

(Im handgeschriebenen Originalbrief ist die Tinte durch Feuchtigkeitseinwirkung leider teilweise unleserlich.)

DONAUESCHINGEN

There has been written rather a lot about our service "im Schwarzwald". Besides the annual reports many a volunteer has pushed the pen.

As many as the reports were as many different sound are heard. From very positive via moderate to most negative ones. But in spite of the unsimilarity, all of them had some truth in it, because Donaueschingen showed more aspects than in any a service.

An Experiment was and still is this service. Perhaps a point most "authors" forgot to notice. As picnicing (?) in any case, asks more of the particular workers on their daily job, than circumstances etc. are settled; obviously. But also the organisation in such a case has to be so that it's a support to them who are trying to bring something of the planned program. Every day and actually every moment the organisers have to realise this. If they do and bring it into practise, one can say at the end of a period well, the foundations are laid, we can go on; or the program turned out to be too heavy we better quit and try to find another way. Both cases, actually, are as positive, in their result.

In the beginning Donaueschingen went well. People worked with much enthusiasm. But this first three, four, may be five months were no proof for a success concerning this long-term-service. The experiment only started just then. I don't think it useful to go into details about the time from that moment up till the end of May. I'll only try to give my impressions over whole.

I don't believe we can say: "as an experiment the service failed." We can't, cause the organisers who had to lead the experiment forgot (may be they couldn't give more, but in that case they should have had to . . . the service in . . . so they had to do so . . . have been this bad . . .

More sad, actually, was the fact the over a period of eight months (that's half of the time) successively the organisation had to call upon a volunteer to take over leadership. Who had, in first case no experience with S.C.I., as he was A.F.S.C. member and the second one had nothing at all (that he had been looking around with S.C.I. for two months). Experiments are experiments, but to start one with "objects" who are experiments themselves, is nothing but some gambling; anyway a game which doesn't fit into S.C.I Principe's.

Right you are. There is work being done. Lots of good work in deed. But not as a result of the fact the service was a long-term one. Similar success would have been reached by a short-term service.

This ? No . . . better Because all energy spends to solve the troubles, raising in succession, one surpassing the other, could have been used in a more positive way. The example K.V.T. gives, I think, is striking, we should take more profit out of it.

Really, let us try in future not to think we with our small groups do better work when we try to lay the stress on quantity. Just because everything in life of the past and of today served to find its value in quantity this confusion exists. We must, must, must go find back the essence of life, but only can get there if being in search, and acting in qualitative way. All we want is by the little help we can give, to add something to meet the positive powers working to get humanity out of the confusion. Point one for us is : to realise how must we do it, what us the most responsible way?

I do know it's nothing new I tried to write down. From many sides the same thing, in a far better and clearer way, is said. But it can't be respected enough. Cause of that, after all, I pushed my ball pointer, hoping it helped to place Donaueschingen in the right light. If this is the fact, in October any way we can say this experiment is finished not as a failure. Though we shall not go on the same way but use the experience in same other positive way.

Yours

Ernst Hulst