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NEWS BITS by Kathy Regan

Anti-apartheid campaigner Archbishop Desmond Tutu warned in Dublin last night against excluding any group from the Brooke talks. The archbishop, preaching at Christchurch Cathedral near the end of a 10-day visit to Ireland, said in apparent reference to Sinn Fein, that people could “kiss goodbye to peace” if any group were left out. (The Cork Examiner 4/15/91).

The Royal Commission to investigate the case of the Birmingham Six: “The galling thing for the judiciary is not that they jailed the wrong men, but that the cat was let out of the bag. The important thing for them now is not to ensure that there is no repeat of such travesties, but to ensure that their tarnished reputation is restored...If the case of the Birmingham Six is not a watertight argument against extradition, then what is?” (Andersonstown News 3/23/91).

A Dublin based peace and justice group, Northern Witness, composed of several religious congregations demonstrated outside the British Embassy in Dublin to mark the release of the Birmingham Six and to call for renewed pressure to be placed on the British authorities to consider other potential “prison victims” including the Armagh Four and the Casement Accused. (Andersonstown News 3/23/91).

A St. Patrick’s Day parade from the [Belfast] City Hall to Casement Park was banned by the RUC because no parade could start from the City Hall although the Boys Brigade will do so later this month. Additionally, a Women’s Day march was banned because it was fronted by a banner with the words “International Women’s Day” in Irish. The RUC said the banner was “offensive and likely to lead to a breach of the peace”. (Andersonstown News 3/16/91). Aren’t the huge Orange parades which regularly go through the city center also offensive? The problem is that they are offensive to the “wrong people”...Despite the fact that over 92% of the RUC officers are from the Protestant community, the majority probably don’t care whether or not nationalists march to Belfast City Hall...However, upholding the unwritten edict that nationalists don’t demonstrate below the hallowed dome of City Hall is part of their role. (Andersonstown News 3/16/91).

On April 23, more than 50 members of the various organizations working for peace and justice in Northern Ireland travelled to Washington, DC to lobby Congressional support for the Joe Doherty Amicus Brief drafted by Congressman Tom Manton and Senator Christopher Dodd. Participants visited the offices of every member of the US Senate and House. This successful lobbying effort was organized by Patricia James, PEC Washington, DC representative...The Irish Hunger Strike commemoration activities, the Cruise, Mass, Procession and Rally, which took place on May 4-5, were a major success. The World Yaeth cruise drew a capacity crowd of almost 1700 people. (AIN-PEC 3/8/91).

The Ulster Unionist Party has issued a statement that its aim in the upcoming talks will be to dilute those aspects of the Anglo-Irish Agreement which gives Dublin a say in the international affairs of Northern Ireland. (Irish Post, 4/20/91)

POLITICAL VETTING IN THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND by Sandy Carlson in Ireland

The Cork, Ireland, Between organization claims it is the victim of British-instigated Irish-government political vetting. Between has provided holidays for Northern Irish women and children--both loyalist and nationalist--for the past 20 years. Throughout this time, Between has made pronouncements on behalf of Irish civilians brutalized by British security forces. Its June 1989 publication highlighting such abuses, “Cry from the Heart”, was the impetus of the Dublin’s vetting campaign. The leaflet’s 4 stories concern innocent civilians brutalized by the British army. Between believes the vetting campaign emanated from British sources because the abuses documented were British government abuses.

During his 1990 visit to the U.S., Between’s secretary learned that the “Irish Government was very displeased” over the document. He also learned that when representatives of the International Fund for Ireland (IFI) went to Brussels for EC funding in early 1990, a senior British official produced the document as reason for rejecting Between’s grant application.

A series of events which began in 1990 support Between’s belief that the Dublin government complies with British-government vetting. One such event was the Britain-based Lawlor Foundation’s advising Between that it had been approached by outside sources which alleged Between was engaged in “political” activities and was therefore ineligible for funds.

The IFI, which had been “sympathetically considering” Between’s application for 3 1/2 years, rejected the application in May 1990 for no clearly stated reason.

In August 1990, the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs cut by half Between’s 20,000 pound grant, after it had assured the secretary that the full amount would be forthcoming.

Then, on 21 December 1990, the EC Commission withdrew its funding on the grounds that, after examining the document, “some doubts have been raised within the Commission regarding the impartiality of your organisation.” This, in spite of the fact that three times in 1990 Irish Minister for Foreign Affairs Gerard Collins assured Between, in the context of this document, that “representations you have made about the behavior of the security forces in Northern Ireland have no bearing whatsoever on the grant allocation to Between.”

Between foresaw the obstruction they would face in official response to its protests against British security forces’ abuses against innocent Irish civilians. However, not until the organization received the EC Commission’s letter stating that the document was the cause of funding withdrawal did it begin to address the issue of the Irish government’s political vetting. Since early February, Between has invested all its time in publicizing their case.

All members are asked to support Between in its work to provide vacations for hard-pressed nationalist and loyalist women and children by writing a letter in support of Between. Turn to Action Request #1 on page 6.
The solution to the civil and human rights struggle in Northern Ireland is simple enough, but it will require honesty and courage on the part of the British government.

The British government must accept the fact that Northern Ireland is not a democracy. It is an illegally held colony partitioned in 1920 from the rest of Ireland against the wishes of 80% (eighty percent) of all Ireland's citizens. This is the root cause of all the “troubles”. Britain must take immediate steps to insure that Northern Ireland quickly becomes a democracy.

The current talks in Northern Ireland offer the British government the best opportunity they will ever have for an honorable solution. If the Loyalists power-brokers say “no” to total equality for their Nationalist fellow countrymen, which we believe will happen (we hope we are wrong), Britain will have every right to wash its hands of the whole situation and declare its intent to withdraw. People of good-will world-wide will support Britain in such a move. Futhermore, such an honorable decision would not be seen as a victory for the IRA.

If this is the case Britain must make it unmistakably clear to all concerned that it will withdraw. Both the Loyalist and Nationalist communities, the Irish government and the churches of Northern Ireland will then have to deal with a reality – a United Ireland. They will be forced to work together for the betterment of all the people of Ireland.

Who would gain from a United Ireland? Everyone. Why? Because Ireland's people, of all religious backgrounds, for the first time, will be allowed to live and work together in peace. Together they can build a strong and prosperous nation.

Who would lose from a United Ireland? A small group of greedy power-brokers who have kept Ireland's people divided.

With its reputation as a “defender of freedom and democracy” Britain has the right and the responsibility to dictate policy to the Loyalist community as they have so often dictated policy to the Nationalist community. Those who oppose equal rights must be seen as a victory for the IRA.

The solution to the civil and human rights struggle in Northern Ireland will then have to deal with a reality – a United Ireland. That United Ireland is the solution.

ACTION REQUEST #2 Offensive Situations

by Kevin P. Murphy, Massachusetts

Member John Whelan advises us that Long Island's (New York) Newsday on March 15th urged all American Irish to shun Irish nationalism. American supporters of peace and justice in Ireland residing in Long Island have long complained about Newsday's pro-British, anti-Irish bias. Some people call it "England's Voice In Long Island". Now they can do something about it! Don't buy it. Instead, buy the new newspaper being founded in Long Island. Member Theresa Slevin of Queens, NY informed us of a March 14 editorial cartoon in The Bayside Times of Queens which depicted a drunken leprechaun stating "I lost me parade". Concerned community members wrote letters to the editor. A similar situation occurred in Long Island, New York. Member Bill Thomas, a member of the NYC Fire Department Emerald Society, organized a letter-writing campaign to Coors Brewing Company in protest of their St. Patrick's Day advertising.

Illinois member Mrs. John Armstrong informed us of an article in the Evergreen Park Courier by staff writer Bill Corcoran suggesting that British PM John Major should launch a massive air attack on Ireland. The article also indirectly suggested that the Irish have not done anything for America or for America's military.

ALL MEMBERS ARE URGED TO CONTACT: Mr. Gerald Gibbons, Editor, Evergreen Park Courier, 3840 W 147 Street, Midlothian, Il 60445 or call (708) 388-2425. In your letter protest Mr. Corcoran's suggestions that the British bomb Ireland and that the Irish have contributed nothing to America. Suggest further that Corcoran's column be discontinued.

A final note: Massachusetts member John G. Creedley informed us that a guest on the March 12 Larry King radio show, Jim Bohanan, alluded that the word Irish should be associated with terrorism.

SEND ALL OFFENSIVE SITUATIONS TO: Kevin P. Murphy, PO Box 8895, JFK Kennedy Station, Boston, MA 02114.
The British government said on two recent occasions that it has no strategic or economic interest in staying in Ireland. But I heard this from British officials (Ministry of Defence and other departments) in 1972. At a conference in Oxford at a time when we thought it useful to discuss with British officials they assured us they had no interest, military or strategic in staying in Ireland.

The day they said that to us in Oxford was Bloody Sunday, when in order to stay in Ireland their troops (under the Ministry of Defence) shot down unarmed civilians in Derry, killing 14 of them.

We learned two lessons -- that you should never believe a British official and that the power within the British system is shared between different pillars of their society, the monarchy and nobility, the military, the state church, the big corporations and last of all parliament, and all of them jostle each other for position. It is an undemocratic system. While the ministry of defence may say one thing, that does not mean the soldiers are saying the same thing, and in the end the soldiers' policy may well win.

We had it all before. In 1912-14 "Curragh Mutiny" in which British soldiers refused to carry out the wishes of the British government; 1974 when soldiers refused to uphold the power sharing Executive in the north of Ireland; Bloody Sunday when they showed who made the decisions to kill Irish citizens. British soldiers can and do make themselves unavailable to their own government and the government has to give in. But not only in Ireland. In Palestine when the British set up a military government there the military had a different policy from the foreign office in London. They acted independently. In this case however the foreign office in London won, and replaced the military with a civil government.

The lesson that you do not believe British officials proved valuable many times. The lesson that the British government has to please the bishops, the rich landowners and the soldiers is being proved true over and over. And it may be proved again when the British government tries to cobble together an arrangement for the future government of the north of Ireland. The government does not yet know if the soldiers will agree. And if they don't....?

Already a soldier named Wilsey has said that in the aftermath of the Gulf War (he thinks the British won it) it was not likely that the British army would allow itself to be "beaten by a crowd of thugs and gangsters". Much the usual stuff but this time we understand better what it means. The British army recognizaeas it cannot militarily defeat the IRA. Will it be content then to leave Ireland with the stain of losing out to the IRA while appearing to win against Hussein in the Gulf? Of course not. The military will not quietly withdraw from Ireland just because either the Irish or their own government want them to. Either they will impose their will on the British government or they will withdraw in a trail of blood. That is what Wilsey is saying (and he appears to be the soldier in charge at this time). If they cannot get their way politically at least they will show who is boss when it comes to killing. This apparently is how the military "thinking" goes. So we have a problem which all the blandness of Northern Ireland Secretary Peter Brooke and the bluster of politicians will not obfuscate: how does an undemocratic and militarist regime curb its own soldiery?

Perhaps the British government should consult the nearest friendly military dictatorship to find out? Or call in United Nations troops?
The Irish saw themselves as political prisoners, even though transported on criminal charges. This was true after the United Irish Rising of 1798. The English believed that the Irish populace was tamed and cowed by the savage repression, the bloody massacres, the portable wheeled gallows, and the hundreds of dead left hanging for months in every county. Juries were then encouraged to indict for property damages, a criminal charge, instead of treason, so that sentences could be commuted to transportation. Many were shipped to Australia without a trial. About 70% of the more than a thousand transported in the wake of the '98 Rising were really political offenders.

The penal colony governors, for their part, paid no heed to the custom of giving more lenient treatment to political prisoners. They considered these rebels the most dangerous. The United Irish, with their intelligence and leadership abilities, were seen as a threat to order in a colony in which 60% of the Irish who came before them were also literate and possessed of initiative. Prisoners might get favorable treatment if they were properly subservient, or better still, were informers.

In 1800 informers reported seditious meetings. The examining magistrate, Rev. Samuel Marsden, an Evangelical Anglican who hated the Irish, held the same kind of mock trials held in Ireland. He found no evidence, but sentenced 9 men to be flogged and 18 to be transported to the infamous colony of Norfolk Island. One man was sentenced to 500 lashes. After he was bound to a tree, two guards, one left-handed and one right-handed, used flails with metal knots. Blood, skin, flesh, and splinters of bone fell from him at alternate strokes. The smiling and sadistic English doctor took his pulse several times and said: “This man will tire you before he fails. Go on!”

Among the United Irish convict arrivals in 1799 were two Catholic priests, Rev. James Dixon and Rev. James Harold, and a Protestant minister, Rev. Henry Fulton. In 1800 Rev. Peter O’Neil arrived. Back in Ireland Rev. O’Neil refused to give names of United Irishmen that it was though he knew from the confessional. He was given 275 lashes with wired cat-o’nine-tails and transported without trial. With three priests in the colony, the Irish petitioned to have Mass said. They were unsuccessful for three years. During that time Rev. Harold was banished to Norfolk Island and Rev. O’Neil, though the intercession of friends in Ireland, was permitted to return home. The governor finally granted permission for monthly Mass in May 1803. This privilege was removed the following year after an insurrection, but restored sporadically. Not until 1820 was Mass said again. Meantime, although 90% of the Irish were Catholics, prisoners were punished if they did not attend Anglican services.

This is only the beginning of the history of the Irish in Australia. The story goes on with the convict death ships on which sometimes 40% died; with Michael O’Dwyer and his companions who came in 1806 and found their surrender terms ignored; with the Catholic and Protestant Young Irelanders of 1848, some of whom, such as Thomas Francis Meagher and John Mitchel, escaped to the United States; with the Fenians in 1867 in western Australia and the subsequent daring rescue of six of them in 1876 by American Fenians.

It is also the story of free Irish coming in the 1840’s and 1850’s for land grants and gold. Convicts anticipating emancipation and free settlers, wrote home asking families and friends to join them in what seemed to be a land of opportunity far away from the heavy hand of the crown. Some did return to Ireland or go to the Americas, but most stayed and became Australians. Australia owes much to the Irish, many of whom started as convicts, who cleared and built the country, and whose descendants give an Irish flavor to the “Land Down Under.”
THE TIME IS NOW
....for AIPEC to have a professional presence in Washington, DC.

Washington, DC is not only the Nation's Capital, but also an international city. It is the center of activity for media and communication services, Congressional action and political and policy-making organizations.

Washington, DC is the center of American power and influence! Many ethnic groups maintain Washington offices, some of them are heavily staffed and well-financed. The more effective ethnic groups have many distinct lobby groups. There are numerous organizations there representing the interests of Jewish-Americans, Arab-Americans and Black-Americans. The National Council of La Raza (Hispanic) has grown from virtually nothing to a staff of fifty and a budget of 4 million dollars in just over twenty years. Polish-Americans and Italian-Americans also have fully-staffed offices. By no means must we overlook the British who have recently opened a Northern Ireland office of Information in Washington. American supporters of Irish justice only have one full-time operation in Washington, DC.

The PEC has established an effective letter-writing network of members and supporters throughout the United States. Much of the mail generated through this network is directed to powerful political and media people with offices in Washington, DC. But we are often unable to follow-up on these opportunities. Doesn't it make sense that AIPEC have a professional presence in Washington, DC for the purpose of informing our national leaders and influential media people, and for networking with and informing other human rights oriented organizations?

In unity,
John J. Finucane, National President

WE WANT TO KNOW WHAT YOU THINK!!!

Please answer the questions below and return to: AIPEC, Malloy, Stony Point, NY 10980 or call (914) 947-2726. (To avoid damage to your newsletter, make a copy of this page for answering or write your answers on a piece of paper. Be sure to include your name, address and phone #.)

1. Should the PEC establish a professional lobbying presence in Washington, D.C.?
   Yes [  ] No [  ]

2. Would you make a special annual donation to support a professional lobbying presence?
   Yes [  ] No [  ]
   If yes, how much of a donation (approximately)? $ _______

3. Would you help AIPEC raise funds to support an AIPEC office in Washington, DC?
   Yes [  ] No [  ]

Remarks:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Name: ____________________________________________
Address: ____________________________________________
Town: _______________________________________________
St Zip: __________________________
Phone: ( ) __________________________
March 19, 1988 was the date of the funeral of Kevin Brady, one of three mourners murdered by loyalist paramilitary Michael Stone, who fired on and lobbed grenades at the mourners of the Gibraltar Three (three unarmed individuals murdered by the Special Air Service in Gibraltar on March 6, 1988).

At Brady's funeral, two British Army corporals sped into the funeral cortège. Several of the mourners attacked the car in an attempt to discern the identity of the occupants. The driver of the car, Corporal Woods, then fired on the crowd while Corporal Howe attempted to produce his gun. After the soldier fired the shots into the crowd, some of the mourners removed the corporals from the car. The men were dragged to Casement Park, where they were stripped and beaten. Within a matter of minutes, two members of the IRA took the corporals away and shot them.

None of those arrested have been charged with the killings. However, as of November 1990, 38 men have been charged for incidences which took place at Brady's funeral and 20 of them have been convicted and are serving over 600 years in prison.

All of these trials have been conducted in Diplock courts, which consist of one to three judges acting as the jury as well as the judge(s). There is no jury of peers to consider the events; rather, the community is contained behind a plexiglass wall, making listening to the proceedings very difficult.

The Casement trials have provided the courts the opportunity to extensively use the video equipment which cost Britain almost $200,000. It was first used in the trial of Michael Stone. The families of the accused and their legal representatives believe that the Stone trial provided the dry run of the video equipment for the government to encourage public acceptance of video trials.

These parties, along with legal observers, believe that the heli-tele (videos recorded from a helicopter) and video evidence have been both overused and much abused. Because the quality of the film is poor, even the police had difficulty discerning what was happening as they watched the filming. Only 4 out of 200 R.U.C. officers were able to identify men from the heli-tele.

Although the video evidence was vague and blurry, it has constituted a large part of the evidence against the men, many of whom are serving ten years or more on the basis of video identifications. In addition, some of the video evidence was treated with contrast stretching and zooming. In this process, color is either taken from or added to the film. In some trials, the judge accepted this treated film as evidence, although some of the data had been removed from the film.

An example of the abuse of the video evidence arose in Patrick Kane's appeal in February, 1990. The man the prosecution identified as Kane in the video evidence wore a blue-green coat with epaulettes and a hood. Kane's coat, produced in the courtroom at the trial and appeal, was emerald green, and had neither epaulettes nor a hood. However, the prosecution insisted both that the coat belonged to Kane and that the man in the video was Kane. His argument was that Kane foresaw his arrest, which came 9 months after the funeral. In his foresight, Kane realized that he would be required to produce the jacket he wore to the funeral. To avoid being identified in the video, he bought a similar jacket to hand over to the police.

Another example of bad evidence used against the mourners is the media witness called "Witness E". Witness E was used to support the prosecution's proposition of fact that the crowd knew the identity of the occupants of the car at an early stage. Witness E, who gave evidence from behind a screen, said he was at the hood of the car at the time and knew the occupants were British when the car arrived because he "could hear them squealing in English/London accents". Witness E alleged that the crowd was shouting, "They are Brits, they are SAS!" Lord Justice Murray said he felt Witness E gave an inaccurate account of the car's arrival. Still, the prosecution continued to use Witness E's evidence to convict. However, 8 men were later acquitted for honestly and mistakenly believing they were being attacked.

In addition to overusing and abusing video evidence and relying on admittedly unreliable witnesses during the Casement trials, the Crown has turned the right to silence on its head by using it to corroborate bad evidence.

From Sean Kelly's refusal to enter the dock during his trial, the trial judge inferred that he was guilty when he considered this in conjunction with the prosecution's assertion that Kelly must have been in Casement Park. This assertion was based on the prosecution's identification of Kelly near the car in the video evidence. During Kelly's appeal in February 1991, Barrister Desmond Boal stated that although Kelly was seen running toward the car, this does not mean he was guilty of attacking the car; others were seen rushing to the car but did not attack it. Boal pointed out it does not logically follow that he was in the park or that the man identified as Kelly must be Kelly just because he was at the car. However, Judge Kelly stated that in the balance of probabilities, Kelly must have been in the park.

Boal pointed out that the trial judge had said the heli-tele evidence "tends to show" Kelly involved in the attack on the car. "Tends to show" is a phrase which lacks certitude; therefore, because the trial judge could have used another to convey certitude but did not, he could not have been certain. Still, Judge Nichols insisted during the appeal that if Kelly seemed so intent to get Woods in the park, it would seem only logical that he must have entered the park.

However, Boal pointed out that there was insufficient evidence to make such a statement. By the trial judge's assessment of the video evidence, the court was left with no firm evidence that Kelly was in the park. Also, because Kelly did not make a statement, no statement could be used to support such an identification. Boal said that the trial judge's use of Kelly's use of Article Four (the right to silence) to corroborate weak evidence put the onus of proof regarding the identification of Kelly on the prosecution rather than on the defence. Thus, the judges' inferences and assumptions were used to try to uphold the life sentence of a 22-year-old man.

The Casement trials are the testing ground for the Crown's use of several different kinds of evidence. However, because the arrests for the attack on the car and soldiers and the killing of the soldiers continue, the matter is still legally sub judice; therefore, media coverage of the cases is strictly limited. This gives the Crown a free hand to put away a large number of individuals from the nationalist community, for the case escapes the public eye. In considering the cases to date, it would seem that anybody present at the funerals is a potential victim of this small-scale internment.

In addition, the Casement trials are setting some dangerous precedents: the dependence on blurry, treated film for identifications; the use of film confiscated from all the media for identifications (thus, the media are induced to act as witnesses); the use of the right to silence to infer the guilt of a defendant. The 8 men who have been acquitted of crimes related to this incident have unnecessarily served time in prison from the time of their arrests to their acquittals.

In assessing the significance of the Casement trials, it is important to consider the amount of time and money the British government has invested in the Casement trials. It would be naïve to believe that the government invested almost $200,000 in video equipment for these trials only. Why is convicting so many individuals on such bad evidence worth such a large investment? What looms on the horizon for the nationalist people? Is this internment by another name?
The ongoing Brooke talks on the future of Ireland are very significant -- and make no mistake, they are about the future of Ireland, not just Northern Ireland. AIEPC feels that we owe it to you to state our position concerning the talks. In reading this keep in mind "where we are coming from." AIEPC is not beholden to anyone in Ireland. We will endorse any initiative which furthers our goals -- a united, democratic Ireland.

Thus, while we believe that all parties should be included in the talks -- and must be included in any final arrangement -- we do not say this because we are wedded to the policies of Sinn Fein, the principal excluded party, but because no long-term solution can be contemplated which does not take into account such a substantial minority, or worse, one which requires the subjugation of that minority. Everyone knows this but apparently the British and Irish governments have accepted that the Unionists would not even come to the table unless Sinn Fein were excluded. Once again the Loyalists have exercised their veto power over British policy -- for the time being. This does not mean that nothing good can come from the talks. We will wait to see what is produced before reaching a final conclusion.

Nevertheless, based on the record of the Irish government in the 1985 Anglo-Irish Agreement negotiations we cannot be optimistic. In those negotiations the Irish government conceded the legitimacy of the partition of Ireland, a fundamental point they had never before conceded. Of course, the Loyalists didn't like the Anglo-Irish Agreement either because it didn't mean that nothing good can come from the talks. We will wait to see what is produced before reaching a final conclusion.

The talks are being conducted in secrecy. Because of the fear of failure on the parts of the British and Irish governments we expect that they will result in something. Should the Irish government indeed renounce its Constitutional claim to reunification then the only possible acceptable result, from our standpoint, would be one which results in some form of Irish unity, even a federal arrangement. Anything less would be a disaster.
ACTION REQUEST #1

On page one of this newsletter in Political Vetting In The Republic Of Ireland, we ask you to write a letter of support for Between. Between, whose work the PEC endorses, was written up in the December 1990 issue of this newsletter.

It is our hope that by bringing pressure to bear upon these officials, they will redress this wrong by recognizing the right of an organized group to confidently speak on behalf of defenseless Irish civilians.

All members are asked to write Monsieur Jacques Delors, President of the Commission of the European Communities, Rue de La Loi 200, B-1049, Brussels, Belgium to protest the EC Commission’s withdrawal of funds for the Between organization. Ask your family, friends, business associates, to do the same. For your convenience, we provide the sample letter below which you can use as a guide or simply rewrite as is.

Dear President Delors:

I am dismayed at the EC Commission’s withdrawal of funds from the Between organization in Cork, Ireland. I respectfully urge that the funds be restored immediately so that the women and children who benefit from Between’s holiday program will not be unjustly deprived of a holiday from the conflict in Northern Ireland.

Sincerely yours,
signature

OHIO -- State Director Susan Whitford informs us of a very important victory. On Monday, May 6 the Cleveland City Council passed a MacBride Principles contract compliance ordinance. The bill requires that all contractors and subcontractors with plants in Northern Ireland comply with the MacBride Principles in order to keep/obtain city contracts. We congratulate all MacBride supporters and organizations for working together to assure this success. We also thank ordinance author John Myers (AIPEC member) and sponsoring councilman Patrick O'Malley...CALIFORNIA -- Member Brian Blake advises us that on May 9 the MacBride Principles bill introduced by Assemblymen John Burton passed in the Assembly by a vote of 43 to 28. The bill is expected to go to the Senate for a full vote in the first half of June....NEW MEXICO -- Member Willie Lennon of advises us that in March, 1991 MacBride Principles legislation passed in both the House and Senate only to be vetoed by Governor Bruce King. King had been asked not to sign the bill by the office of Northern Ireland’s Archbishop Cahal Daly and the British government. King’s public announcement for opposing the fair employment legislation was that he did not want to restrict state investments. Congratulations to Willie Lennon who spearheaded the campaign, the AOI, IAUC and all involved for a first-year effort well done. We also thank the bill’s sponsors, in the Senator Manny Aragon and in the House, Cisco McSorley. Lennon advises they will be back in ‘92 with a bigger and better campaign....MONTANA -- In March the State House and Senate approved a Joint resolution expressing its support for the MacBride Principles.

DETACH HERE---------------------------------------------------------------

TO ORDER TAPES, VIDEOS, BOOKS, ETC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>ORDER#</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR NEW MEMBERS OR CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Name______________________________
Address______________________________
City/Town________________________________________St Zip__________
Date____________________Phone#____________________

Membership includes a one-year subscription to our monthly Newsletter.