14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
September 16, 1976

Alan Jones
London

Dear Alan,

Thank you for your two letters of September 6, the one from yourself and the other from your Political Committee, and your September 2 letter. They were waiting for me when I got back from Conneticut.

Joe and Barry are not yet back from their vacations, but I am sure everyone will agree that it would be a good idea for several of us to come to Britain for several days after the October United Secretariat meeting. We can discuss the possibilities of this in Brussels. It will depend on schedules and health.

Even though you are pressed with the Healy article, I am glad that you took the time to write down your outline on other steps to take in relation to what we discussed in Ohio. I will restrict circulating the outline here to the leading comrades who will be involved in preparing for the informal discussions in Brussels.

In addition to these general categories for discussion which you wrote in your letter and which we began discussion on in Ohio, there are a number of pressing matters that we should also nail down.

One is the tour of Malik Miah in Britain which becomes all the more important after the events of the last month.

Secondly is how to drive ahead in our campaign against Healy. We have him on the ropes in a way that we would not have guessed possible a year ago, and we have to consider some major moves in Britain to take advantage of this and push it further. I think it may be possible to get together a big public meeting in London itself that could be the broadest refutation of Healy's pretenses.

I am enclosing a letter that Cliff Slaughter sent Ernest, and our correspondence on it.

The third topic we should discuss is the internationalization of our campaign against the FBI and CIA, where an entire new chapter just opened in the United States as you can see from today's Militant. What the Attorney General's decision does is, among other things, open up further possibilities for information and turning our attention more

toward the CIA, Army Intelligence, etc., gaining the same exposure and some of the documents as we got from the FBI, only with a lot more "foreign" connections.

A growing number of supporters of the Political Rights Defense Fund in the states are insistently proposing that we internationalize the campaign and we would like to solicit your opinion on rolling ahead on this.

* * *

Could you let me know your schedule? Can you arrive in Brussels a couple of days before the informal meeting to go over these initial matters? Can you put aside a few hours if a couple of us come to Britain prior to the Brussels meeting?

* * *

I am rather familiar, as you might guess, with the Old Man's letter to Burnham. But I'm not sure from your brief note that we give it the same interpretation. Anyway to show I am not against being "world historic" in the informal give and take, I am sending you a speech that Jim made on September 2, 1945 on unity and splits concerning the maneuvers by the Workers Party. I think it is right to the point in relation to several of the things we discussed in Ohio. It is going to be included in the next Cannon book which will hopefully be out by the time of the YSA Convention at Christmas. This will be another rich collection covering 1945, the post-war upsurge, to the end of 1946.

* * *

All the matters raised in your September 2 letter are completely agreeable to me. My omission of the July USec resolution was intentional as I was assuming that it had already been submitted under point ten. Of course, it should go into the same bulletin. It would be a disservice to the membership to stick these things in different bulletins.

I assume the same thing on the other July USec resolution concerning the invitation to the OCRFI. I just assumed that the USec majority was submitting this; if they do not then we will just submit it as part of our material. And, of course, we will include the USec resolution that your Political Committee letter refers to.

By now this may all be moot since the September Secretariat meeting has taken place. I don't know what, if any, decisions were taken in regard to my submissions to the IIDB.

Ernest wrote me the following paragraph about it: "As to your proposals for new material to be included in the IIDB, please do not go ahead printing before the next USec meeting. Formally, only the USec can agree on the composition of these bulletins. Some of your proposals include answers to material not previously published, which is abnormal. Some other include what seems at first sight factually inaccurate material, which might heat up things unnecessarily if factual rectification is not published simultaneously. So it would be necessary to wait till the USec meeting before deciding the exact contents of any additional IIDB. As the USec meeting takes place in ten days, this is certainly not an exagerated delay."

I hope this doesn't mean what I'm afraid it might mean. There is little to discuss, formally or informally, if our contributions to the discussion bulletin continue to be selectively suppressed, censored or not translated.

* * *

Don't forget to drop me the note on your schedule.

Comradely,

s/ Jack

enc. ÷

bcc: P.C.