

NATIONAL ARCHIVES

IRELAND



Reference Code:	2014/32/1928
Creation Date(s):	8 November 1984
Extent and medium:	3 pages
Creator(s):	Department of Foreign Affairs
Access Conditions:	Open
Copyright:	National Archives, Ireland. May only be reproduced with the written permission of the Director of the National Archives.

SECRET

Meeting with PJ Mc Grory, 7 November, 1984.

I meet with PJ Mc Grory in the Law Society Club in Belfast on 7 November.

Mc Glinchey. He said the case against him is very weak, the forensic evidence resting on Mc Glinchey's fingerprints on the car believed to have been used by those who killed Mrs Mc Mullan. The owners of the car, a couple from the strongly Republican area of Bellaghy, had refused to attend as crown witnesses, probably because of a fear of reprisal. Likewise the owner of a van involved in the Ahogill killing which (wrongly in his view) was raised in Court by the prosecution. Mc Grory claims that had the three witnesses appeared in court it would not have benefitted the prosecution very much as the witnesses would have had difficulties proving that Mc Glinchey, who comes from Bellaghy, could not have touched their vehicles before they were stolen. He doesn't expect the RUC to prosecute the three because of their failure to appear. In addition the fingerprint on the car, is in his non-expert opinion, a poor print.

The core of the prosecution case rests therefore on the statements made by Mc Glinchey when in custody in our jurisdiction after the warrant had been issued for his arrest. This raises interesting precedents and it is Mc Grory's view that the balance of probability will result in Mc Glinchey's acquittal. It is possible, as happened with Gerry Adams, that he could be arraigned before Christmas (ie. have 'the charge read over to him in court) and that a judge, acting as a Grand Jury, could acquit him. It is more likely, however, that the verdict will await a trial in the New Year. Should Lord Lowry be the judge, and he thinks this quite likely, he would expect an acquittal. Mc Glinchey would then be asked if he wishes to be tried under the Criminal Law Jurisdiction (Amendment) Act 1976 or to be returned to the South for trial. Mc Grory has no doubt but that he would choose the latter.

Gilmour Mc Grory says that from the point of view of the prosecution Gilmour is an excellent witness, of the same quality as Black. Desmond Boal is trying very hard to break him but is unlikely to succeed. Mc Grory believes that Gilmour was coached in the Book of Evidence by the police for over a year.

Kirkpatrick is very different to Gilmour and Mc Grory believes he could crack, which of course is what Mc Grory is trying to do as he represents a number of the defendants in this case. If Kirkpatrick holds out then Mc Grory would expect that some of the defendants would get very heavy sentences. He has no doubt that some of them have committed very serious crimes and said that Mc Glinchey claims he won't associate with them. (Mc Grory doesn't necessarily believe this to be true).

Mc Grory, like other nationalists I have spoken to recently, is very concerned at the alienation in the minority community which he claims is continuing to increase and is reaching very serious proportions. He is worried that recent reports from London and Dublin would seem to indicate that the response from the British Government to the Forum Report could well be inadequate and delayed overlong. The forthcoming Summit will be important in this respect. He stressed, as he has in the past, that nationalists be satisfied with a system which is far short of a united Ireland. He also stressed that middle class Protestants would accept a far reaching political role for the Irish Government. Working class Protestants remain loyalist and it would require a politician of charisma to get them to change their views.

Mc Grory, whose ambience is Belfast which is distinct from the rest of Northern Ireland, thinks that the SDLP is close to splitting broadly along the lines of those who support Millon and those who support Hume. If progress is not clearly visible by February then the strains within the party will lead to its disintegration. A recent example was Pascal O'Hares' refusal to talk to Rhodes Boyson because the latter had refused to meet Sinn Fein Counsellors who serve on the same Council Sub-Committee as himself and with whom the SDLP, as well as the DUP, OUP and Alliance are prepared to sit during Council business. He said O'Hare told him that Hume had given him a roasting. O'Hare, however, knows that his constituents support what he did and that had he done otherwise it might well

have affected him adversely in the next election. (When I met in a hotel foyer with O'Hare the previous evening, he said he believed he had done the right thing. He was supported by Paddy O'Hanlon who added that Sinn Fein should have been invited to the Forum).

Mc Grory also repeated that it must be made clear to the Unionists that their guarantee is based on the consent of the nationalists to co-exist with them and is not an unlimited guarantee as they claim.

Mc Grory believes that the militarists in the IRA now dominate the Provisional movement and that those who favour political means have less influence than they ever had. Adam and Morrison now do what they are told to do. He thinks that the sections in Adam's speech to the Sinn Fein Ard Fheis which dealt with the Brighton bombing were put in by the militarists who now have the power to insist on such matters.

D O'Ceallaigh

8 November, 1984

c.c.'d PSM ✓
PSS ✓
Mr Lillis ✓
B O'Reilly ✓
A-I Section ✓
BOX ✓