Brussels

Dear Ernest,

Thank you for your September 3 letter. I found it waiting for me when I returned. We consider the October fourteenth and fifteenth meetings confirmed.

I'll show a copy of the Slaughter letter to George and to Joe, when he returns. Until you get Joe's opinion I assume you are responding to this in no way.

You are correct in your assumption that we have no objections to an international campaign in defense of the South Africa freedom fighters. To the contrage, as you can tell from our press, we have been going full speed on this for some time. I assume other sections and sympathizing groups have not been waiting for a United Secretariat statement to do the same. I reread my letter to you and I don't see how you can interpret it as proposing that the USec delay dealing with any pressing political matters.

I am sorry the schedules of the North American comrades did not work out as you hoped. There is always a tendency to overestimate how quickly it is possible to get back after a convention and post-convention responsibilities like taking care of medical and other problems that have been neglected. In addition, I confess I insisted several comrades take a few weeks for a much needed vacation, the regular necessity of which you and I have always agreed to regardless of other differences.

I assume I will hear from you soon about the September Secretariat's decision on the submissions to the IIDB I wrote you about in my August 26 letter. I'll check here and see if there are any problems in the material we are getting, if so I'll drop you a note.

Your draft European resolution is all set as you requested without a word being changed.

However, there are some problems with the introduction.

First, the introduction is signed by "the United Secretariat of the Fourth International." This is a surprise, since the minutes of the United Secretariat record no decision to publish an introduction in the name of the United Secretariat. Furthermore, since this is a contribution to an internal discussion, not a public release, it can't be signed in the name of the entire United Secretariat. How you choose to sign it is your affair. It could be: "the USec majority;" "a USec majority;" or "the IMT Steering Committee;" or just a list of the names of the comrades on the Secretariat who voted for it. Please let me know which of these you would like.

The second problem is in the vote that you have listed. The minutes show 13 in favor, as you stated, but there were 4 against. You left out one of the consultative votes against. (Galois and Johnson both voted against.)

Instead of listing the vote the way you do, it would be good to correct it to read like this:

"In its meeting of May 25, 1976, the United Secretariat voted on the general line of this draft theses. The vote was:

13 in favor Aubin, Claudio, Duret, Fourier, Frey, Georges, Ghulam, Jones, Kurt, Otto, Roman, Walter and Werner.

4 against
Adair, Gelois (consultative), Johnson (consultative),
Marcel

l abstaining Julio (consultative)"

Also, not only the vote should be listed but the names of those comrades voting for and against it. This is how we have done this in the past and it is the only way the membership knows the political positions of elected leaders on the major line questions being submitted for discussion and decision.

A third problem is in the first paragraph. You refer to "the character of the general political resolution the USec is preparing for the Eleventh World Congress." But to the knowledge of comrades who attended the USec meeting, and according to the minutes, there has been no proposal or committee assigned to draft such a resolution nor has there been any agreement on its character. The simplest correction would be

the following:

"All these problems will be dealt with in the framework of the general political resolution we are preparing for the Eleventh World Congress."

The "we", of course, referring to the signers of the introduction.

Comradely.

s/ Jack

bcc: PC+