

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.

Passivity and resolution are inconsistent

A case has been made

It is possible to argue that the CLMC threats did not involve a breach of the 6 principles. *It is suggested that for the purpose of* 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.