

CONFIDENTIAL

204

804  
21  
CENT SEC

FROM: PS/SECRETARY OF STATE  
21 JANUARY 1993

ASST  
SEC 25 JAN 1993  
MM  
CENT 654/1 SEC

cc: PS/Secretary of State (L&B) - B  
PS/Mr Hanley (L&B, DENI) - B/M  
~~PS/Mr Fell~~ - B  
Mr Thomas - B  
Mr Williams - B  
Mr Bell - B  
Mr Cooke - B  
Mr D J R Hill - B  
Mr Maccabe - B  
Mr Brooker - B  
HMA Dublin - B  
Mr Archer, RID, FCO - B

UNDER/ SEC 749/1  
21 JAN 1993  
CENT SEC

PS/PUS - B

PEACE ENVOY - US AMBASSADOR TO DUBLIN

a new ~~ambassador~~  
in Dublin

The Secretary of State has seen the PUS's note of 18 January and very much agrees with the PUS's analysis that an Ambassador to Dublin with some sort of all-Ireland remit would be far more difficult to cope with than a special envoy.

Ms Murphy

2. That said, he is conscious that we could hardly object to a decision to appoint a higher powered Ambassador to Dublin than the present incumbent nor to his/her having a legitimate interest in a process designed to create a "new beginning in relationships" between, among other things Dublin and Belfast and Dublin and London.

ms 40

SIGNED

W R FITTALL  
PS/SECRETARY OF STATE  
OAB EXTN 6462  
21 JANUARY 1993

CONFIDENTIAL

SOFS/16184/CAO



CONFIDENTIAL

MJW/10/93/sh

FROM: M J WILLIAMS  
US(POL)

20 January 1992

ASST  
SEC 25 JAN 1993  
CENT 668/1 SEC

785  
778/1  
UNDER/ SEC  
22 JAN 1993  
CENT SEC

cc PS/SofS (L&B) - B  
PS/Mr Hanley (L,B&DENI) - B  
PS/Mr Fell - B  
Mr Thomas - B  
Mr Bell - B  
Mr Cooke - B  
Mr D J R Hill - B  
Mr Maccabe - B  
Mr Brooker - B  
HMA, Dublin - B  
Mr Archer - B

PUS (L&B) - B

PEACE ENVOY - US AMBASSADOR TO DUBLIN

There was a brief discussion this morning at Mr Thomas' Anglo-Irish Planning Group meeting on the VCR of your minute of 18 January, which I regret I had not received at the time.

2. As I see it, coming new to the subject, the two serious drawbacks about the proposal for a "peace envoy" are that all the running for it in the United States has been made by the Irish Lobby, with the implication that whoever was appointed would be primarily sympathetic to the objective of a united Ireland; and that the arrival of a peace envoy would seriously disrupt whatever talks process we were engaged in at the time. However if we were able to persuade the President to appoint someone who was genuinely neutral on the issue of Northern Ireland, and if he could be persuaded not to appoint anybody at all as long as the Talks were still in play (and these may be very big ifs indeed) then perhaps the appointment, if unwelcome, might at least be manageable. It might even enable us to make some progress with general opinion in the United States, which at the moment is probably still too much in the pocket of the Irish Lobby.

3. However I agree entirely with your comment that it is not acceptable that the new US Ambassador to Dublin might serve also in some way as the "Peace Envoy". The person chosen for the Ambassadorship in Dublin would inevitably be someone sympathetic to the Irish point of view; he would doubtless expect to be involved in Northern Ireland throughout the four (perhaps eight) years of his appointment; and finally, and most damningly of all as far as unionist opinion is concerned, it would look as though the Americans



CONFIDENTIAL

are appointing an Ambassador to the 32 counties, rather than to the Republic alone. The Irish Government might however not find the proposition as difficult as we do; they might quite enjoy the idea that the US Ambassador in Dublin had some kind of watching responsibility in relation to Northern Ireland.

4. I am not at all sure that the extent of our concern on this issue would be fully understood in Washington. I believe we need to get the message across as soon as possible. The new Clinton administration will be positively flooded with requests, petitions and proposals for action of all kinds. Accordingly I suggest that RID should consult our Embassy in Washington about the most effective means of putting our concerns across to the new administration.

[signed MJW]

M J WILLIAMS  
Ext 2507



CONFIDENTIAL

FROM: PUS  
18 JANUARY 1993

ASST  
SEC 21 JAN 1993  
CENT 594/1 SEC

HEAD OF THE H.I.  
20 JAN 1993  
628

cc. PS/Secretary of State (L&B) - B  
PS/Mr Hanley (L,B&DENI) - B  
PS/Mr Fall - B  
Mr Thomas - B  
Mr Bell - B  
Mr Cooke - B  
Mr D J R Hill - B  
Mr Maccabe - B  
Mr Brooker - B  
HMA Dublin - B  
Mr Archer, RID, FCO - B

1. cc Mr Hanley  
2. Mr Hanley

20 JAN 1993  
CENT SEC

MR WILLIAMS - B

Ms Murphy

cc Mr Watkins

PEACE ENVOY - US AMBASSADOR TO DUBLIN

I have been reflecting over the weekend, in the light of the London, Dublin and Belfast press and subsequently of discussion with Dr Maurice Hayes, on the possibility of the Clinton Administration's peace envoy commitment being displaced by the appointment of a high profile US Ambassador to Dublin with some sort of remit to engage on the North/South set of issues.

2. I should welcome comments and advice in case we feel there is a message to be put to our Washington Embassy about this. The more I think about it the more uncomfortable I become. While a "peace envoy" has substantial disadvantages (both in terms of creating difficulties for HMG, and in terms of Unionist reaction) there are ways in which a one-off emissary could be made acceptable if his garments were suitably designed and his script well written. The one-off emissary, or even the economic envoy bearing gifts, could, as we have told ourselves already, be accommodated.

3. But what I find much more difficult is the notion of a US Ambassador to Dublin who is given some sort of remit to address what, viewed from London and Belfast, are essentially United Kingdom issues where the US Ambassador to London, if anybody, has the locus. I simply do not believe it would be possible to contain the impact of the US Ambassador to Dublin venturing into Northern Ireland on a regular footing and claiming the attention of Ministers and local politicians as if his Dublin accreditation lent him some status here.

CONFIDENTIAL

JEN/B/1/18/34091



C O N F I D E N T I A L

4. I do not doubt that the US Embassy in London, and the Irish Government would take a similar view to ourselves but I worry a bit lest the Clinton Administration might dash into this without full understanding of what is implied. A US Ambassador to a 32 county Ireland is something so fundamentally unacceptable that unless we can be sure that is well understood in Washington (and Little Rock) we ought perhaps to sound the alarm about it. I wonder what you think.

Signed:

J A CHILCOT

18 JANUARY 1993

C O N F I D E N T I A L

JEN/B/1/18/34091