

- (-

To: Monica Mc Williams.

From: Brendan Mc Allister.

mobile no.

0802 - 201370

Date: Wednesday 8 April, 1998.

Office: 438614.

Home: 01693-65946

Dear Monica,

Further to my fax this morning, I'm sending you some more thoughts.

- In the discussions which go on, it would be useful to have people articulate their BEST INTENTIONS in this situation. In separate interviews Trimble and Adams have said that they want the best for ALL the people. This infers a degree of generosity towards 'the other'. When people take issue with bits of the document or with things that 'the other' has said, they will be expressing something of their WORST FEARS. If the discussions become crippled on the rocks of worst fears, it may help to remind them of the best intentions which they have previously expressed to you (or to Mitchell's people or whosoever). Then, re-articulating the best intentions, you can re-start the process of creative thinking.

- The agreement must strike a balance between CLARITY and AMBIGUITY.

By the sounds of them today, the unionists need greater clarity on certain things.

However, if one uses an inclusive form of language both sides can interpret it differently.

Questions: what are the 'bits' about which there must be clarity? What are the bits which can be termed inclusively - with some ambiguity?

2

3. The co-habitation of conflicting dynamics.

The document will founder if it appears to bolt the door on the dynamic towards unity which republicans believe has been blocked for so long.

Similarly, it will founder if it appears to open the door and undermine the dynamic of the union which partition maintains.

In this respect, one should not attempt to RESOLVE this CONFLICT.

Rather one should try to MANAGE it, by allowing both dynamics to be set free in history so that each can prove their worth.

If republicans no longer feel oppressed by the unionist dynamic then it may thrive as never before.

If unionists no longer feel threatened by the republican dynamic, it can have a chance to prove itself to the future generations.

The document should have enough ambiguity or fluidity to let future generations decide things for themselves rather than our generation impose restrictions on them.

4. I heard David Grimble talk about the need to secure the future of the RUC.

It may be useful to distinguish between the requirement here and now to agree on the constitutional parameters (the 3 strands),

and the need for greater consensus about the institutions of state. Therefore, one could argue in favour of, for e.g., a commission on policing as an example of the institutional evolution which must (quite naturally) take place in the future. So, the term -

3

'the consensual evolution of policing' or the
'consensual evolution of prisons policy' may be of use
somewhere for you.

Monica, you might not have had time to
read this and it might be off the wall, but I hope these
thoughts at least support your thinking.

Give only a phone call away if you want
a chat - at any time of the day or night.

Best wishes to you and your colleagues on
behalf of us all.

Borden
x. x.