

Secret.



Political movement: key questions.

Northern Ireland Office
Stormont Castle
Belfast BT4 3ST
Telephone Belfast 63011

37

- Motivation of debate within Provisional movement - sense of opportunity or fear of being marginalised? ^{Electoral considerations?} How far is this debate a function of questions about British policy?
- What would happen if they were told 'no deal' - long term recession to violence or still stronger motivation to change in future?
- What are their minimum aims? ^{and how (if at all) have these changed} would political legitimacy in the South alone be enough?
- What could Adam deliver? How could we assess this? How much residual violence would we have to expect?
- are there any other ways we can encourage the process of a further speech?
- What is proposed in the Ume/Adams scheme? Over what time frame? What specific commitments/pacts would be required from Ume/Adams? ^{on what time frame? Where would direct contact/ gestures or mission fit in to this scheme? Agreement to direct contact a precondition}
- What is envisaged as happening to the Govt of NI should some rationalised convention take place? Is this (i) topically (ii) politically compatible with pursuit of the Broeze initiative?
- does whole process depend on acceptance of a nationalist agenda? To what degree? Is this politically conceivable for any of it genuinely involves an end to violence? ^(in respect both of the Protestant community and GB opinion)
- What is our bottom line - change by consent alone, acceptance in practice of continuation of Union for the foreseeable future etc? Would Provisionals be able to live with this? ^{encompass both initiatives?}
- Can the full agenda and ours be reconciled to ^{involvement of SF in NC} ^{and other}
- What would our position be on involvement of SF in NC political process (bearing in mind need to keep Unionists on board)?
- Where would double referendums - concept fit in to what is now proposed
- ~~What would we get~~ - what role is envisaged for both movements? How far would they look to us for at least tacit support? How would the political credit for ending violence be shared?
- if direct contact is regarded as essential by them before termination of violence, can we see a way to square the circle: simultaneity; although they appear ill-matched?

V23/11