## INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY SERVICE FOR PEACE

VICE-PRESIDENTS: T. EDMUND HARVEY, LAURENCE HOUSMAN, GILBERT MURRAY, EDWIN D. H. ROWNTREE, LILIAN STEVENSON, GEORGE SUTHERLAND

CIVIL SERVICE VOLONTAIRE INTERNATIONAL

INTERNATIONALER FREIWILLIGER ZIVILDIENST



FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICE:
34, BROADWAY
LONDON S.W.1
TELEPHONE WHITEHALL 1461

D. L. Sainty, IVSP Relief Section 109, British Red Cross, BAOR.

DLS / 20

22nd June 1946

Dear Derek,

## **GERMANY SHORT-TERM SERVICES:**

1. I have today seen Col Andrews, who told me that the position now is that the CCG are prepared to consider our proposals for IVSP in Germany further when reports on the summer schemes have been

presented to them. This means:

- (a) that what we asked for as an immediate programme has been granted, and
- (b) that there is something to go on for future development. This was the result Col Andrews wished

to arrive at this stage.

2. On the subject which Col Gidley-Kitchen raised I got confirmation from Col Andrews of points which

had been doubted and comments and information, as follows:

- (a) The basis of our approach to the CCG was that this project was a departure in policy for the CCG which required specific authorisation from the top.
- (b) So far as we were concerned we did not think that the work of the schemes was in an entirely separate category from the general work of the Relief Sections, but was a development on relief and reconstruction lines of work with an individual society emphasis, in the same way as the Friends and the Salvation Army are extending their work along their lines (If anything, I understood that the feeling in London outside IVSP was that these purposed schemes were more

in

this

that

line with relief work than some of the purely religious work which the Friends hope to do; but

is not quite relevant and has not been raised during the short talks this week). Certainly the approach to the CCG was not based on any idea that permission was necessary because the work was outside the scope of the present set-up.

(c) The difficulty of getting people out under CCG has always been emphasised. The policy laid down is that for this year the programme of Youth Camps, etc., including now our proposals, is authorised on the understanding that it can be carried out within the existing framework, and

no outside personnel or finance can be allocated.

Col. Andrews during the discussions on this at Norfolk House when he was in London mentioned

the possibility that extra people would be put forward by IVSP to the Red Cross Commission to

come out under its auspices to help with these schemes, and the officials there were in entire agreement with that suggestion (Col Andrews has not put this in writing because he did not know

how far it might complicate negotiations at our end). He is now reluctant to go to Court again,

on and the second of the secon

this separate question of getting people out, because its quite impossible to do it in the time:  $B \quad 46\ 06\ 22 - 1\ 02$ 

he thought a couple of months ago the time available then would be too short (Mike Lee told me

month ago that they had put up a scheme from Cologne, I think about January, for students to come out to Cologne University and do some library cataloguing and that sort of work, and that the CCG was sitting on it: it is now, I believe, impossible).

a

Col Andrews has got a few students coming out for educational work generally during their vacations - for two months (How long this has taken I don't know). Two of them he wants to use at his two training centres for a fortnight each, and then he would like them to go on our

There are fifteen others who are more rigidly tied down to a programme than that, but who should

have ten days or a fortnight to spare, and he suggests they might be incorporated in the schemes during that time (willingness and suitability could I imagine be easily learned when they are here).

- (d) Col Kitchen's reaction to what I told him this afternoon about the CCG's agreeing to people coming out under the present set-up was "He doesn't know we've had a bill from the Army for instance for 6/6 for transit mess charges for a person going home on leave".
- (e) It seems to me that the present financial confusion in the minds of the various Army departments

has nothing to do with the general principle of what does and what does not come under the general terms of the CBSRA agreement, and while its impossible to forecast what the interpretation will be found to involve, I hope it will not cramp our style! As I said in Thursday's letter, I think it's right to get this settled, and if you can help at your end, so much the better.

- 3. I forgot in DLS/18 to say that we decided in Münster to go ahead with plans for five schemes. I thought six was more than we could manage, but I wanted to do as much as ever possible since the more we can do up to our maximum the better. I said we would undertake to run five.
- 4. The teams in general seem to be getting doubtful about our ability to run schemes. The work is not falling off as we estimated, and they foresee collapse if people are removed to lead schemes. I always

discount such fears by at least 50% and in view of the urgency of these schemes I think we'll manage

them. There was considerable opposition to the Friedland scheme on various grounds, before it came

off.			

Cheerio, David