



## An Chartlann Náisiúnta National Archives

<b>Reference Code:</b>	2019/31/17
<b>Creator(s):</b>	Department of the Taoiseach
<b>Accession Conditions:</b>	Open
<b>Copyright:</b>	National Archives, Ireland. May only be reproduced with the written permission of the Director of the National Archives.



## Ulster Unionist Party PRESS RELEASE

cc PSM

PSs

Mrs Nally

Mrs Gallagher

Dr Mansergh

Counsellors

SPEECH BY THE RT HON J H MOLYNEAUX MP, TO THE  
ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ULSTER UNIONIST PARTY ON  
SATURDAY 21ST OCTOBER 1989, IN THE KILLYHEVLIN HOTEL,  
ENNISKILLEN.

DELIVERY TIME 12:00 NOON

STRICTLY NOT FOR PUBLICATION OR REFERENCE TO  
CONTENT BEFORE TIME OF DELIVERY

With a party machine based upon models of organisation designed by Unionists like Miss Cooper, both in Fermanagh and in some, but not all, of our Constituencies, we did well in two important elections this year. Sufficiently successful to spur us to greater victories, but not to breed complacency.

In this first half of the winter season I want you all to hold inquests into why we did not do even better.

I predict that you will discover that organisation was not uniformly good. That defect must be remedied before next spring.

The Party Executive will be invited to consider plans to assist Constituency Associations in our search for perfection.

Nothing less will do.

We have no right to expect the electorate to give support not earned. We will earn that support by relating more closely to the general public and to the needs of the general public.

We have at our disposal the necessary manpower and woman power.

We have -

ONE EEC MEMBER

NINE MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

ONE HUNDRED & NINETY FOUR ULSTER UNIONIST COUNCILLORS backed by a superb Officer Team, each with a separate role.

Throughout the Party there is an urge to start delivering the goods. We can leave it to others to reinforce failure while we exploit success.

After the fall of France in 1940 Churchill was incensed by doubts expressed by the enemy and friends of the enemy. His indignant response was "what kind of people do they think we are?"

In 1989 I have to ask the same rhetorical question and for the avoidance of doubt supply the answer. Part of the answer lies in our past and this year we have been conscious of anniversaries of the past - some of which are relevant to the question before us.

It has been said that anniversaries have a threefold function. First, they cause us to reflect on the past; secondly, they force us to take stock of the present; and thirdly, they provide an opportunity to discern, however faintly, the pattern of the future.

In 1989 we have celebrated the 300th anniversary of The Relief of the Maiden City of Londonderry. When the relief ships finally broke through, Ulstermen had demonstrated - not for the first time nor for the last, that surrender in the face of superior numbers was inconceivable; and that willpower could not be broken by any combination of intrigue and treachery. That rare quality has done much to sustain our race in all the challenges we have faced in the 300 years since the lifting of the siege.

The second anniversary has marked the 20 years since the army was committed to battle in Northern Ireland. That event had a high price tag attached in terms of death, human suffering and tragedy. The luxury of hindsight enables one to look back to 1969

and see that the then leaders of Unionism failed to counter the so-called Civil Rights Campaign because they had strayed from the fundamental Unionism of Carson. In 1921 he vehemently opposed any form of Home Rule and begged the House of Commons to govern all the citizens of Ulster, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, in the same way as all other British citizens. Unfortunately, by 1969 Unionism had become detached from these touchstones of political wisdom. Instead it appeared to offer unrecognisable variations of Carson's way and worse still shied away from a vigorous defence of its own peculiar products. Had Unionism remained true to Carson the flood waters of Civil Rights would have divided into two distinct streams: the genuine democrats and the closet Republicans. That is the Lesson of 1969 and all that.

This year will also see the Fourth Anniversary of the Anglo Irish Agreement which we were correct in identifying as the greatest political challenge yet.

The nature of that challenge can best be understood if we look briefly at the motives of the two main opponents of Ulster - Whitehall civil servants and the successive Dublin Governments.

The aim of certain civil servants in the NIO and the Foreign Office is a simple one: they seek to deprive the people of Northern Ireland of their British citizenship. That was the long term strategy of the designers of the Agreement headed by Robert Armstrong between 1983 and 1985 although Mrs Thatcher did put her foot through their drum on several occasions. The strategy was to deliberately exclude the interests of the people of Northern Ireland and blatantly reject their democratically expressed wishes. The hope being that Unionists would be jolted into abandoning the Union and even contemplating a United Ireland. Well, I have news for the Armstrongs of Whitehall. We can spot your nasty little games at a thousand yards with one eye closed! You may con your Dublin partners but you don't con us!

Their Dublin partners are simple souls by comparison. They steer a somewhat erratic course. One favourite pastime is a frenzied search for the white blackbird - the Ulster Protestant who is also an Irish Nationalist. They hark back to 1798 as if the political values of McCracken and Drennan still have some meaning. This eccentric game is often combined with an unwillingness to look Ulster Unionism squarely in the face.

Another favourite blood sport is baiting the Brits (meaning the English), blissfully unaware that Northerners suffer most from the effects of the fall out.

On occasion, they lend an ear to the Northern Ireland Office whisper that Unionists are being deceived and misled by their Leaders until an election proves otherwise.

The final ingredient in the "Space Cadet Cocktail" is indifference combined with occasional gestures to salve the political conscience.

What these two hostile groups have ignored is the continuing reality of Legal and Constitutional responsibility for Northern Ireland. This has been crystal clear since the Government of Ireland Act 1920.



Section 75 of that act reads: "The supreme authority of the Parliament of The United Kingdom shall remain unaffected and undiminished over all persons, matters and things in Northern Ireland and any part thereof".

That clear legal obligation - establishing as it does the legitimacy of Northern Ireland, is underpinned by the very character of our people. In the 18th century Ulstermen formed the backbone of Washington's Army in the American War Of Independence and men such as John Hancock and Charles Thompson played important roles in drafting the American Declaration Of Independence. Many tributes have been paid to them all but the best came from a beaten opponent who called them

"The most God-provoking democrates this side of hell".

Colourful language to modern ears but it tells us a lot about what kind of people they think we are.

We must repeatedly transmit that message to the Government and to Parliament. Whether as a majority or a minority we are democrats and we demand to be treated as democrats.

That and all else I have said demolishes the allegation that we represent entrenchment in a ditch of prejudice.

The fact that we have survived 20 years of terrorism and endured 20 years of shrunked responsibility by successive Governments, demonstrates an amazing capacity for flexibility and change, without which our society would have come apart long since.

We may have to endure further terrorism and political skulldugery but we have in our arsenal one weapon which no civil servant can sabotage.

The specification was described by the great Commander of the Confederate Forces in the American Civil War, General Robert E Lee. When asked

"What people make the best soldiers?"

He replied

"The Ulster Scots because they had all the dash of an Ulsterman, in taking a position and all the stubbornness of the Scots in holding it"

It's the ability to both attack and defend which will enable us to sustain and win the war of attrition against the Anglo Irish Agreement and speed its progress towards the dustbin of history.

In the decade when opposition parties and large sections of the news industry are only too eager to attack the Government on the failures of its policies, it is evident that one dismal policy failure is exempt from even the mildest criticism.

It is as if there was a corrupt conspiracy to accord to the Anglo Irish Agreement the status of the sacred cow of British politics and to regard even a breath of criticism as a crime more serious

on swearing in Church.

For example, British exasperation over the Father Ryan breach of faith is suppressed in case it should be taken as an admission that the Agreement is slightly flawed. For Geoffery Howe is it only a disappointment? The use of firmer language is banned in case it should encourage Unionists to believe they were right all along.

I have a word of advice for established politicians and the barons of the news industry. By lending themselves to such a corrupt cover up they are well on the way to discrediting themselves in the eyes of a disbelieving world which sees our two nations locked in a loveless marriage which has irretrievably broken down, which if not dissolved, will merely increase mutual hatred and endless friction.

As we approach the Fourth Anniversary of the signing of the Agreement, is it too much to suggest that the two Governments be invited to furnish even one morsel of evidence as proof that the Agreement is serving any useful purpose.

For the onus is not now on Unionists to prove the Agreement's failure - we don't need to.

The onus is upon its life support operators to prove its success.

If I were mechanically minded, I could design a machine and claim that it could -

Drain a field  
Plough a field  
Sow a field  
and Reap a field

I could claim that with a few optional extras it could be made to

Scare the birds  
Kill the weeds  
and Stone the crows

I could send a glossy brochure to every British Embassy throughout the world

I could brief, wine and dine and corrupt every editor and producer.

I could unveil the contraption on a Hillsborough lawn.

But my wondrous invention would be made a laughing stock by one Fermanagh farmer asking -

"Please can we see it working?"

The Anglo Irish contraption was unveiled four years ago. After a spell the contracting parties ceased to claim that it would deliver Peace, Stability and Reconciliation. For a time they pretended that their close relationship would achieve harmony in the fight against terrorism. But now even that claim has become a sick joke.

For their own credibility and for the common good they ought to be honest with each other and calmly decide to cut their losses and end the nightmare for all of us.

They should not deceive themselves over the position of our two Unionist Parties and the vast electorate behind us.

We are not on a hook from which we have to be rescued by some dishonest form of words.

We stand on solid rock and we have no intention of deserting that rock to wade towards a ship dead in the water and sinking under the weight of its shifted cargo.

Nor have we any intention of entering into discussion about any structures in line with the requirements of Article 4 of the Agreement. In the words of the Task Force Report -

"Unionists could not contemplate participation in any form of Devolved Government whose work and functions would be supervised and overseen by the Anglo Irish Conference."

We note that in the Review Paper the two Governments have provided for consideration of proposals which really would achieve the aims of Peace, Stability and Reconciliation. In January 1988 Mr Paisley and I handed such proposals to Mr King. We are convinced that our proposals, based as they are upon the policies of our two Parties for a new Agreement would succeed where the old one has failed.

But the two Governments must be left in no doubt about the process which alone will make movement possible.

First there must be a joint declaration that the two contracting Governments are prepared to consider an alternative: secondly, they have to openly and honestly suspend the working of the Conference and its Secretariat; thirdly, Her Majesty's Government will need to discuss firm ideas with the Constitutional Parties in Northern Ireland; and only if there is the certainty of agreement would it be appropriate for those Parties and the Secretary of State to come together to affix the seal of approval. But the process will fail if the steps are taken in reverse order.

One has to admit that this phased process may now be difficult given the deteriorating relationship between the two Governments, which results from the failure "to trap the Dublin Government into a structure which would compel them to complain in private but not in public" to quote one of the senior British designers of the Agreement.

Given the failure of that strategy, the Agreement is now actually damaging British-Irish relationships.

Friction is bound to increase as the Dublin team (lead by the Joint Chairmen) arrives to each meeting with yet more demands while the British team is bound by the Agreement to make determined efforts to resolve difference.

The ultimate in one way traffic.

That being the case, Her Majesty's Government has a responsibility to restore democracy to the people of Northern Ireland. They were elected to govern the United Kingdom and it has not been their practice to govern through negotiation with opposition Parties in Parliament. The Conservative Party is in the happy position of having its blueprint ready: decisively endorsed by the electorate in 1979; and now depending, for its implementation, upon the will of Conservative Ministers to impose Conservative policies upon the Northern Ireland Office - the one Department of State which has so far defied and obstructed the present Prime Minister.

The Conservative Government knows that Northern Ireland is entitled to normal legislation and to real powers for local government. They know where their duty lies - let them do their duty.

They know, too, where their duty lies in defending those United Kingdom citizens who live in Northern Ireland. They know because the Home Secretary told them earlier this year. He said: "No political solution will placate terrorists - they just have to be extirpated".

And let them permit the security forces to do theirs - free from all foreign dictation and interference.

We should not forget that Her Majesty's Government has a duty to support and defend Her Majesty's Forces because they are the instruments of Government and supply its cutting edge. No one must be allowed to blunt that edge through such devices as the campaign against the B Specials twenty years ago.

That smear campaign was successful because it targetted and singled out only one arm of the security forces. That is precisely why the Ulster Defence Regiment is being singled out, despite the fact that all elements of the forces have been smeared in exactly the same way. Even the most secret intelligence services have been accused of leaking information, but republicans are fighting desperately to keep the spotlight on the UDR.

And republicans are not alone.

Was it not strange that a Dublin source was able to boast to me on that Sunday morning that they had news of "a mass arrest of UDR men under the Prevention of Terrorism Act?"

Dublin told first so that the news could be greeted with "quiet satisfaction" in that capital. It smells - doesn't it? And doesn't it demolish all the earlier denials of joint authority?

An important resolution to be debated later rightly supports the Ulster Defence Regiment, and goes on to support all the Crown Forces. That ought to be our guideline in coming weeks as it has been in past weeks.

Do not let us play the enemy game of isolating any one of the Forces so they can be picked off in their turn.

Let no one tell you that terrorism and political instability will



● We ask our streets for another twenty years. World events will not wait for ditherers.

At last year's Conference the talking point was Europe 1992. Today that is old hat because no one can predict what the map of Europe will be like five years from now.

Will Germany be reunited? And what will be the effect of that on the EEC?

Can Eastern Europe remain divorced from the rest of the continent and remain shivering outside what Mrs Thatcher and Mr Gorbachev call "our European home"?

Can any known force resist the tidal wave of souls seeking freedom after fifty years in bondage?

What will be the effect upon our British nation? The detente between America and Russia has already caused a reappraisal of the special relationship between America and Britain. That means that Britishers will no longer be leant upon by an admittedly more benign big brother. In that sense we too will be liberated.

These movements of the political crust will have their effect on Ulster.

Mrs Thatcher recently quoted Abraham Lincoln who said:

"No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent!"

"That is the principle that lies at the heart of Parliamentary democracy."

Statesmen cannot demand democracy for Eastern Europe but deny it to a part of the Kingdom which gave birth to Parliamentary democracy.

It was with all that in mind that we took, as this year's battle cry - "The Party for the 90s."

It was no mere election gimmick. It is intended to remain as a ten year beacon - particularly for those who will live through the decade and into the twenty-first century.

Earlier I asked "what kind of people do they think we are?"

A far more important question is "what kind of people do we think we are?"

'Tennyson provides the answer:

"That which we are, we are;  
One equal temper of heroic hearts,  
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will  
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."