



An Chartlann Náisiúnta **National Archives**

Reference Code:	2019/31/48
Creator(s):	Department of the Taoiseach
Accession Conditions:	Open
Copyright:	National Archives, Ireland. May only be reproduced with the written permission of the Director of the National Archives.

*my copy
This is of some
importance & should be
kept. Family reference for
Mr. Gallagher,*

*PST; PSUT
H. Meeley; PPS
H. Harburt; H. Flanagan
Carruthers A.L. T.B.R.*

*11.10.88
Dyghma
H.R. Loughrey*

*for
S25553
relevant
has
B.R. 11/10*

*No 10
7
No 18*

*Dyghma,
for NOS
10 7 18
please
CB*

1. Remarks by Peter Robinson, in an interview with John Hume on Radio Ulster on Sunday 8th October, are worth noting as representing what appears to be a developing sense of urgency among at least some Unionists about breaking the political impasse.

A transcript of the Robinson/Hume interview is attached. Noteworthy elements are:

- the emphasis on the need for politicians to show determination and urgency in unblocking the present political impasse (contrasting perhaps with Molyneaux's belief that time is on the Unionist's side);
- the apparent agreement with John Hume that it would be counter-productive for either side "to put forward their solutions or proposals first before they go into any talks" (i.e. that negotiations should begin on the basis of general rather than specific positions);
- the explicit acceptance that there are "three dimensions" to the Northern Ireland problem (relationships within Northern Ireland, within the island of Ireland and between Britain and Ireland);
- most importantly, the clear and repeated references to a package approach : "I have to say that in real terms the way forward will only be found by way of a package that embraces all three" (relationships). While Robinson asserts that the priority is to resolve relationships within Northern Ireland, he accepts that progress there will be dependent on a resolution of the other relationships and realistically, therefore, a package approach is the only viable one..... "Well I think you can take certainly the relationship within Northern Ireland as the starting point but I am not sure how far you get down that road before you have to

bring other relationships along with it and nothing will be agreed until all three are agreed so it is a case of bringing all along together.

- the acceptance that new political structures in Northern Ireland, to be viable, must enjoy the support of all sections of the community; and
 - continued emphasis on the fact that Unionists will not come to the Conference table under pressure (of the Anglo-Irish Agreement), and a call for a "gesture" to be made towards the Unionist leadership to enable them to get to the Conference table.
3. It is difficult to know what significance to attach to these comments. There are obvious questions about Robinson's representivity and power base as well as doubts as to what he has in mind in acknowledging the crucial North/South relationship? Nevertheless, his comments can only be regarded as encouraging in going some way towards establishing the atmosphere in which political progress might be possible.

Anne Anderson
11 October 1989

w3716

INTERVIEW WITH MR. JOHN HUME, LEADER OF THE SDLP AND

MR. PETER ROBINSON, DUP'S DEPUTY LEADER.

RADIO ULSTER, "NEWSBREAK", 8 OCTOBER 1989

Conor Bradford: The murder by terrorists this morning of a senior RUC officer in Lisburn and, indeed, the whole security leaks issue which produced today the arrest of 28 members of the Ulster Defence Regiment in connection with the Stevens inquiry, surely underlines yet again the need for an acceptable political settlement here which would give the community the peace and stability that has eluded it for so long. So given those events this morning, it is perhaps particularly appropriate that we can bring you this afternoon a rare event in local broadcasting. For on this Sunday Newsbreak, we have brought together face-to-face two senior Northern Ireland politicians representing each side of the political divide whose views and attitudes are considered by many to be crucial to the achievement of any political progress in the Province. They are the SDLP leader, John Hume, MP, and member of the European Parliament and the DUP's Deputy leader, Peter Robinson, MP, and we have set aside the entire programme to enable them to come together to talk about their views on the way forward at a time of continued political deadlock twenty years after the outbreak of the present cycle of violence. When they came into our studio yesterday evening I began by asking them both: Did they think that they, and their respective sections of the community, have mellowed given all the turmoil and death of the past two decades? First, John Hume.

J.H.: Well I suppose the truthful answer to that is I don't know and I suppose there is the assumption in the question that if I had mellowed I must have been intransigent. I would think that my view of the problem and approach to it has been reasonably consistent but others think differently. I think that over that twenty year period and particularly with all that this community has suffered, I think there is a deep realisation among the people that, in fact, the answer to the problem of a divided community isn't victory for one side over another and through those twenty years, of course, peoples' view of the world has been changing as well because we are part of the bigger world now with Europe etc, etc. People recognise that every society in the world has got deep differences in it but that the essence of their stability

is the acceptance of their diversity and difference in not pushing difference to the point of division.

C.B.: By saying mellowed, I suppose I meant by that in a way a desire to arrive at some form of compromise. Peter Robinson, do you wish to reach a compromise?

P.R.: Well I don't think that any politician in Northern Ireland from any section of the community has acted perfectly over the past twenty years and it would be absurd to suggest that any of us, if we had to go through it again, we would do exactly the same things as we did before. I think that the main change that there is in the climate of opinion in Northern Ireland is a recognition on the part of most people that unless we approach the whole area of finding a solution with much more determination then we are going to have another twenty and I think having lived through twenty years of instability and violence is, in itself, the impetus for those of us who are around in this generation to ensure that the next generation doesn't have to go through it as we have and I don't think for any politician there could be any more urgent need than the need to get stability in a community that so clearly is divided. I indicated on an occasion last week that I don't believe that the answer to the divisions that exist in Northern Ireland is to try and melt everybody down and remould them. I think we will have to recognise that there are differences in culture and identity and to try and get structures that allow those differences so that at least we have structures where we can come to arrangements.

C.B.: Now you are really getting down to the nitty-gritty of it. We are talking about setting out the stall and you both have different stalls to set out. We talk about structures there can we get into that. What are your requirements, what is on your stall at the moment?

P.R.: Well I think that there are two matters which affect people most and the first issue is clearly that of security, the ability of people to go about their daily business and to enjoy that most basic of human rights is the right to life and there is the constitutional issue, the issue of having structures that will allow a society to exist in a stable way. I don't think that you can divorce those two factors. I think they are tied together though the inability to reach any satisfactory conclusion on one should not

stop us in trying to make progress on the other. As far as a structure that would allow us to have a stable society in Northern Ireland is concerned, I think there are certain basic criteria that we have to consider. First of all is the reality that the vast majority of people in Northern Ireland wish to remain a part of the United Kingdom and, therefore, if any structure is set up that does not allow them to enjoy that which they believe to be their right then clearly it is not going to last. The next is that it must be a democratic structure. It must be able to respond to the views of people as expressed at the ballot box. At the same time, we recognise in the kind of society we have in Northern Ireland that it must be a structure that can enjoy the support of all sections of our community that people can identify with. For if they do identify with it then they will rail against anybody who attempts to bring it back and those who will bring it down, not only through political means, but those who would attempt to bring it down through military means.

C.B.: We are talking in general terms so far. John Hume do you agree so far with what Peter Robinson said?

J.H.: Well I agree with most of what Peter Robinson said in the sense that when he says we have to accept that in a divided society such as this that the solutions must be based on the acceptance of difference and on creating structures which respect difference. That is so self-evident today. It hasn't always been self-evident in Northern Ireland but as I have said already the essence of stability in every country in the world, every democratic country, that is, of course is the acceptance of difference and diversity. If you don't accept that, and if you push difference to the point of division, you have conflict. It is how you arrive at the stage where in fact we have structures that do genuinely respect our differences. That's the real difficulty and that's where politics comes in and that's what politics should be about because we are about trying to create the structures that will accommodate our differences and I think that we should have a long, hard look at how we do that and I have been proposing that we go about it in a sort of a reverse way from the past. In the past, we didn't discuss the principles or the realities that have underlined any solutions to this problem. We came forward with our solutions and we know what they all are. We have power-sharing, devolution, Irish unity and now the new one - integration. We have all those. But if we start off by stating our

solutions, we will be sure of repeating our experiences of the past; that we will not reach agreement on structures whereby we can respect the differences. Instead of talking about solutions, let's agree that we are going to meet to talk about the problem for a change and let's simply define the problem and let's agree also that before we go to the table we won't announce what we are going to put on the table. We will announce that we are going to discuss the problem and that we will define the problem as human relationships and as resolving the conflict of human relationships that exist and I would define three sets of relationships where I would be open to any other suggestions that have to be resolved. The first being the relationship that exists here between the two sections of the community in Northern Ireland, the relationship within the island of Ireland and the relationship between Britain and Ireland. Those are the three sets of relationships that have to be resolved. In my view, they have to be resolved to everybody's satisfaction and I see that this is where I think there might be some disagreement.

C.B.: Which one do you resolve first?

J.H.: That's the question. I see the central relationship is the relationship between the unionist people and the rest of Ireland and the reason I see that is that my analysis of why we have failed up to now is the lack of a relationship, or the lack of an agreed relationship, between the unionist people and the rest of Ireland. Or to put it even more strongly, unionist distrust of the rest of the people of Ireland. If you look at Northern Ireland, Northern Ireland in itself was set up because of that distrust in the first place. Secondly, the old Stormont failed because of that distrust because that was the distrust that led to unionist attitudes to the minority in Northern Ireland. Power-sharing was brought down on the same basis because they didn't like our link with the South, so I conclude from all that as a serious politician looking for a solution, and until that relationship is sorted out, not to my satisfaction, but to the satisfaction of the unionist people as well as everybody else, then nothing is going to be stable or nothing is going to work.

C.B.: Peter Robinson, do you believe that its the relationship of the people within Northern Ireland that has got to be worked out first. Given the failure rate up to now to reach any sort of agreement, why have you any

confidence that this can be done before you move on to the other areas that John Hume has been talking about?

P.R.: Well let me deal with a number of the matters that John Hume has been talking about. First of all, I think that there would be general agreement within the unionist community with a view that for either political side of our equation to put forward their solution or proposals first before they go into any talks is a recipe for ensuring that their proposals will never be accepted and I am inclined to believe that within the unionist community the position taken by the two unionist leaders is the correct one; to have proposals, to indicate to the Government the genuine nature of those proposals but to hold back from submitting those proposals until there is a table in which they can be part of the general discussion and negotiation. So we are agreed on that. I am quite happy indeed that the unionist proposals which have been submitted by the two unionist leaders recognise what has been described as the three dimensions. The most important in my view is a relationship within Northern Ireland. I contend that the main problem isn't a problem between the Irish Republic and the United Kingdom. The main problem isn't one between the Irish Republic and the North of Ireland but the main problem, the one that affects our lives most, is the relationship between the sections of the community in Northern Ireland and therefore I have to declare it to be the priority and I think that if you can move down the road towards settling that all the other relationships will fit in much easier though I have to say that in real terms the way forward will only be found by a way of a package that embraces all three. I don't see that if we go down the road and say we are going to sort out No. 1 that we will be able to do it because I think that people will say well that's o.k. as far as No. 1 is concerned but that depends on what happens in NO. 2 or No. 3. So I think it is by way of a package.

C.B.: What, sets of parallel talks between, say yourself and the SDLP, or yourself and the Irish Government, or something along those lines?

P.R.: Well I think you can take certainly the relationship within Northern Ireland as the starting point but I am not sure how far you get down that road before you have to bring other relationships along with it and nothing will be agreed until all three are agreed so it is a case of bringing all along together.

J.H.: I wouldn't disagree with that at all. I have already said that the agenda should be the three sets of relationships. What I did say was that I saw one of the relationships as central and I gave the reasons why that was so because first of all whenever Northern Ireland was being run then, since then we have been talking since 72, talking different times about how to run it again and each time we have floundered, I believe, on the same rock, the rock of distrust in the South. Therefore, that is the reason why I suggest that until that is sorted out, I would want to emphasise and this is extremely important, when I say sorted out, I mean to mutual satisfaction and I don't mean to our satisfaction and in order to demonstrate that we mean that I have proposed and my party has proposed that before we enter into any such dialogue about such an agreement, which is essentially an agreement as to how we share this island piece of earth together to our mutual satisfaction, that any agreement reached has to be endorsed by both the people in the North and the people in the South and the majority of each part and if either side says no, it is not on. I think the strength of that is that it meets the unionist suspicion that my suggestion about sorting that relationship is some sort of take-over bid because it assures them that they have to say yes to it and from a nationalist republican point of view it has quite enormous strength that any agreement reached on how we live together or any institutions that we set up would have total legitimacy because we would have the total support of everybody.

C.B.: Is that an acceptable condition, Peter Robinson?

P.R.: Well there was a preliminary comment that I want to take up before I move to that aspect and it also related to the earlier discussion that we were having. As far as the three relationships are concerned, it has been argued, very strongly argued, particularly by Dr. Paisley, and the sense of it will become immediately obvious that it is very difficult to work out what your relationship should be with the Irish Republic because it is clearly a relationship between a new structure in Northern Ireland and the structure that exists in the Irish Republic. It is very hard to work that out until you know what these structures are going to be and those are some of the practical difficulties that we have to face up to but the point that is made and is being made repeatedly is that unionists have to sort out their relationship with the Government of the Irish Republic. I have indicated on previous occasions, I emphasise it again today, that unionists have a right

to feel as if they are threatened, they have a right to distrust the Irish Republic from the point of view that they see Articles 2 and 3 of the Constitution of the Irish Republic as being threatening to them. I don't think anyone could argue that it would appear otherwise because we have articles which are claiming jurisdiction over Northern Ireland and that obviously is an obstacle on the way to having good relationship and cooperation with the Irish Republic and I have indicated that if the Irish Republic were to tackle that and to make suitable amendments to their Constitution that it would transform the situation in Northern Ireland and the relationships between people in Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic.

C.B.: John Hume, I know you said in the past that if one was going to be making big steps forward then maybe the whole Constitution would be up for change and therefore to tinker with the present one is unnecessary but given that gestures are necessary, wouldn't it be possible?

J.H.: Well I think let's come back to what we both said earlier. Let's not ask anybody before we get to the table to give anything or to suggest what the final outcome is going to be. Let's agree before we get to the table that we are going to talk about the problem but it seems to me to be pretty logical that what I have been proposing that if, in fact, suppose it all happened, suppose we did reach agreement on how to share and live together on this island, and that was endorsed by the people in the North and the people in the South. Quite clearly that has consequences for Constitutional matters North and South. It is quite clear it has got Constitutional consequences and in fairness to the parties in the South both the present Government and the opposition parties have made clear time out of number that in the context of any new relationship or new agreement that would emerge, it will be quite happy to look at the possibility even of an entirely new Constitution. So what I am really saying is that we can bring up the issues now which concerns us and Peter has just brought one up which concerns him, I could bring one up that concerns me but what I am really saying is that wait until we can get to the table and we will put them all on the table and I am also saying that I think that that table is going to last quite a while. I think there will be days when we will walk out in anger but I think that we should agree before we go there in the first place that when that happens we will agree in advance that we will walk ⁱⁿ the next day because I think it is going to take its time but if there is a genuine will and the force for that will should be

what Peter Robinson has already said - any politician who wants to repeat the last twenty years doesn't really care about the people in this part of the world. Can we not build on this island institutions which allow us to grow together at our own speed?

P.R.: As far as the referendum issue is concerned in relation to the result of any negotiations that may take place, I think that undoubtedly as far as the internal structures of Northern Ireland are concerned it does copper-fasten those structures if it is upheld by the people of Northern Ireland. In relation to the Irish Republic having a referendum whether on the same day or on any other about a package, well naturally whatever the Irish Republic puts to its people is largely its business. I think where I become slightly concerned, though I recognise that if there is to be any change constitutionally in the Irish Republic, or if there is a relationship between Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic that needs to be endorsed by its people, clearly they would want to do that by a referendum. Where I have some difficulty is that if the people of Northern Ireland decide and approve in favour of a package, that is agreed between their politicians from both sides of our community and it does not meet with a favourable response in the Irish Republic and I think it is unlikely that that would happen but it seems to me that it would be ludicrous that we are agreed on the way forward that we simply don't go down that road because the Irish Republic has voted against us and, therefore, there is a difficulty when our internal structures in Northern Ireland would be subject to the view of those outside if we were not reworking those internal structures.

C.B.: Wouldn't it be helpful if the Irish Government did back up the agreement which was made here, wouldn't that be an endorsement?

J.H.: Well there is another factor in that. Peter has already talked about what he described as the identity of the unionist people. Other people have an identity as well. It is the accommodation of those that matter.

C.B.: Well are you prepared to let unionists be unionists?

J.H.: What I am saying to unionists, and I am quite serious about what I am proposing, then there is no way that I can define for them that they are. They must define who they are themselves and if I am serious about

accommodating difference, I can't start saying that you are really this, you are not really that. They must come to the table with their own definition, their own ethos about what they wish to preserve the text to develop and we must do the same. The challenge to t

in other words that we both agree that we mean it when we say that the stability we are trying to create is going to be based on the acceptance of diversity and we are going to spend time trying to create the institutions that will reflect that.

C.B.: So people listening to this now and maybe reading reports about it in the newspapers are they to be led to understand that you would allow unionists to remain unionists within this new solution.

J.H.: Sorry I haven't come to a solution. You misunderstand me. I am saying that I am not allowing because that's an arrogant word. I have to respect whatever they come to the table with as their basic fundamental ethos to be protected. It is up to them to do that. It is not up to me to do that and it is up to me to represent what I have to represent and I noticed a remark that Peter Robinson said the other day with which I agree very profoundly which I think goes to the heart of the matter is that if you need to destroy another tradition in order to preserve your own then what that means is that you have no real faith in your own and of course that is one of the things that's wrong with the people who are running around this community with guns. One of the real things to be said about them is that they have no real belief in their own tradition or no real confidence in it because they think in order to convince someone else

P.R.: I don't want to go back to the introductory question and my comments in relation to it but I come back to the fact whether anybody else in Northern Ireland or outside it likes it or not, I am a Protestant and a unionist and I am a loyalist. Nothing is going to change that. No bit of paper whether signed in Hillsborough or anywhere else will change that. No agreement in the future will change that. I am what I am and there are hundreds of thousands like me and we are here and here to stay and it's us as we are that you have to deal with, not something that you would like us to be. And I think if we accept that reality and try to work within the realities that exist in Northern Ireland, we are more likely to come to a solution rather than redefining for ourselves what we want others to be.

C.B.: One does detect quite a positive constructive atmosphere so if you are talking in here now, why can't a date not be set for talks about talks?

P.R.: I have to tell you that one essential in having productive negotiations is to ensure that everybody comes freely to the Conference table and they are free at the Conference table to negotiate. As things stand, we have the representatives of the nationalists, except that John Hume is the main representative for the nationalist community in Northern Ireland and his argument, if I can put it in synopsis, is that he is prepared to talk here and now with the Anglo-Irish Agreement in place. The unionist leadership is saying that that is a cage around us. It is a restraint on our negotiating ability and we want to have a suspension of the working of the Anglo-Irish Agreement so that we might be free to participate in negotiations. I happen to think that's reasonable and that a gesture should be made towards the unionist leadership in getting that kind of conference table which would ensure that they were free to negotiate and they didn't have to negotiate themselves out of the Anglo-Irish Agreement before they negotiated themselves into something else. More than anybody else, I believe John Hume should accept and respect that because, maybe history repeats itself in odd ways in Northern Ireland, but he in fact found himself in exactly the same position around the period 1982. Unionists were involved in the Assembly. They didn't particularly like the Assembly structure but they worked it and they cooperated with the Government within the Northern Ireland Assembly and I can recall the day and daily getting to the dispatch box at Stormont and pleading with the SDLP to come in and to talk to us about ways forward as far as devolution was concerned. The answers came back very clearly. We have a manifesto commitment which says that we can't come in to the Assembly. Our next step was to plead with them to meet us outside the Assembly and that it would be without prejudice to the manifesto position and again the answer came back that they didn't believe that the structure that then existed was a structure in which proper progress could be made. So we almost have a reverse of that at the present time.

C.B.: It's the Anglo-Irish Agreement that is the sticky point and there is no give on either side on this absolutely critical issue.

J.H.: Well first of all I think that our past is littered with legislation that I don't like and the people I represent don't like. In fact the

Assembly that Peter talks about is still on the statute book and could be reactivated tomorrow. We haven't made a precondition of anything that the legislation be tore up and that the Agreement be tore up but what we have always tried to do is do something better and what we would say in response to that precondition that Peter Robinson has laid down is first of all we have already engaged in talks, together with the unionist leaders. We are talking now in public about this matter. What is wrong about talking seriously about it. We have talked together and gone together to the Prime Minister about, for example, the shipyard. If we can talk about it, I didn't suggest that that represented a daily departure if we can talk about jobs we can talk about matters of life and death but also in order to, if you want, respect their sensitivities on the matter, let us simply declare at the beginning that this is without prejudice. We all accept that this is without prejudice to the different parties views about the Anglo-Irish Agreement. Let us also declare at the beginning, that the objective of all of this is an agreement in which would transcend in importance any previous agreement ever made and I think that that would be a realistic and reasonable way of meeting the unionists on their attitude to that particular matter.

C.B.: So that would then supercede the Anglo-Irish Agreement and make it redundant?

J.H.: What I am saying is that it would be far more important than any previous agreement ever made if, in fact, unionists would sit down with our selves and sit down with Dublin and if we were to reach an agreement as to how to live together and share this island it would be endorsed by the people North and South, I wouldn't be worried about any previous agreements ever made, I can tell you that.

P.R.: (Bit missed) there would be those who would be parties to any negotiations in the future, should have as their goal achieving the maximum degree of responsibility to elected representatives in Northern Ireland and to do it in a manner that is likely to get the greatest degree of support within Northern Ireland. I think if we start looking at various heads of Government and how we might deal with what the prospects are as a result of it we will find ourselves in much greater difficulty than we presently are. I hope that any future Government in Northern Ireland will have responsibility for security. I recognise that under the Anglo-Irish

Agreement they would not be allowed that, by and large, that it would still remain the function of the Intergovernmental Conference. I recognise also that the clear view of the British Government is that they should retain control over security but the aspiration of any elected representative in Northern Ireland should be to have a government in Northern Ireland that has the greatest degree of responsibility over this piece of earth and I don't think that that is something anybody else in Northern Ireland will be particularly concerned about accept those who believe that putting our trust in people who have betrayed us in the past, those who cut our health service and increase our mortgage rates is the best way for a happy future.

J.H.: On the subject of security, my view repeatedly has been and it wouldn't diverge from what Peter has just said in this sense that security in every society in the world, every democratic society, is based on agreement on how you are governed and once you have that then all the institutions, particularly the institutions of order in the courts, the police, our institutions, that's everybody's institutions, where you live in a divided society, where you have disagreement on how you are governed, then you get into the us and them and you get into the sort of security problems that we spent a lot of our time over the past few weeks talking about. But if we actually reach agreement on how we live together and how we are going to govern ourselves then we have actually solved the underlying security problem because we will have created for the first time identity of the entire society with the institutions of order. But that is not going to be easy ...

C.B.: It seems to me Peter Robinson you might have more in common with John Hume than many members of the British Government whom you feel in many respects have been the sort of friends you can do without?

P.R.: Well I think there will always be difficulties with any Government and the unionist community and as much as the Government has often pandered to blocks outside of Northern Ireland who have an international sway that the unionist representations never had and I think that in that sense unionists have always felt vulnerable and maybe that's part of the identity crisis that unionists have had in the past. I only want to say this to you that in relation to the future of Northern Ireland and how we might make progress in Northern Ireland, I happen to believe that it is best done through devolutionary structures. I don't believe that going off towards the model

Tory ~~Ethiopia~~ is going to do our people. I think it is a great danger and as much as it makes people believe that these are easy ways of dealing with our problems in Northern Ireland - almost to bypass the difficulties and divisions that exist and certainly as far as I am concerned I want more responsibility to people in Northern Ireland rather than people in Northern Ireland being governed by people who don't get any votes in this country at all.

C.B.: We have just got a couple of minutes left, what I was driving at there is that the atmosphere in the studio seems to be one of mutual respect that you have with John Hume and Peter Robinson together is that a correct analysis and if it if the chemistry is right the dialogue can begin?

J.H.: Well what I would say is that if I don't respect the people with whom I differ in a society, who have a different tradition than me, that's obvious, if I don't respect that I have no chance of ever solving this problem and the vice-versa is the case if I am saying as I have been saying for a long time the acceptance of diversity is the basis of stability. Then I must mean what I say. I must accept that diversity. That must be based into respect of other tradition, must be based, and Peter Robinson said this in a speech earlier in the week, it must be based on equality of treatment of individual human beings. It must be based on a genuine civil and religious liberty which has been a slogan which has dominated this society for a long time but has never in fact being put into practice. Respect must mean real respect and if we do have that I don't have any doubt that we would be able to build the institutions that would accommodate the differences.

C.B.: Of course there are only two parties represented here. Peter Robinson, the Ulster Unionist Party is actually the largest unionist party would they go along with what you are saying, to carry them with you?

P.R.: Well I don't think it is a case of carrying them with me. The two unionist leaders and their policy ^{groups} ~~grips~~ have agreed together a way forward. A very broad spectrum of unionism is agreed on the way forward. They have suggested to the Secretary of State an outline on how we might move forward so it is not a case of the two unionist parties having to go in different ways or having to prove one along with the other. We are agreed in the approach and the general approach that I have outlined is the view of the

unionist leadership so I am happy that I don't have to drag anybody along. We are going along together.

C.B.: Talking about respect from a personal point of view you can only talk about yourself. Do you respect John Hume? Can you do business with him?

P.R.: Well I am going back to a speech I made during the course of last week. I have a much higher estimation for those who have even a directly opposite view from my own rather than those wishy-washy-washy possessors of the middle ground who tried to understand everybody but end up believing nothing and I much prefer, I suppose it is the Ulster way, to have people who have stated clearly where they stand, who fight for their cause even if that cause is different from the one I hold myself.