

6 July 1996,

Professor Paul Power,  


USA.

Dear Professor Power,

Thank you for your letter, and my apologies for the delay in replying, but I have been very taken up with the elections and subsequent talks, and my correspondence has fallen behind.

You ask a number of important questions.

Firstly, the easy ones about the Alliance position. Detailed papers are available from our Internet page on <http://www.unite.net/customers/alliance/> but I can briefly answer as follows:

Alliance has long proposed (since early 1970's) that the removal of the constitutional claim of jurisdiction in Articles 2 & 3 and their replacement by an *aspiration* to a United Ireland.

On *de-commissioning* we proposed the establishment of an International Body to supervise de-commissioning of weapons parallel to the process of negotiations. Our proposal for an International Body was well in advance of the agreement by the two government to invite George Mitchell and his two colleagues to take up the task.

We believe that the Sinn Fein admission to the three-stranded talks should be dependent only on a commitment to the so-called *Mitchell Principles*, but this would in its nature require an IRA cease-fire.

We believe that a political settlement must involve:

1. A Regional Power-sharing Government in Northern Ireland, with a Bill of Rights and other protections for minorities.
2. Northern Ireland remaining within the United Kingdom until a majority of the people decide otherwise.
3. North-South cooperation being institutionalized through structures which could have considerable influence, but must be democratically accountable to the Assembly in the North and the

Dail in the South. The term 'executive powers' is too indefinite. It raises excessive hopes and fears by its lack of clarity.

In respect of the *'Hume/Adams document'*, I would strongly advise you to read the recently published book *'The Fight for Peace'*, by E Mallie and D McKittrick, (1996) Heinemann, London. This charts the series of drafts of this 'document'. It is a complex matter, with carefully crafted nuances, but the essential difference between the two documents is that while the Downing Street Declaration clearly recognizes the right of Northern Ireland to exist, and the requirement of the consent of the people of Northern Ireland to any constitutional changes, the Hume-Adams approach is an All-Ireland one, whose purpose is clearly to create the structures and dynamic to remove Northern Ireland from the United Kingdom, and requiring the active, energetic and publicly stated commitment of the British Government to achieve it. This does **not** represent a recognition of partition by Sinn Fein. It is the construction of a new political strategy by Sinn Fein to achieve its ends. The book made one key mistake however. It published an IRA document called the TUAS document, and described it as the Totally Unarmed Strategy document. This is incorrect. It is properly called the Tactical Use of the Armed Strategy document. The breach of the cease-fire demonstrates this very clearly, and this serious error has recently been corrected by Ed Maloney in the Sunday Tribune newspaper.

As you correctly note Mr Adams steers away from any references which show his true position. The rejection of the Downing Street Declaration and the Draft Report of the Forum for Peace and Reconciliation in Dublin, demonstrate quite clearly that he and his movement have **not** accepted the 'revisionist' position, but are simply adding a new strategy to the traditional one. There is now a skillful, and for the unwary, very deceptive use of language by Sinn Fein. I explored these matters extensively with Sinn Fein in the Forum in Dublin and elsewhere, and have never seen any evidence that there was an acceptance of the position you describe as revisionist.

I hope that this is of help. Do not hesitate to get in touch if I can be of further assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Dr John Alderdice  
PARTY LEADER