14 November 1993,

Roel Kaptein, Staringstraat 20, HENGELO 7552LA, Netherlands.

Dear Roel,

Thank you very much for your letter. Unfortunately I think that we will not be able to meet on 7 December. It looks as though I will have to attend a psychiatry meeting in London about the training I do in Belfast. My apologies about this, but perhaps we can keep in touch by letters and telephone.

I have read your paper. Some of it I like very much. I was struck by the analysis of the Articles 2 & 3 issue. You may well be right about this. I find it quite persuasive.

The consequences - that Britain and Ireland must free themselves of their fascination with each other, and that the people of Northern Ireland are the scapegoat - I of course agree.

The solution is however a judgement of Solomon.... cut the child in two, and each shall have half of it. I do not like this solution. What happens when two people who cannot live together decide to separate? Do notthe children live with one parent, but (in the best circumstances) keep a good contact with the other, and when the child grows up and becomes independent, it can then build whatever relationships it chooses.

If you ask me what I think of joint sovereignty, I would say to you that I would much rather have a United Ireland. Then at least I would have a part in my own future. [In any case every inhabitant of Northern Ireland already has the choice to be a citizen of Ireland or Britain, or both, since we all have the right to have either, or indeed both passports, as Brian Keenan (an east Belfast protestant) did in Beirut, and indeed it helped to save him!]

I think that the underlying assumption in your proposition is about Ireland being one people. Is this true? Or is it the case that it only ever was 'one' when under Britain?

What do you think?

Yours 'aye

ROEL KAPTEIN.

7552LA HENGELO. 10.11.93.

Staringstraat 20.

Dear John,

During a meeting of our conflict-team we talked a little bit about the articles 2 and 3 of the Irish Constitution. As a result I wrote a small paper, of which I send you a copy with this letter. Our phantasy was to send it to Dublin, to Reynolds or to Strong.

This version is, of course, a very first one. Everything can be changed. And if the idea is on second sight no good anyway, we simply stop with it.

So, please:

1. Read it carefully and make up your mind if it is worthwhile to pursue it further.

2.If so, which remarks, comments, criticisms, propositions you have?

3.Consider, if we send it, who should do it? There are of course several options:

--We send it, as the conflict-team.

-I send it as a private person.

-You send it, either as a private person or as the leader of the Alliance Party. Please consider this possibility very carefully. I agree of course wholly if you would like to do so.

All the best! I wish you space, freedom, joy, amidst of all the work and havoc. Let me please as soon as possible know about December 7th.

Love and greetings for Joan and for you,



(157) THE ARTICLES TWO AND THREE OF THE

CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND.

I.Some weeks ago, just after the explosion of the bomb in Shankil Road, which killed nine people, the Rev.Dr.lan Paisley commented that the Republic of Ireland should abolish the articles 2 and 3 of its Constitution. He put, that in doing this the Republic would take away, both for the Roman Catholic and the Protestant terrorists, the legitimation of their violence. The IRA would not any longer be able to invoke these articles to legitimise its violence. The UFF would not any longer be able to legitimate its resistance against the claim, formalised in these articles.

The reasonintg is clear and probably right. Of course this doesnot mean that terrorism in Northern Ireland would be over if the Republic only would retract these articles. The violence could even become worse if nothing else is done, because the Roman Catholic population of Northern Ireland generally and the IRA especially could feel again more betrayed. If only that was done, it could be a confirmation of their worst suspicions.

1. The articles 2 and 3 of the Constitution were only inserted in 1 937. They were not the beginning, but the end of a process. They were a clear sign that the actual striving for the incorporation of Northern Ireland into the Republic was given up and that, instead of this real commitment, a rhetorical, a pathetical declaration was inserted into the Constitution. It was stated formally in a highly official and ritual manner, in the Constitution of the Republic itself, that Northern Ireland belonged to the Republic of Ireland, but is was in the same time clear that it only had a Platonic relevance: It is true, ideologically it is a fact, but we won’t do anything to change this claim into a reality.
2. When this is the case, then these articles bring the Roman Catholics in Northern Ireland in a double bind: The Republic does wish them, clearly, and doesnot wish them, obviously. The country which is representing their own culture, to which they belong, is deeply ambivalent towards them, making them themselves, necessariliy, deeply ambivalent, both towards this country and towards their own culture. This means that the ambivalences, which characterise the whole situation of all groups in Northern Ireland, is again deepened in a very substantial manner. 1
3. Ambivalences towards the own culture are foundational for all terrorism. Without these
4. These ambivalences in which both Roman Catholics and Protestants are in and which have invaded all the relationships both are in, included their relationships with each other, are very clear. Those of the Unionist are elaborated in paper 022: Double Binds and Paradoxes of the unionists, dd. 30.01.1989. Those of both groups in paper 117: Ethnocentrism in Northern Ireland, dd.14.03.1992.
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ambivalences terrorism simply doesnot occur.2 Because of that, the articles 2 and 3 of the Constitution of the Republic, showing the ambivalence of the Republic and consequently deepening, if not even causing, those of the Roman Catholics in Northern Ireland, give not only both te IRA and the UFF the legimitation of their violence. Much more hidden they are (one of) the most important cause(s) of that violence. They provoke terrorism, because they make the Roman Catholics in Northern Ireland unsure about their identity.

1. Terrorism always is a consequence of very deep insecurities about the own culture. These are, for the Roman Catholics, if not initialised than in any case deepened by the ambivalence of the Republic towards them. Exactly the same is the case with the Protestants in their relationship with the UK. Originally they were already driven out of their country, during the Planations and their aftermaths. Nowadays the UK is at least as ambivalent towards the Protestants in Northern Ireland as the Republic is towards the Roman Catholics. Because of the relationship it has with the Protestants and their culture, the UK is, as the Republic is for Roman Catholic terrorism, an, if not the, origin of Protestant (counter-)terrorism in the country.

6.It is clear that both groups in Northern Ireland are scapegoated. The Roman Catholics are scapegoated by the Republic, which always is half-hearted, in the end betraying them as we always do with our scapegoats. The UK is doing exactly the same with the Protestants, for whom it is, historically and politically, deeply responsible. We always have scapegoats because we cannot cope with our situation. We put the blame, the responsibility for our difficulties and failures on weaker ones, in this case the inhabitants of Northern Ireland. They, both groups, are especially, for both the Republic and for the UK, the scapegoats for their own, long, extremely complicated and in fact very deep relationship with each other. The UK and the Republic are deeply fascinated by each other. Every fascination is full of violence. The deeper the fascination, the more violence is around. This violence is by both the UK and the Republic of Ireland, exported to and perpetrated by Northern Irish people. They execute the violence of the Irish-British relationship, of the two not in- but inter­dependent countries.

7.It follows that there are at least two consequences:

7.1 .There only is a possibility for peace in Northern Ireland if there comes peace between the Republic of Ireland and the UK, when these two countries are freed out of the fascination for each other, with all the violence going alomg with it, and come into a real relationship. This means asking for and giving each other forgiveness for all things done to each other, especially but certainly not alone done by the English to the Irish, from the Xllth century till to-day.3

7.2.Scapegoats always are people, are human beings. It is not a country. The difficulties in and about Northern Ireland finally are not about a country and about to whom that country belongs. They are about the people living in Northern Irland, who are in a very deep sense

1. This made clear in paper 117, mentioned in foornote 1.
2. Giving each other forgiveness means accepting each other in each other’s life, forgetting, existentially, about the past, thus creating a new reality, in which both are freely and trusting together. Giving and accepting forgiveness is an existential movement, together, into a new life, a new world.
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the victims of the inability of the UK and the Republic of Ireland to free themselves from the fascination, and thus from the violence, which was for such a long time and clearly still is between them.

1. Thus, as things have developed, there only is one real possibility for a new future for everybody involved: When the UK and the Republic of Ireland really find peace together, by asking and giving forgiveness, thus freeing themselves from the necessity of having scapegoats in common and if, as a consequence of that, they can recognise the inhabitants of Northern Ireland as people to whom they belong and for whom they both, together, are responsible, then peace will come and, automatically, terrorism will end, because the very possibilities of terrorism are taken away.

8.If this only real conditions is fulfilled, then there are possibilities, e.g.:

8.1 .Northern Ireland becomes a condominium of the both states, as long as they themselves still are separate countries.

1. Every inhabitant of Northern Ireland gets the opportunity and possibility to choose, either to be an Irish or a British citizen. The choice is wholly free, for everybody.
2. They all partake in the forgiving, going on between the UK and the Republic of Ireland, asking each other and giving each other, groups and people separately as far as necessary, in the manner in which they are together or, eventually, with the very words, forgiveness for the past, making each other free of the past, freeing each other from the fascinations and the violence.
3. Doing this the inhabitants of Northern Ireland give each other the possibility of a way forward together. They start from the actual situation, seeking a way of justice for all. Old claims can in that process be honored or given up, age old old injustices and hatred can be forgotten.
4. AII live together in one country, for which they are responsible and which they together gouvern, belonging, in some manner, in the same time both to the Republic of Ireland and to the UK.

9.Of course this is a very rough outline. Nevertheless, this certainly can be a way to go, towards a better future, not only for the inhabitants of Northern Ireland, but for everyone on the British Isles.

Hengelo. 10.11.93.

Roel Kaptein.
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