



An Chartlann Náisiúnta
National Archives

Reference Code: 2021/47/83

Creator(s): Department of Foreign Affairs

Accession Conditions: Open

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

PA-Parades.

PA
D.C.

Confidential

Question of meeting between RUC officer and
a member of the UDA

Background Note

1. On 26 June, a UVF paramilitary (Brian 'Herbie' McCallum) from the Shankill seriously injured himself and a number of other people with his own grenade. The explosion took place on the edge of Loyalist territory during a rerouted Orange parade to the Whiterock Orange Hall in West Belfast. A pistol, believed to have been used previously in attacks against nationalists, was reportedly recovered by the RUC. The UVF subsequently confirmed that a number of its members had been positioned along the route of the parade, armed with automatic weapons and grenades "to protect the community", and that McCallum's grenade had exploded prematurely. The import of the UVF statement would appear to be that the UVF was equipped and prepared to attack nationalists.
2. McCallum died on 29 June and his funeral, which was reportedly attended by several Unionist politicians, took place on Friday 2 July. That evening, localised rioting, orchestrated it seems by the UDA, occurred in Loyalist areas of North and West Belfast. The following evening, disturbances occurred in Loyalist areas of South Belfast, particularly the Village, Donegall Pass and Sandy Row areas. Disturbances were also reported in Portadown, Bangor and Carrickfergus. There were no fatalities during the weekend's disturbances, and damage was mainly to property within Loyalist areas. Unionist politicians have sought to use these events to play up the notion of "Loyalist alienation".

3. In West Belfast on Saturday 3 July, local Loyalist Councillors and Dr. Ian Paisley reportedly met the RUC and the UDA concerning the disturbances there. Media reports, which the UDA sought to confirm, alleged that the RUC entered into discussion with a local UDA representative in a house in the Shankill. It appears to be uncontested that a UDA representative was present at the house in question. (According to nationalist contacts of ours, his name is believed to be McDonald). While the events as reported suggest that Dr. Paisley and the Councillors may have been brokering some sort of arrangement to defuse tensions between the RUC and the UDA, the RUC deny that they entered into any deal or understanding with the UDA representative. The RUC state also that, once the presence of this individual became known to them, the RUC officers present indicated that they would not enter into discussions with him. (Text of the RUC statement in the matter, issued on 6 July, is attached).

Dr.

Anglo-Irish Division
7 July, 1993

A779

7 July 1993

PA

To Belfast from HQ

For Shane O' Riordain from D. Kelleher

RUC statement on question of meeting with UDA member

Grateful if you would obtain and send us as soon as possible text of the RUC statement, which is widely referred to in today's media, on the question of the alleged meeting in the Shankill.

PA - USA
- Parnodes.

PA - Paisley
- Security Policy
- uDA

RUC Statement of 6 July 1993

Arising from allegations which have appeared in the news media, the RUC wishes to make the following statement.

There was no deal, no agreement, no understanding between the RUC and any paramilitary person or organisation. No such action would ever be contemplated by the RUC nor did it happen. Furthermore, there was no question of the RUC using Unionist Councillors and Intermediaries with a loyalist paramilitary organisation or person in order to halt the weekend violence.

The facts are as follows:

On Saturday last, a local DUP Councillor indicated that the Rev. Dr. Ian Paisley, M.P. wished to meet Police on the Shankill to discuss the situation. This meeting was agreed to and in the event it took place at the Councillor's home. A number of Councillors were present, together with Rev. Dr. Paisley. An RUC Superintendent and a Chief Inspector attended. Those present discussed the situation. It was made clear by the RUC that the Police would continue to take such action as was necessary to deal with the violence.

During the course of the meeting, a man from the area arrived at the house. Because of his background, the Superintendent immediately made it clear that in no circumstances would the Police have any discussion with this man. The Chief Inspector left the room and the man was informed that there would be no discussion with him. The man complained to the Chief Inspector in heated tones about Police activity in the area.

There was no question, as has been suggested, of a sit-down discussion with this man in the kitchen of the house. It was a brief stand-up encounter and the man then left. The Police had no foreknowledge whatsoever that this man would arrive at the house. They most certainly would not have been present

had they known in advance that there was any likelihood of such an encounter.

Throughout the week-end, and since, the Police continued to do their duty. Arrests were made at the time and a vigorous investigation is taking place with the intention of bringing to justice those responsible for the week-end violence. Insofar as loyalist terrorism is concerned, the pursuit of people responsible for murder and other serious crimes could never be construed as harassment.

It is the inescapable duty of the Police to do that duty impartially, without fear or favour, and that the RUC will continue to do.

There will be no let-up by the RUC in bringing terrorists to justice, whoever they may be.

A778