

10 Sept 96

If the paper by the PUP/UDP^{then} were trying to distance themselves from the CLMC it would be unacceptable. But the paper does not: it acknowledges their relationship.

There is, however, an inconsistency in the paper with regard to that relationship. The fifth para treats it as passive. It merely talks of offering a facility to the CLMC and disclaims responsibility for CLMC decisions. Yet in the final paras the PUP/UDP reaffirm their commitment to the principles of democracy and non-violence and declare their resolute opposition to all threats.

Passivity and resolution are inconsistent

We hope that in this discussion the PUP/UDP can resolve this inconsistency and ^{make explicit what is implicit in their paper, namely,} ~~show~~ that their resolute opposition to threats includes the particular threats in question today.

Mediation, this is the way ahead

It is a way of resolving the

disputes between the PUP and the CLMC

in a peaceful and non-violent manner

by using the services of a mediator

who is impartial and independent

and who is not involved in the dispute

has been made

It is possible to argue that the CLMC threats did not involve a breach of the 6 principles. ^{It is possible to argue} The threats are not issued to influence the talks or to achieve a political objective: indeed the threats were issued to restrain persons who wish to end the Loyalist ceasefire and resume the use of violence to achieve political ends. Yet the threats are contrary to the spirit of the 6 principles which are summed up in their general description as "principles of democracy and non-violence" and it would not be right, now or in the future, to turn a blind eye to threats of violence merely because they did not fall within a narrow reading of the particular words used in the Mitchell Report.

We welcome therefore the fact the the PUP/UDP paper implicitly acknowledges that the CLMC threat is contrary to the principles.