist became friendly with one of the defendants, Henry Hillick, during the investigation. He said that Mr. Hillick asked the agent to contribute some of his sketches to NORAID. "Hillick told him the money for the pictures would go for women and children. Later, when they were friendly, Hillick admitted that the money didn't go for widows but for guns."

NORAID is also reported to be active in Canada, where its officials have secured the amalgamation of a number of small fund-raising bodies. A 1972 estimate of "about \$40,000" for contributions from Canada has been reported as having been given by NORAID (I. Independent, 13/5/1974).

Gun-Running

NORAID's main activity is fund-raising and supply and there is no evidence that the organisation as such is involved in gun-running to Ireland. On the other hand several members of NORAID have been charged with gun-running offences in the U.S.

The case of the "Fort Worth Five" in 1972 became a cause celebre both in Irish-American and U.S. Civil Rights circles because of, from the strictly Irish-American viewpoint, the issue of supply of guns and ammunition to the IRA and, from the civil rights stance, Constitutional and civil rights questions arising from the defendants pleading the Fifth Amendment in refusing to testify and the fact that they were five New Yorkers coming before a Grand Jury in far-off Texas. The case attracted considerable publicity when Senator Kennedy spoke about it in the Senate and to a sub-committee of the House of Representatives and made an application on behalf of the Five to the Supreme Court.

In February 1973, a Mr. Charles Malone, a NORAID member living in San Francisco was convicted of exporting firearms and ammunition to Ireland. In May 1973, James O'Gara of the New York chapter of NORAID was indicted on charges of gun-running and convicted of purchasing weapons in 1971 using false identification. In November 1973 James Malin of New York was convicted of illegally buying firearms for the IRA.

On May 24, 1974 four persons - two Irish and two Irish-Americans - were indicted in Baltimore, Maryland of conspiring to smuggle.

58 Semi-automatic rifles (Armalite AR-15's), plus armour-piercing shells, rockets and other explosives from New York to Ireland. The defendants were reported to have placed an order for 100 Armalite semi-automatic rifles per month with a Maryland gun-dealer. While there was no indication in the course of the trial of where the money came from, the head of the Justice Department's investigation is reported as saying there was ample evidence that the money had been provided by NORAID.

On December 23, 1975, 5 Americans of Irish descent including the Philadelphian chairman of NORAID, Daniel Cahalane, were indicted on charges of shipping 378 rifles and 140,000 rounds of ammunition to Ireland from August 1970. They were also charged with attempting to purchase rocket-launchers, mortars and machine-guns. The case comes to trial some weeks hence.

Finally, under this heading, it may be worth repeating the point that some convictions in Ireland for arms smuggling suggest sources other than the U.S.A. There is, on the other hand, little doubt that a great part of the funds for these activities emanates from the U.S.A. and specifically from NORAID. (See Appendix 3 to this Report: "U.S. Guns in Northern Ireland and Export Controls.")

Political Activities

NORAID is also a policy mouthpiece of the Provisionals in the U.S. Its propaganda activities include public demonstrations and picketing outside Irish and British State and semi-State offices in the U.S., distribution of handbills, radio programmes and a newspaper The Irish People, organisation of meetings and lobbying of public figures including Congressmen. Concerts, dances, dinners and GAA matches organised with the help of NORAID are also used for the distribution of propaganda, the content of which is fairly low in quality being mainly emotional in content. The most lurid pictures are conjured up of the lot of the Provisionals and their families North and South and the message is frequently couched in the terms of the Irish-American "brcgue" psuedo-dialect.

The main lobbying and publicity function of the Provisionals is now carried out by the Irish National Caucus (See Paper No.7)

NORAID and the Irish-American Community

According to NORAID spokesmen, collecting money for the IRA in the Irish-American community is viable only when there are signs of "action" or "blood" on the ground in Ireland. This principle, with all its implications for the quality of awareness of Irish realities on the part of Irish-Americans, seems to have been borne out in recent years. At its beginnings in 1970, NORAID was a ramshackle unknown affair but gradually with the growing Provo campaign in Ireland, contributions and remittances grew. Bloody Sunday had an enormous and persistent impact and levered NORAID into a position of considerable prominence in Irish-American circles until it became involved to some extent in most social events aimed at "blue-collar" Irish-Americans, infiltrating popular groups such as the GAA (John "Kerry" O'Donnell the doyen of the American GAA is a supporter) and many Irish-American societies. The appeal to help "our suffering brothers" and the evocation of traditional

military and anti-British cultural values are undoubtedly strong meat to the Irish-Americans concerned.

To put this matter in perspective it is necessary to remember that NORAID progaganda reaches only a tiny proportion of the Irish-American community at large (perhaps 100,000 out of a minimum total of 13 millions)

28.2.1976

Extracts from Statements by Irish Political Leaders on NORAID
and Similar Groups

- (1) The then Minister for Justice, Mr. O'Malley, in a speech to the Emerald Association of Long Island on 25 October 1972:

"You will, I hope, see then why I, and my colleagues in the Government are so disturbed that much of the money to finance the I.R.A. campaign of violence is coming from the United States.

One organisation which is collecting a good deal of that money in the United States is the Irish Northern Aid Committee. This organisation is very active in the New York area in particular, and we are reliably informed that much of what is collected gets to the Provisional wing of the I.R.A. While I am sure that this is not known to some of the people active in that organisation and while I certainly would not want anybody to point the finger at any particular individual, the matter is so important that I feel bound to ask everybody who has the best interests of Ireland at heart not to contribute funds to that organisation."

- (2) Mr. Jack Lynch, former Irish Prime Minister, in a New York television interview in March 1974:

"... Many people in this country contribute funds, possibly innocently to the IRA campaign - to the 'dependents of the IRA people' they call it, 'Ulster Aid' or whatever it is. But these people are actually contributing to the guns and bullets and the explosives that are killing and maiming people.... and certainly doing nothing to help the unification of Ireland".

- (3) Dr. Garret FitzGerald, the present Minister for Foreign Affairs in a speech at New York University on 9 May 1974, appealed for

"... the whole-hearted help of Irish-Americans in thwarting the flow of money which is used for the purchase of arms through IRA front-organisations such as the Irish Northern Aid Committee. Every dollar bill contributed to agencies such as this contributes to the killing and maiming of Irish people - 800 of whom have now died as a direct result of IRA violence or through violence provoked by the IRA campaign".

Handwritten notes:
Hatched
make 11/17

Faded text:
Dinner and Entertainment
Dinner and Entertainment

GUEST OF HONOR

Provisional I.R.A.

Representative

Sponsored by

KNIGHTS OF THE RED BRANCH

and

IRISH HERITAGE AND COM. HT.

Music by *BLANK COPY*

Plus Irish Entertainment

Dinner 5 pm - 8 pm — Dancing 9 - 1 am
DONATION \$3.50

Event Hall - 1700 Madison Street

Hosted by *Blank Copy*

For information call

566 3878

664 8700

United States Guns in Northern Ireland and United States Gun
and Export Controls

The British Security Forces and the R.U.C. are reported to have seized 1,500 weapons in Northern Ireland of U.S. origin. In a recent television interview broadcast in the United States on the ABC network, Prime Minister Wilson estimated that between 70% and 80% of the Provisional IRA arsenal came from the United States. Mr. Stanley Orme interviewed on the NBC TODAY Show in January 1976 estimated the amount at 85%. Spokesmen for the U.S. Justice Department and the Arms Bureau of the Treasury Department are reported in a number of recent press reports to regard these estimates as far too high. A Mr. Zimmerman of the Treasury Department estimated that weapons from the U.S. constituted no more than 25% of Provisional weaponry (BALTIMORE SUN, January 23, 1976) but he admitted that probably the bulk of the more modern type semi-automatic rifles used by the Provisionals came from the U.S.

A number of press investigations suggest that two types of Armalite semi-automatic rifles, the AR-180 and the AR-15, are the weapons most sought after by the Provisionals because of their high velocity capacity and their suitability for smuggling as they can easily be broken into small parts and shipped as "machine parts".

The U.S. authorities have conducted thirteen major investigations across the country (including New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Texas and San Francisco) into IRA gun-running.

The following in brief outline is the legal position as far as the U.S. authorities are concerned.

- 1) Under a well-known Constitutional provision citizens have the right to acquire and hold firearms.
- 2) Under Federal Law the carrier of a weapon is obliged to inform the owner or operator of any commercial vehicle

that he is transporting a weapon.

3. Federal law provides that it is illegal to convey ^{another} firearms to a resident of/State within the U.S.
4. It is also illegal to export arms without a licence from the U.S.State Department.
5. It is illegal to purchase or attempt to purchase automatic weapons unless the purchaser has acquired a licence from the U.S. Treasury Department (\$200 cost). This provision has been invoked in the Baltimore and Philadelphia cases where it is alleged the defendents either purchased or attempted to purchase rockets, rocket launchers, and fully automatic machine guns (Armalite rifles are semi-automatic and do not come under this Provision).
6. It is understood that in the case of the pending ^{the} Philadelphia trial/prosecution will invoke a "obscure" federal provision which makes it illegal to act as an agent for "a body of insurgents within a country with which the U.S. is at peace.....without prior notification to the Secretary of State".

Fund-Raising

The legal position relating to the freedom of citizens to raise funds to support insurgents in another country is complicated. At all events, as stated earlier, no direct link has yet been established between NORAIID as an institution and the purchase in the U.S. or export or the purchase elsewhere of fire arms NORAIID is, of course, registered with the Justice Department under the Foreign Agents Registration Act and has apparently complied, sofar at least overtly, with the provisions of that Act.

CONFIDENTIAL

Paper No.7

The Irish National Caucus

1. The Irish National Caucus, a creation of NORAID, was founded in October 1974 in New York and has as its object to lobby U.S. politicians and public opinion to pressurise Britain (a) to release internees and grant an amnesty to political prisoners, (b) to withdraw troops from the streets of Northern Ireland and, by a specific date, from the area and (c) to make a declaration of intent of withdrawal - in short, the objectives of the Provisionals.

Its principal officers are Jack Keane, current national President of the AOH, a member of NORAID and a confessed supporter of the Provisionals, and two Washington lobbyists, Fred Burns O'Brien and Sean Walsh of similar sympathies, also members of NORAID. Brendan McCusker is listed as Liaison Officer with NORAID. In October 1974 Walsh registered with the Justice Department as the representative in the U.S. of Kevin Street Sinn Fein and of the Irish Republican Information Service.

Walsh and O'Brien, acting on behalf of the Caucus, submitted a 50-page document to the House Committee on Internal Security entitled "Brief for the Provisionals" which was intended to refute references to the Provisionals in a publication on terrorism put out by that Committee (source Irish People, February 8, 1975).

2. The Caucus purports to represent a wide range of Irish-American groups, but consists more in reality of interested hardliners who happen to be members of the groups rather than of the groups themselves. Among the groups are NORAID, ACUJ, Conradh na Gaeilge, Celtic Cultural Society, the Irish Arts Centre, The National Council for Irish Americans and the American Congress for Irish Freedom. A number of their organisations exist only on paper (See Paper No.8) and their membership, however inactive, comprises persons who support NORAID. In other words, many of the groups which the Caucus claims to represent have no membership additional to those represented already by NORAID.

Moreover, the Caucus, in its pretence to represent certain other Irish groups, has made several false claims. Among the groups described on Caucus notepaper as members of its "Advisory Board" are: The Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, The American Irish Historical Society, The United Irish Counties Association, The National University of Ireland Club, The Irish-American Bicentennial Club.

The Presidents of these bodies (Philadelphia and New York Chapters of the Friendly Sons) have confirmed to the Irish Consulate-General in New York that they have no connection whatever with the Irish National Caucus.

3. Outside the narrow circle of NORAID, the Caucus has made significant gains in two groups, the AOH and certain AFL-CIO (largest U.S. trade union conglomerate) unions. It has also taken over the role, hitherto played by NORAID, in lobbying Congressmen.

The AOH is the largest nationwide Irish-American society. Its membership, largely middle-class and "blue-collar", numbers about 45,000 and it has active chapters in virtually all urban centres in the country. Under its constitution it is confined to Catholic membership and is committed to promote Irish unity by "all legitimate means". (It severed its connection with the Irish AOH in 1916.) It operates essentially on a loose basis and is largely keyed to social activities at the local level. Six of the current members of its National Board are committed to the Provisionals.:

Jack Keane, (St. Louis, Missouri) the National President, is an active member of NORAIID and chairman of the Board of Governors of the Irish National Caucus.

Fr. Sean McManus, (Boston) Deputy Chaplain, a rabid supporter of the Provisionals.

John Duffy, (New York) National Secretary, member of NORAIID.

David Burke, (Massachusetts) editor of monthly Hibernian Digest, which in two years he has transformed into a Provisional propoganda outlet.

Liam Murphy, Deputy Chairman of AOH Freedom for All Ireland Committee and, until recently, editor of NORAIID weekly the "Irish People".

Thirteen of the other fourteen members of the National Board are largely indifferent to Northern Ireland and have allowed President Keane to commit it to support for the Irish National Caucus. One member, however, Kerry-born Michael Delahunty, himself a former AOH National President, is a strong supporter of SDLP position and has attempted resistance to the trend of events without success. He has kept an officer of the Embassy informed of developments and, at a recent meeting of the National Board he delivered a speech drafted by that officer which attacked Keane's policies and some inflammatory statements and suggestions made by other members. Keane's presidency ends this year and it is to be hoped that he will be replaced by a more moderate man. Until then, however, while the majority of ordinary members of the AOH have probably never heard of the Irish National Caucus, the organisation is committed on paper to the Caucus.

4. The Caucus also frequently parades the fact that it has on its Board three leading trade unionists:

Teddy Gleason, National President of the Longshoremen's Union (traditionally Irish-controlled, some of whose members are probably involved in smuggling weapons aboard ships in the New York area on behalf of the Provos). Active in NORAIID since its foundation, Gleason is a member of the National Executive of the AFL-CIO. At the unofficial hearings held in New York by Congressman Wolff in October 1975 (See Paper No. 4), he stated that his longshoremen might block all ships bearing British imports to the U.S. in certain circumstances which he did not define. Most informed observers feel that this was nothing more than bluff.

Denis Guinan, National President of the Transport Union, has also been active in NORAIID for several years.

John Henning, West Coast Secretary fo the AFL-CIO was formerly a non-career Ambassador for the U.S. to New Zealand. He was chief guest of honour at the NORAIID annual dinner last year.

As one of a series of resolutuons on foreign policy which went unreported by the media, a resolutuon was passed at the 1974 and 1975 annual conventions of the AFL-CIO supporting the stated objectives of the Caucus (mentioned at the outset of this paper).

5. The Caucus, through its Washington lobbyists, Walsh and Burns O'Brien, has made energetic attempts to lobby Congressmen and has concentrated primarily on those who were committed to NORAID, principally Wolff and Biaggi of New York. Its success outside this group has been limited; it has succeeded in having photographs taken with some leading figures but it has received no active support to speak of.

6. Walsh and O'Brien are given to making wildly false claims such as the false assertion that they represent six leading Irish-American groups which they do not (see above). Walsh claimed, in an interview with the Washington Star (22nd November 1975) that the House Majority Leader, Tip O'Neill, was committed to the Caucus; O'Neill's senior aide denied this officially to the Star. One of the most vicious "Big Lies" attempted so far was published under Burns O'Brien's signature in the NORAID weekly, The Irish People, on April 26th 1975 in an article entitled, "Caucus Report" in which he asserted that the Special Branch of the Gardai had carried out at least twelve sectarian killings in Northern Ireland, and attributing to the SDLP the pinpointing of the victims of those killings.

7. The Dublin newspaper, the Sunday World, published in its front page on December 14th 1975 allegations by Official Sinn Fein that Walsh and Burns O'Brien were CIA operatives. We have no evidence for this beyond the fact the Walsh was apparently at one time an aide to the ranking minority member of the House Armed Services subcommittee on Intelligence. He was also a member of the Green Berets, an elite counter-insurgency unit of the U.S. Army. Burns O'Brien was a lawyer with the Internal Revenue Service and the U.S. Customs and served as an aide to a number of Presidential Commissions. What can be said is that some of the more lurid lies they attempted to propagate are consistent with "black propaganda" at its worst.

8. Neither Walsh nor O'Brien have any recent family connections with Ireland and it is reported that they are not well liked by some of the "hard hat" Irish membership of NORAID.

The telephone of the Caucus was recently disconnected and there are rumours that the Caucus has no money to pay its bills. This is hard to credit as one would expect NORAID to bail it out

29.2. 1976.

Other IRA (Provisional or Official)

Support Groups

1. American Committee for Ulster Justice (ACUJ)

The ACUJ was formed in mid-1971 by a group of well-known American figures including then Congressman, now Governor, Hugh Carey, Paul O'Dwyer, Cormac O'Malley, Walter Curley (now U.S. Ambassador in Dublin), Declan O'Sullivan, Eugene Foley (an important figure in the Kennedy administration). Its object was to work "for the bestowal of civil rights in the North, the restoration of internal stability in the Six Counties and the finding of a permanent political solution".

During 1971 and part of 1972 it received assistance in terms of information briefing and cooperation in providing speakers from Irish Government offices in the United States. The ACUJ was in fact partly responsible for the organisation of the Congressional Hearings of February and March 1972 (see under Paper No. 4, para. 1) and helped to finance the travel to the U.S. of a number of distinguished and responsible spokesmen for the minority e.g. Austin Curry and Fr. (now Bishop) Edward Daly. In April 1972 the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Hillery, in reply to a Dail question from Deputy Desmond if he would recommend any Irish American organisation to which contributions might be made to relieve distress in Northern Ireland, recommended the American Committee for Ulster Justice as well as the Irish Red Cross and a fund to relieve distress established at that time under the Assembly of the Northern Ireland People (SDLP).

In the late summer of 1972, the membership of the ACUJ began to fall off and the organisation came increasingly under the influence of members who (a) supported the Provisionals and (b) were hostile to the Irish Government. From then on the tone of its monthly newsletter, which now appears only sporadically, continued to be pro-Provisional and anti-Dublin. The more distinguished and hard working members of the ACUJ who favoured a moderate line, principally Cormac O'Malley, Walter Curley, Declan O'Sullivan and Peter Murray of New York, either formally resigned or became inactive. The principal influences in the ACUJ are Paul O'Dwyer and Mark Barrett both of whom claim, on the one hand, not to support violence but to "understand the need for the Provisionals". Both have regularly attended functions of NORAIID and assisted that organisation in various ways.

In 1973 the ACUJ funded a weekly radio news commentary on Fordham Radio, WFUV, by Mr. Tom Duffy, a native of Derry, who now describes himself as a spokesman in the U.S. for the Provisional IRA. The President of Fordham had Mr. Duffy's programme terminated in 1974 following a personal attack by Mr. Duffy on Cardinal Cooke of New York. Mr. Duffy has now found two ten-minute weekly slots at low listening time on WNYC and the Columbia University radio stations. Both slots are said to be supported by the ACUJ.

The ACUJ membership has now dwindled to a point where it no longer holds meetings.

The Irish National Caucus claims to represent the ACUJ.

2. National Council for Irish Americans (NCIA)
American Congress for Irish Freedom (ACIF)

These two groups, largely interchangeable, are run by a Mr. James Heaney of Buffalo, New York State, who is sometimes described as National Coordinator for NORAID (see Paper No. 6). In effect they are paper organisations as their membership is comprised entirely of NORAID members. So far as we know they do not hold regular meetings.

The Irish National Caucus (see Paper No. 7) claims them among the organisations it represents.

3. The Irish Republican Clubs of the U.S. and Canada

This group represents the Official Sinn Fein and Republican Clubs of Ireland and supports the Official IRA. Its membership is very small (to judge by its Annual Convention, between 50 and 100) and its impact on the Irish American community is minimal. Its officers together with those of the NAIF (see below) were principally responsible for a fund-raising tour of the U.S. by Bernadette Devlin McAliskey in late August 1969 during which she raised \$92,000.

Irish Americans in the category who take an active interest in Northern Ireland (see Paper No. 2) tend in the American "hard hat" tradition to be trenchantly anti-Marxist in their feelings and, with the emergence of the Provisionals and NORAID in 1970, most support and funds were withdrawn from the Republican Clubs and the NAIF, both organisations being Marxist in their ideology.

The principal national officers of the Republican Clubs are: Dr. Moira Bradshaw, Liam Kelly and Denis Cassin. Mr. Cassin runs a cultural institute called "Irish Project" which produces dramas from time to time in New York.

4. National Association for Irish Freedom (NAIF)

This group was formed in April 1969 as the National Association for Irish Justice. In 1970, following the IRA "split", it changed its title to the present one. It is the official American support group for the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association on whose behalf it collects funds.

While NAIF claims to have 30 chapters, its membership is now miniscule. Its National Coordinator, Mr. Seamus Naughton, has attacked New York Congressmen who were giving support to groups such as NORAID and did so openly at the unofficial hearings arranged by Congressman Wolff in New York last year (see Paper No. 4, para. 3).

which
NAIF/is largely synonymous with the Republican Clubs frequently issues press releases attacking NORAID and the Provisional IRA in Official Sinn Fein terms, i.e.

it accuses the Provisionals of dividing the working class in Northern Ireland on sectarian lines and of playing into the hands of capitalism.

29.2.1976

Legitimate Humanitarian Fund-raising Groups

1. The absence of organised legitimate fund-raising activities in the U.S. which could be seen to benefit those in distress in Northern Ireland and promote reconciliation has been a matter of concern to the Embassy and our Consulates in the U.S. Following the takeover of the American Committee for Ulster Justice by the Provisionals and the ending of the SDLP's Alternate Assembly, the practice followed by our representatives in the U.S. was to advise enquirers to send funds to the Irish Red Cross and the heads of the Christian Churches in Ireland. This situation was not satisfactory however because subscriptions to these groups were not tax exempt (which subscriptions to most legitimate U.S. charities are) and, in the case of the Irish Red Cross, there were two additional causes of concern: a) the fact that the Red Cross is unpopular with U.S. public opinion because of its allegedly incompetent performance during World War II and b) the involvement of the Irish Red Cross (however innocent its role may have been) in the hearings of the Committee on Public Accounts on gun-running. There is also the fact that the churches in Ireland and the Irish Red Cross are remote organisations in the sense that they have no immediate representation in the U.S. itself (the Catholic Church in the U.S. has sent sums of money on a number of occasions to Cardinal Conway and the National Council of Churches, representing the U.S. Protestant Churches, has also acted as a channel of funds to its counterpart in Ireland).

2. Under the direction of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, our representatives in the U.S. provided assistance in terms of contacts, etc., to a number of Irish-based groups whose object is to promote reconciliation between the communities of Northern Ireland, principally the Glencree Reconciliation Centre in the Republic and the Corrymeela Reconciliation Centre in Northern Ireland.

3. In the course of 1975 a number of U.S.-based funds either came into existence or began to incorporate themselves which would be directly concerned with the collecting of funds in the U.S. to promote reconciliation in Northern Ireland or to provide relief to distressed persons in the area.

4. The Ireland Fund was established by Mr. A.J. O'Reilly, President of Heinz, following a successful fund-raising dinner in May 1975 which benefitted the Central Remedial Clinic, St. Michael's House for Mentally Handicapped Children, the College of Surgeons as well as the Glencree Reconciliation Centre. (Note: The Taoiseach's daughter, Miss Mary Cosgrave, attended Mr. O'Reilly's dinner in New York). Subscriptions to the fund have been cleared for tax exemption by the U.S. authorities. The fund is currently publishing a brochure which dwells on the need for reconciliation in Northern Ireland, on the need for Irishmen to live rather than to die for their country and on the opportunities afforded by the current crisis for concerned Americans and particularly Irish Americans to help rather than hinder progress.

The Board of Directors of the Ireland Fund includes the Rooney family who have extensive interests in U.S. sports (they own race tracks, dog tracks and the Pittsburgh Steelers, U.S. national professional football champions of 1974 and 1975), Fr. Hesbury, President of Notre Dame University, Mrs. Ethel Kennedy, Mr. John Mulcahy, Mr. Walter O'Connell (wealthy New York businessman), Mr. Tom Gallagher (President of Doyle Dane, the largest advertising agency in New York) as well as Mr. O'Reilly. The Executive Secretary is Mr. Morris Murphy of Pennsylvania, the owner of a public relations firm, himself Mr. O'Reilly's PRO and the Press Officer for the Presidential campaign of Governor Shapp of Pennsylvania.

The Ireland Fund proposes to have a dinner in May of this year to honour Senator Kennedy or George Meaney, (President of the AFL-CIO, the largest trade union group in the U.S.) or Daniel Moynihan, who recently resigned as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations .

The fund, in providing tax exempt channels for subscriptions to legitimate and desirable activities in Ireland, provides a useful alternative to NORAID for Irish Americans concerned to do something to help solve the problem of Northern Ireland.

5. Ireland's Children, Inc. was formally incorporated and granted U.S. tax exemption status in January 1976. Its purpose is to collect funds to benefit children in Ireland and principally Northern Ireland. Rather than send money to Northern Ireland which might, its organisers fear, fall into the wrong hands, it would

prefer in the first instance to purchase equipment for play groups, playgrounds, hospitals, schools, etc. In the longer term, one of its ambitions is to pay the salary of psychiatrists in Northern Ireland who would devote themselves to the problems of children reared in a situation of violence.

The Board of Directors of the organisation consists of American "establishment" figures. Its Secretary is Mrs. Wayne Fredericks, wife of a former U.S. Deputy Secretary of State for African Affairs, herself active in Protestant Church charities and a friend of Senator Kennedy. Other members of the board include Ambassador Walter Curley in Dublin, Margaret Mealey, Director of the official Catholic laity organisation in the U.S., Catherine McDermott of the Carnegie Foundation, Dr. George Peabody, etc.

Americans are traditionally deeply concerned about the fate of children in war-torn situations and indeed many philanthropic groups have provided holidays in the U.S. for Northern Ireland children. This foundation is attractive in several ways: it has tax exempt status, it is directed by figures of known probity and it will arrange to take extreme care that any funds it collects do not fall into the wrong hands.

6. The Catholic Church body responsible for world relief organisation, Catholic Relief Service, and the national coordinating body representing the Protestant Churches in the U.S., the National Council of Churches, have had a number of joint meetings recently to explore the possibility of establishing a joint INTER-CHURCH FUND

which would provide relief in cases of distress in Northern Ireland and also help fund projects which would promote reconciliation. As envisaged at present, funds collected under a joint appeal by the Christian Churches in the U.S. would be disbursed through a similar joint inter-church organisation in Northern Ireland. The Christian Churches together with the Jewish community established a public appeal at the end of the Nigerian civil war which apparently had very considerable impact and provided several million dollars in terms of relief. The Christian Churches, it is envisaged, would make a similar appeal in this instance, but in addition to relieving distress and promoting reconciliation within Northern Ireland, they would try to inform U.S. public opinion that sectarian violence in Northern Ireland did not represent Christian values.

This fund, if established, would have a number of attractions: it would be very widely publicized and its impact would be correspondingly extensive.

Secondly, the claim made by NORAID that they are the only group to collect money to aid distress in Northern Ireland would no longer stand up. Thirdly, it might be that the joint involvement of the Christian Churches in Northern Ireland in identifying criteria and cases of distress as well as projects likely to promote reconciliation, might have the affect of bringing the communities of Northern Ireland somewhat closer together.

7. Note: Catholic Relief Service and the National Council of Churches have already jointly consulted and decided that in the event of a situation of extreme chaos in Northern Ireland they would operate jointly in providing relief. The Minister for Foreign Affairs discussed this contingency with Catholic Church leaders and the National Council of Churches during his visit to New York in October 1975. He expressed concern that the churches should operate quickly should such a situation develop so as to ensure that organisations promoting violence did not pre-empt the support of the public.

29.2.1976

Leading Personalities1. Senator Kennedy

Senator Kennedy in the course of 1972 made a number of hardline statements on Northern Ireland and supported in public the Fort Worth Five (see Paper No. 6 under Gun-running) who refused to testify before a Grand Jury in Texas on gun-running to Northern Ireland. During 1973 he came strongly under the influence of Mr. John Hume whom he consults periodically and his policy statements came much more into line with Irish Government policy. He expressed strong support for power-sharing and the Sunningdale Agreement and, in his enthusiasm at that time, suggested that Mr. Whitelaw be considered for the Nobel Prize for Peace.

His attitude now is that he would like to do anything that might help the situation that he can but he does not see a role either for himself or the U.S. in solving the problem. He is interested in the new legitimate fund-raising groups currently emerging (see Paper No. 9). He is careful to consult the Embassy before making statements on developments in Northern Ireland and, for example, his statement on the death of Frank Stagg which was drafted in close consultation with the Embassy, was highly responsible and acceptable from our point of view.

Senator Kennedy of course represents a constituency in Massachusetts with a heavy concentration of Irish blue collar workers. His main problem with his constituency arises from his support for school busing

as an instrument of solving the racial problem, the opposition to which has come principally from the heavily Irish community of South Boston. He is however under a good deal of pressure from supporters of the Provisionals but he has maintained a highly responsible attitude despite this.

The Taoiseach and/or the Minister for Foreign Affairs might, if they have an opportunity, express their thanks to him for his help on the Northern issue.

2. Paul O'Dwyer

Mr. O'Dwyer is President of the New York City Council. Prior to the outbreak of the current trouble in Northern Ireland, his constituency in New York politics was primarily liberal Jewish. He was himself involved in the establishment of the State of Israel and boasts that he ran guns for the Irgun movement at the end of the Second World War. His interest in Northern Ireland derives, he claims, from his commitment to defend human rights and he has the reputation in New York legal circles of being a committed specialist in that area. Nevertheless his involvement with the issue in the U.S. has overwhelmingly been in activities which promote the Provisional IRA and its cause. Thus he has acted free of charge as attorney for NORAID (see Paper No. 6) and has been publicly associated on many occasions as a speaker or in accepting awards with both NORAID (Paper No. 6) and the Irish National Caucus (Paper No. 7).

His policy position on Northern Ireland is somewhat incoherent. On the one hand he claims (Irish Times, March 25, 1975) to be a strong supporter of the SDLP. Yet he attends NORAIID functions although NORAIID openly supports the Provisionals who have been repeatedly condemned by the SDLP. Further confusion arises from his condemnations of the Dublin Government for what he alleges is its failure to support the SDLP. During a recent conversation he told an officer of the Embassy that Mr. Paddy Devlin had assured him that Dublin had done everything to put obstacles in the way of the SDLP. Either he cannot or will not accept the overwhelming evidence of Dublin's support for the SDLP on all major policy issues, as witness the current debate on Fianna Fail's policy on Northern Ireland.

He has a deep hatred of the British, derived perhaps from his involvement with the Zionist movement. It is exemplified not alone in his references to Northern Ireland but also in some of his official activities e.g. his proposal that the New York City Council change the official date of its founding so as to take the credit for this from the British and give it to the Dutch (which may well be historically justified).

Currently, his public position is that the British Government cravenly failed to deal with the challenge of Protestant extremists in May 1974 and thus are responsible for the collapse of power-sharing. This left no option but violence to the minority in his view. He feels Dublin abdicated its right to a say in the affairs of Northern Ireland by its insistence

on de facto recognition of Northern Ireland and the misreported statement of the Minister for Defence on Irish radio last year that the Irish Army would never intervene in Northern Ireland even to save the minority from destruction. He appears to be impervious to arguments about the inconsistencies in his position.

Mr. O'Dwyer has given his family homestead in Pohola, Co. Mayo to the Cheshire Homes. A Cheshire Home bearing the O'Dwyer name will be opened in August this year for mentally handicapped adults. He established the Mayo Foundation in the U.S., with tax exempt status, to collect funds for the home.

The Consulate General New York recently saw a letter from Mr. O'Dwyer announcing a charter flight to Ireland in August of this year for the official opening of the home. It will be conducted, according to O'Dwyer, by the President, Mr. O Dalaigh.

3. Notes on Senator Jackson, Fred Harris and Governor Carey, possible candidates for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency can be found in Paper No. 5. A note on Congressman Lester Wolff is in Paper No. 4.

29.2.1976

Likely Questions and Suggested Answers

General

It was suggested in papers nos. 1 and 2 that the question most likely to be of interest to U.S. newsmen covering the Taoiseach's visit is Irish-American support for the campaign of violence of the Provisionals, either in the form of gun-running or fund-raising in support of gun-running. It was suggested that while the Taoiseach should be forthright in his condemnation of such activities, he should lose no opportunity to be positive and conciliatory in his replies.

It is furthermore suggested that the Taoiseach should, within the bounds the realities impose, strike whatever optimistic notes may be sounded for hope of a politically agreed solution to the Northern Ireland problem.

Finally, particularly in the case of TV or radio interviews, the Taoiseach should not assume any detailed knowledge of the Northern Ireland problem on the part of his audience.

Sample Questions and Suggested Answers

1. Q. How much of the violence in Northern Ireland is caused by Irish-American support for the Provisionals?

A. Irish political leaders are sometimes accused of coming over here purely to attack Irish-Americans. The fact is we are proud of the overwhelming majority of the Irish in America

and we are aware of their humanitarian concern at what is happening in Northern Ireland. There are regrettably a minority - a tiny minority, some of whom are idealistic but misguided - who do support the violence. But for their activities, many dead Irishmen - probably hundreds-would be alive today.

2. Q. Is there any evidence that guns are coming from this country to Ireland?

A. Over 1,500 guns have been discovered in Northern Ireland which were traced to the United States. As you are probably aware, a number of persons have been charged in your courts for gun-running to Ireland and several have been convicted.

3. Q, Have you any evidence linking Irish-American fund-raising activities, such as NORAID fund-raising, with this gun-running?

A. In March 1973, a Mr. Joe Cahill, described as quartermaster to the IRA, was arrested by our police off our coast in a vessel carrying 30 tons of weapons, ammunition and explosives, much of it of Soviet manufacture. According to public records in your Justice Department, Mr. Cahill personally received over \$90,000 from the Irish Northern Aid Committee. This money is theoretically collected to help widows and orphans. I'm afraid Mr. Cahill's cargo was more likely to create widows than to aid them.

In the course of a gun-running trial in Baltimore in 1974, the prosecuting attorney said that one of your federal agents was told by a man convicted of gun-running that NORAID money was really being collected for weapons.

The fact is that NORAID, who are by no means representative of the Irish in this great country - and it distresses me that American-Irish at large are sometimes falsely identified with them - NORAID openly supports violence and their spokesmen have said so several times. Would you give money to a group who advocate violence, even if they claim the money is for the relief of distress alone?

4. Q. What would you advise concerned Americans who wish to help to do with their money?

A. I realise that Americans are among the most generous people in the world and that very many of them want to help. I would only ask them to try to make sure - for the sake of the human lives which are at stake - that their money does not fall into the hands of men of violence. One of the best ways of ensuring this is to contribute through the leaders of your own religious community, asking them to convey the money to their counterparts in Ireland. The Catholic and Protestant Churches and the Jewish Community are well represented in Ireland.

I was also glad to learn that a number of funds such as the Ireland Fund and Ireland's Children were recently set up in the United States to promote reconciliation in Northern Ireland and to benefit the children of Northern Ireland who, God knows, have suffered terribly from violence.

5. Q. Do you think the problem of Northern Ireland is well understood in the United States and in particular by the Irish here?

A. On the whole I think, yes. Any conflict or crisis occurring in a different country can receive only a certain amount of attention outside the area which it immediately affects. The U.S. mass media - TV, radio, the press - have on the whole given a fair picture of what has been happening. I think the American public understands well by now that the problem is not about religion as such - that is, about theology - but derives from a historic division in the community which violence and complex political problems have made acute. Violence breeds fear and intransigence and it is this fear and this intransigence that moderate politicians North and South in Ireland are trying to overcome. We are trying to create trust between the divided communities. We are trying to bring them together so that they can govern themselves together effectively and fairly.

Violence in your own cities - I need only mention the tragic bombing at La Guardia Airport in New York - has brought home to Americans the horror and futility involved. What we say with absolute conviction is that violence will help no one to bring Irishmen together - it only intensifies fears and deepens divisions.

The Irish in America have, like the Irish at home, followed with particular concern the pattern of violence - the random bombings, the hundreds of sectarian assassinations - and they know well this is not going to reconcile Irishmen of different traditions to each other.

6. Q. What about the U.S. Government? Is it doing all it could to help find a solution?

A. The U.S. Government is deeply concerned at the problem. It shares our view that no solution is going to be found outside Ireland. It is for Irishmen of all traditions to work out their own problems. If they don't, nothing your Government or any other Government can do is going to provide an answer.

We do know, of course, that the United States strongly supports political means and not violence as a means to a solution and this is very encouraging for those of us who are struggling in the political arena trying to

come to an agreement acceptable all round.

(Note: It is suggested that an answer similar to that contained in the first paragraph of the above suggested answer would be appropriate in dealing with questions on U.N. involvement).

7. Q. Are you satisfied that the U.S. authorities are making a good enough effort to control the flow of money for guns as well as the flow of guns?

A. I believe they are making every effort possible under your law to curb the flow of arms. There have been 13 prosecutions of cases of alleged gun-running and several convictions have been secured. We are of course deeply grateful for this as it can only save Irish lives. The control of funds is, I understand, more difficult under your law but again I believe the authorities are using your existing law to the full in this matter. I believe that some fund-raisers have been obliged to register under your Foreign Agents Registration Act, for example.

8. Q. The crisis has been going on for six years. 1,500 have been killed. In this country - from here - there seems no end to it. Do you see any solution?

A. It is easy to be discouraged about Northern Ireland. We have no right to be. There is too much at stake. The only solution that we see as likely to be feasible and effective is one based on partnership in government between the two communities of Northern Ireland. This is sometimes called "power-sharing" or "coalition". A solution involving this concept was in fact instituted in 1974 and lasted and worked well for five months. Unfortunately fear, distrust and ancient antipathies were played on by demagogues and men of violence and the power-sharing experiment was undermined and brought down. Our job since then has been to do everying in our power to rebuild trust to the point where the communities can come together again but this time on a more solid basis. We have been greatly encouraged by the change in the attitude of some people in the Unionist camp who show signs of support for the idea. It is in the majority Unionist Community that distrust of power-sharing has been deepest but we had news in the past month of a poll which indicated that two-thirds of that community favoured some form of inter-community government.

The United States, now the strongest country on earth, was once divided and, through reliance on laws and fair institutions rather than myths and shibboleths, it forged a deep and lasting union. It was a long process

requiring much patience. We must emulate you, and the people of Northern Ireland, who have suffered enormously in recent years, must now have our patience and our compassion and, if I may say so, yours too.

9. Q. But if no solution is found, is there not a real danger of civil war?

A. Yes, and that is why we must have a political solution. Once the political process is seen to have dried up, violent men will take over. These are small groups of men in both communities - Unionist and Nationalist - deeply fanatical and absolutely committed to violence, who actively want a civil war because they know that it is only in a situation of ungovernable chaos that they will have their way. They know the people have never supported them at the polls and never will.

This is an age in which people sometimes disparage politicians and the political process. The Irish people, no more than people elsewhere, do not regard their politicians as perfect but they prefer politicians to violence and that is why the obligation on us, the politicians, is so great at this time. We must keep the political process going.

10. Q, Let us suppose the worst happened and a civil war situation developed. It has been reported that your Government has decided not to intervene in Northern Ireland even if people were being killed by the thousand. Is this so? What would you do?

A. I appreciate the concern of many at this contingency arising. Obviously I cannot tell you what my Government would do in such a crisis, as to do so would only encourage fanatics on one side or the other - probably both - in Northern Ireland to precipitate a conflagration. All I will say is that you can be sure that the primary concern of the Irish Government would be, as it has been throughout this crisis, to save human lives, not to destroy them or place them in jeopardy.

11. Q. Some say that the British connection, the fact that Northern Ireland is part of the United Kingdom, is what is causing the trouble. If the British leave or commit themselves to leaving within a given time, would that not remove the irritant that has driven people to violence?

A. If it were, the solution to the problem would be simple. The British would go and our problems would be over. Alas the problem is much more complicated. We believe, as do the elected representatives of both communities in Northern Ireland, that if

the British leave or say they are going to leave, tensions will intensify dramatically. The blind forces of fear will cause both communities to consolidate their territorial defences against each other, a series of flash points will accumulate to a crisis and there will be real danger of bloodshed on a massive scale. We saw this recently in Beirut where several thousand died in a matter of weeks. The crisis of Northern Ireland has been simmering for several years and an explosion would probably be much more difficult to contain.

No, the British must stay at least until an agreed solution is found. Historically and constitutionally they are responsible for the problem. They cannot walk away from it.

12. Q. Do you see a united Ireland ever coming?

A. I am an Irish nationalist like most people in the Republic of Ireland. That is I hope that one day Ireland will be united - by agreement not by force. Unification by force would not be unity - it would be colonisation again and we Irishmen - most of us - suffered that for enough centuries to know it never works.

Europe is slowly but surely uniting. Borders are losing their significance. My belief is that once we can establish trust among

Irishmen and establish agreed fair institutions of government in Northern Ireland, the long-term common interests of North and South in Ireland will become overwhelmingly obvious to everyone on our island.

29.2.1976