

## FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTERS

The Friends International Center is an attempt to express in action the religious idea that, since all mankind without any exception are the children of one God, the common aims and aspirations which can unite outnumber the things which divide.

A meeting-place is found where men and women of all nationalities, all religious beliefs, and all social, economic, and political convictions can worship and work, talk and play together in an atmosphere of understanding. This hospitable home is located in an area of tension between nationalities or where exceptional international influence gives a center of good will a wide opportunity. In the midst of rioting Calcutta or near the UNESCO offices in Paris, a Friends Center seeks to provide a chance for differences of opinion to be examined with a detachment impossible in other surroundings. With lectures on controversial subjects by persons of demonstrated capacity, with discussion groups gathered from all classes to search for basic truths which reconcile differences, and above all with the opportunity for religious experience in silent worship which speaks to all men and is thus non-sectarian, these Centers strive to reach across barriers toward a world ruled by love.

In each Center the program and housing and organization of personnel differ. But each is a friendly gathering place with a staff of Friends or like-minded people whose approach is non-sectarian, and in each, adults and young people share ideas and seek for the understanding which disregards frontiers.

Growing out of the relief work of World War I, a number of Friends International Centers were jointly sponsored by the Friends Service Council of England and the American Friends Service Committee. In some countries International Centers have been started by the Yearly Meeting of Friends, in that country. But when World War II came and prevented the support of British and American Quakers, these small "oases of understanding" were somehow kept alive by local Friends and other concerned persons, and they stand today with this wider international backing and with their validity tested in the years of war.

The American Friends Service Committee at present takes part in the jointly sponsored Centers in New York, Paris, Geneva, Calcutta and Shanghai, assists as requested with staff, financial help or books and literature the locally maintained Centers in Amsterdam, Copenhagen, Oslo, Delhi, Peiping and Hawaii. In Kingston, Jamaica, a Center is jointly sponsored by the Friends Service Council, the American Friends Board of Missions, and the American Friends Service Committee.

In a post-war world of hunger, and fear, and disillusionment, the Friends International Center faces a challenge that may well be the greatest ever presented to the Society of Friends - a challenge to help heal and reconcile an embittered world.

American Friends Service Committee  
20 South 12th Street  
Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania

FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTERS

Centers Desk

Jointly sponsored by FSC and Centers Desk, AFSC, with the help of local Friends:

Quaker International Centre  
17, rue Notre Dame des Champs  
Paris 6e, France

International Friends Center  
10 rue de la Madeleine  
Geneva, Switzerland

Friends' Centre  
169 Yuan Ming Yuan Road  
Room 507  
Shanghai 0, China

Friends' Centre  
1 Upper Wood Street  
Calcutta, India

Sponsored by local Friends with the help of FSC and Centers Desk, AFSC:

Quakercentrum  
Raphaelplein 2  
Amsterdam Z, The Netherlands

Jointly sponsored by Jamaica Yearly Meeting, AFBM, FSC, and Centers Desk, AFSC:

Kingston Centre  
11 Caledonia Avenue  
Crossroads  
Jamaica, B.W.I.

Sponsored by local Friends:

Scandinavian Quaker Center  
Vendersgade 29  
Copenhagen IV, Denmark

Sponsored by FSC:

London International Centre  
32 Tavistock Square  
London, W. C. 1, England

Myrtle A. Wright  
Tuengen Alle 9  
Vinderen i Aker, Norway

\*Louisa Roberts  
c/o C.B.S.R.A.  
HQ. Vienna Area  
APO S/564  
British Troops, Austria

\*\*Lucy Burt  
Yenching University  
Peiping West  
North China

\*Ranjit Chetsingh  
Quaker Centre  
24 Rajpur Road  
Delhi, India

---

\* with help from Centers Desk, AFSC

\*\* with help from Centers Desk, AFSC, and contributors in United States to special Lucy Burt Fund.

Sponsored by AFSC:

\*\*\*Quaker House  
450 East 52nd Street  
New York 22, New York

\*\*\*International Student House  
1825 R Street, N. W.  
Washington 9, D. C.

Sponsored by Arch Street Mission Board, Philadelphia, with help from local Friends and some help from AFSC:

\*\*\*Friends Center  
14-1 Chome, Mitadai Machi  
Shiba, Minato-ku  
Tokyo, Japan

\*\*\* At present not in Centers Desk program.

This is not intended as a final statement on the sponsorship of various Friends International Centers. It is drawn up primarily as a mailing list for Centers overseas and is subject to change.

Centers Desk  
American Friends Service Committee  
20 South 12th Street  
Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania

## THE QUAKER CENTERS - THEIR ORIGIN AND SIGNIFICANCE

Excerpt from "Friends in Europe" Handbook of The Society of Friends in Europe published by Friends World Committee for Consultation, Friends House, London.

In a widely accepted statement concerning the "Friends World Committee" prepared by the Secretary of the American Section in 1942, at a time when that Section was acting in some measure on behalf of the whole World Committee, there appears the following passage:

"The international nature of the Society of Friends is the outgrowth of three distinct movements. One we usually refer to as missions; the second as a service of relief and reconstruction, and the third as Quaker Embassies."

It is sometimes supposed, on the contrary, that the Quaker Embassies, or Centers as they come to be known later, were a simple continuation of the war and post-war relief and reconstruction service of Friends. It has been suggested that, just as in the missionary movement a passion to save souls had necessarily involved the care of minds and bodies, so, conversely, the later pre-occupation in Europe with the relief and rehabilitation of starved bodies and distraught minds led inevitably to a concern for spiritual reconstruction. There is just enough truth in this last attractive generalization to give it an air of plausibility. But it is too neat and too simple. Indeed it is untrue; for it not only over-simplifies the motivations behind both Quaker missions and Quaker relief service, but fails to take account of the significant fact that the initiative for Quaker Embassies predated the large scale relief service of the post-war period; furthermore this initiative, as the record shows, was directed to each and every aspect of human life - physical, mental and spiritual. In fact, the most significant and potent force in the Embassy concept was precisely the rounded, or integrated, nature of its appeal to human personality as a whole, and to humanity as a whole, irrespective of nation, race or class.

The first statement of the Quaker Centre idea was contained in a little pamphlet entitled Quaker Embassies published in 1918 by Carl Heath, who, with wide experience in international affairs, had been drawn into fellowship with Friends through activity in the fields of peace and relief service, and still more through appreciation of that practical mysticism which characterized Quakerism at its best.

But the most adequate brief description of the original concept is perhaps contained in a Report written by the same Friend some years later, as Secretary of the Friends Council for International Service, when the work of British and American Friends had developed in nearly a score of countries. It reads as follows:

"The conception of the Quaker Embassy, the original seed out of which came the C.I.S., was an embassy of the City of God to every great City of Man. To preach the Gospel, yes, but not to preach only. An integral life was to be demonstrated which, in its freedom, joy and intelligence would draw men and women of goodwill everywhere. At the heart of each embassy was worship, that loving cultivation of the presence of God, and in its activism, be it relief, reconstruction work, educational service, medical and sanitary aid, peace activity, prison service, clubs, lectures, research or what not, the embassies would set forth Christ anew, in the largeness and strength of that applied mysticism which is characteristic of the Quaker Society."

Assuredly this was the hitch the Quaker wagon to a star! Quantitatively speaking it was audacious to imagine that the little Society of Friends could bring within the purview of its international service "every great City of Man." It was even more audacious, perhaps, to suppose that the Quaker "diplomats" who bore, at home and abroad, the main responsibility for directing the Embassies would in fact be also bona fide representatives of the City of God on earth.

Nevertheless, regarding these claims and aims with a reasonable sense of perspective and humour, the observer cannot but be struck by the creativeness of the root idea, and by the remarkable results of the enterprise when measured against the vastness of the fields of operations and the slender material and personal resources available.

Summing up an exhaustive study and analysis of the record, Willis Hall in his Quaker International work in Europe since 1914 wrote as follows:

"It must be granted that not all of their plans have been completely realized. This may or may not be due to the human limitations which failed to take sufficient account of difficulties, or which failed to see the road through these difficulties, and it is therefore impossible to ascertain how far such plans would have been helpful in attaining the ends sought for in the international work of Friends had they been successfully carried through. But their manuscript records and the written minutes of their official work are definite evidence that very few of the important events which have threatened the peace and well-being of Europe since the World War have escaped their attention. The Quaker International Centres have been one of the great factors which have made these problems appear real and vital to many members of the Society of Friends and to others who have in some way come in touch with the work." (p. 199)

The final sentence gives one clue to the relatively potent influence of the Quaker Centres. It was inherent in the concept that Friends themselves would only be one element in the whole. To find Friends, rather than to make them, was a common slogan of the International Service in the inter-war period. Whether those collaborators who were found, and entered actively into the spiritual and organizational activities of the Centres everywhere, ever became members was a secondary question. The Wider Quaker Fellowship (as the sympathizers and co-workers who retained other religious affiliations or none, came to be known subsequently) was, moreover, supplemented by varying degrees of corporate co-operation with like-minded and like-motivated bodies of persons, for a wide variety of common purposes.

Evidently the Centres could only be points of departure and of selective influence, as it were. For that reason they were of set purpose established at places that provided opportunities for maximum contact with, and impact upon, contemporary events.

If continental Europe be considered the main field of Quaker Centre experimentation - as in fact it was, for a variety of reasons which may or may not remain valid in the future - then the number of regularly organized centres, jointly supported by the Friends Service Council and the American Friends Service Committee, was at no time greater than 8 (Berlin, Frankfurt, Nuernberg, Vienna, Warsaw, Moscow, Paris and Geneva). By 1938 they had been reduced to half that number (Berlin, Vienna, Paris and Geneva), although the Quaker Meetings which sprang up in other places (Holland, Sweden, Czechoslovakia and the older Meetings - Norway and Denmark) were influenced greatly by the Centre idea and engaged in work on similar lines. Moreover in 1939 new International Centres were opened in Amsterdam and Copenhagen

and continued until the progress of the war made international work impossible. The London International Centre was started in December, 1941.

It is possible here neither to write a history of the Quaker Centres, nor to discuss the wide range of activities, which differed in accordance with varying environments and personalities. It must suffice to refer briefly to five aspects of the Centre Service which were not only significant in the inter-war period, but which constitute some of the chief determining factors in any estimate of the future international service of Friends in the world. It will be noted that these relate mainly to the internal organization of the Society of Friends and not to the Service itself, the results of which are summed up in the passage from Willis Hall previously quoted.

1. In the first place, the Centres provided specific opportunities for joint undertakings overseas on the part of most of the separate groups of Friends in the United States; so that that process of coming together in positive service, so helpfully begun in the relief period, was continued over the years, with the effect of strengthening a common heritage and bridging traditional separations.

2. In the second place, the Centres afforded a fruitful continuance of regular co-operation between the British and American groups of Friends, which co-operation had had its ups and downs in the relief period, and might all too easily have fallen back into sporadic intervisitation and conference, leaving the great bulk of Friends unaffected by the stimulating effects of differences of outlook and experience. The achievement of this co-operation is summarized by Willis Hall as follows:

"The American Friends gradually became more sympathetic towards the work carried on by the C.I.S. The A.F.S.C. was new, weak, cautious, primarily concerned with relief, dependent to a large extent on non-Friends for funds administered, and represented four "branches" of Quakers which had had rather limited relations one with the other before 1917. Step by step from 1919 to 1925 it came to carry an almost equal share of the responsibility with the C.I.S. in Europe as it slowly developed into the regular International Centre work with permanent headquarters and staffed with full time workers."

3. Thirdly, and even more importantly, the Centres gave the English-speaking Friends points of permanent contact with groups of various European peoples who brought to the Quaker stock new contributions of thought and insight, with values and emphases different from those in a predominantly Anglo-Saxon tradition. The difference in outlook and atmosphere between the two Friends World Conferences, of 1920 and 1937 respectively, is some measure of the change that came over the face of the Society. Moreover, among the minority of Friends who have been effectively brought into contact with these new currents in Quakerism the metamorphosis is much greater than any over-all picture of the Society of Friends would suggest.

4. Fourthly, it must be recognized that the role of the Centres has been auxiliary in the development of an international Society of Friends. The Centres themselves, on account of the primary administrative and financial responsibility devolving upon the Anglo-American group of Friends through their Service Committees, could not fail to reflect in some measure at least the attitudes and policies of their chief promoters. But much was done in different ways to bring indigenous groups into partnership, while the parent societies were only too ready to concede and foster autonomy whenever, and wherever, any national group of Friends showed signs of wishing to stand upon its own feet. The Centres were not the permanent nuclei of such new national groupings; but they stood ready at hand to aid any movement toward independence.

5. Lastly, the existence of the Quaker Centres at strategic places, such as Paris, Berlin, Vienna and Geneva, brought regular opportunities for the collection and dissemination to Friends far and wide of accurate and assimilated information concerning the many questions (e.g. peace, penal questions, slavery, education, etc.) of deep interest to Friends. Furthermore, the Centres provided oftentimes both the training ground and the facilities for discreet or open intervention, as occasion might warrant, in public affairs, where personal or corporate concern dictated it.

In a word, the Centres constituted points of contact and channels of communication at places calculated to maximize such knowledge, experience and wisdom as Friends might muster, working together with like-minded persons in the world today. They may not necessarily meet the need of the coming years, at least in the same form as heretofore. But they have proved vital links in the chain of Quaker development toward world-wide service and community. As such they are worthy of the sympathetic attention of all those who will carry forward the Quaker International Service in the new post-war period.

The extension of the Quaker Centre idea to the East may be mentioned. The Shanghai Centre was established, primarily, to act as a centre of reconciliation in the Pacific. It continues during the war, but its first secretary subsequently opened a Centre at Chungking, under a Committee of Friends Service Council, American Friends Service Committee, Friends Ambulance Unit and Chinese Friends. A Centre in Mid-India has now been moved to Delhi, and the Calcutta office of the F.A.U. is a joint concern with the F.S.C., with a view to its developing a wider service of reconciliation. It is not unlikely that after the war the Quaker Centre idea will be extended to other countries, particularly those where mission work exists and also where the F.A.U. had made promising openings.

Mimeographed 10/7/48  
American Friends Service Committee  
20 South 12th Street  
Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania

REPORT ON TWO YEARS OF ADMINISTRATION OF FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTERS  
1945-1947

To understand and evaluate what has been done in the past two years of administration of Friends International Centers by the staff and the Centers Sub-Committee of the American Friends Service Committee, it seems well to begin with the situation at the beginning of the period.

**SITUATION IN** There was genuine uncertainty as to whether Friends International  
**DECEMBER 1945** Centers should properly be under the auspices of the Service Committee rather than under some committee, like the Friends World Committee, which was a part of the Society of Friends. There was confusion in the relationship of the Friends International Centers to the Local Society of Friends in the countries where they were located. There had been a conference held at Honfleur, France, in 1939, to clarify the relationship of the Center with the sponsoring bodies, but the war had intervened to prevent the implementation of its decisions, and this relationship also was confused. There was wide-spread realization that post-war changes required modification of some kind in program, with no clear-cut idea of what lines should be followed in making the modification required. And there was pending before this committee a request to establish a Center in Kingston, Jamaica, which could only be done by working out a method of cooperation with Friends Mission Board.

**STEPS** The first thing which had to be clarified was the question whether AFSC should  
**TAKEN** continue the sponsorship of Friends International Centers at all. This was done by a definition of function, worked out from correspondence with Center workers, past and present, all over the world. The second step, in point of time, was the establishment of beginning lines of collaboration with the American Friends Board of Missions in opening the Jamaica Center, which was done partly by correspondence and partly by attendance by a member of this committee and its secretary at the Annual Meeting of the Mission Board in April, 1946, followed up by inter-visitation between the four sponsoring bodies. Third, the secretary of this committee was sent to nine European countries where Center work was in progress or was suggested, to help clarify the relationship of the Friends International Center to the Society of Friends in the countries involved, and to work out new program lines, using the American Friends Service Committee's Memorandum FX-135 dated June 18, 1946 and the Friends Service Council's letter 647 FJT/JW dated July 16, 1946 as the basis of both discussions. Fourth, a restatement of the relationship of the Friends International Center to its sponsoring bodies, based on the decisions of the Conference of Honfleur, was worked out in consultation by members of staff and committees of the American Friends Service Committee, Frederick J. Tritton for Friends Service Council and Louise Schmitt for France Yearly Meeting.

POLICIES GOVERNING FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTERS

The forms given hereafter are those under which Friends International Centers are at present operating, and have been agreed upon as acceptable for such use by the participating bodies. They are, however, subject properly to amendment or revision by the joint meeting of the American Friends Service Committee's Centers and Policy Planning Sub-Committees, and in accordance with the suggestions which may have been made at the AFSC Conference of Field Workers held in Amsterdam from October 30 to November 3, 1947. Changes would have to be submitted for consideration to the various sponsoring bodies affected, and the official form could only be made up after the results of such consideration are known. The official form when finally reached should be sent to all Friends International Centers and their Local Center Committees, for their information and guidance.

Sponsoring Bodies to be consulted in Case of Changein Over-all Policies

Friends Service Council  
 (if Kingston is affected)  
 American Friends Board of Missions  
 and  
 Friends Service Council

agreement of these essential before  
 any change can be considered valid

in Policies for Individual Centers

Paris Center Committee  
 Geneva Ad Hoc or Center Committee  
 Calcutta Center Committee  
 Shanghai Center Committee  
 Jamaica Center Committee

final decisions on program and staff  
 rest with these committees, not with  
 AFSC or FSC

AFSC has no responsibility or control over policies of the National Friends Centers, where it is collaborating at the request of the Local Group.

CONTRIBUTION OF  
 AFSC SPONSORSHIP  
 OF CENTERS

The Society of Friends, acting through Friends International Centers sponsored by Friends Service Council and the American Friends Service Committee, can provide a religious experience entirely non-sectarian in character, as it cannot do through Yearly Meetings or the Friends World Committee. Reports from widely separated places indicate the need for such a non-sectarian religious experience and the fact that no other body is prepared to render it.

DEFINITION OF  
 FRIENDS INTER-  
 NATIONAL CENTERS

Primarily the aim should be a religiously motivated service to non-Friends in areas where tension exists between nations or groups, or where unusual opportunities for international influence present themselves. The International Center should be the demonstration of a way of living which resolves conflict, and because it is maintained by Friends it should provide an atmosphere of calm where tension may be lowered and differences of opinion can be examined with a detachment otherwise impossible. The traditional position of the Society of Friends as refusing to take part in conflicts has made it peculiarly fitted to operate these non-partisan gathering places.

The Friends International Centers are not primarily to undertake relief operations, although frequently and for a short period they may provide assistance. Such assistance should always be in such form that other organizations can use as a pattern for administration, or it should be such an operation that another organization may be found to take it over. Nor should such Centers primarily work to extend the Society of Friends, although groups of convinced Friends are likely to grow up around them. These groups should be encouraged to organize separately as Monthly Meetings and to have their own independent life. They should be tied to the local Yearly Meetings if such exist; and if not, should be under the care of some other established Yearly Meeting.

This service of international reconciliation through the operation of Centers falls into three classifications:

(a) National Centers where a problem of international or group tension exists. In this type of Center, the responsibility rests with the local Friends. The part the Friends Service Council and the American Friends Service Committee play is the supplying of staff members when requested, or facilitating the visits of Friends and non-Friends who have some distinct contribution to make to the local situation. They have no responsibility for policy in these Centers.

(b) Centers at regional cross-roads, where international understanding can be crucial. In places where currents of national life cross as in Berlin, Vienna, Warsaw,

Calcutta or possibly some other Indian site, and Shanghai, the organization of Friends International Centers is the responsibility of Friends Service Council, the American Friends Service Committee and the local sponsoring group, acting as equal partners.

(c) Centers at world cross-roads where the offices of world political organization or outstanding opportunities of international influence are located. In such places as New York, London, Paris, and Geneva, the organization of Friends International Centers is the main responsibility of Friends Service Council and the American Friends Service Committee with the cooperation of local Friends.

There is general agreement in the principle of International rather than merely Anglo-American participation in staff and sponsorship, as soon as the Continental and Asiatic groups of Friends and like-minded persons interested are able to assume their proportionate share of responsibility. It was agreed also that no Center should be established until properly qualified and concerned personnel were available.

LINES OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT      Recognizing our own national short-comings, we present this program out of our own great need to take part in a common search for a way of living that resolves conflict. We see the need for two-way interpretation of the basic issues and ideals of the international community to each one of us, and of the hopes and dreams of each of us to the international community; for similar interpretation between local groups of Friends and the Society of Friends at large; and for explanation of the basic motivation which prompts the work of the Center to those who make use of it. Such a program would be likely to include lectures on controversial subjects by persons of demonstrated capacity, and discussion groups gathered from all classes to search for the basic truths which reconcile differences, but always it should provide the opportunity for religious experience in silent worship which speaks to all men and is thus non-sectarian. In each Center, details of program and housing and organization of staff will differ, but in each, workers who are Friends and like-minded people join with adults and young persons to share ideas and seek for the understanding which disregards frontiers.

There is general agreement in the principle of preserving continuity of operation in Friends International Centers by long-term, five-to-ten-year, periods of service, with recognition of the necessity for provisions of security at the close of such service; in the use of one staff member, or Senior Personnel based on the Center, having the highest possible qualifications in an effort to reach the higher levels of government, and of educational and cultural life; and in the selection of staff at a given Center to cover as many levels of culture as it is possible to meet, having special emphasis on an effort to make contact with laboring people.

Suggestions were made and agreed to in Europe and England, but not submitted to Asia nor acted upon here, that the categories of possible Centers be enlarged by the addition of the Temporary International Friends Center in a place of peculiar tension or opportunity, for the duration of the emergency; and that the necessity be recognized, since the system of absence with pay does not exist outside of America, to provide salaries for highly qualified personnel drawn from elsewhere.

There was agreement in the principle of subsidizing Intervisitation, by persons qualified for international interpretation, between Europe, Asia, and America.

ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIP WITH LOCAL CENTER COMMITTEES      1. Over-all policy for all International Centers is worked out by FSC and AFSC consulting with the local sponsoring groups. Examples of this are the decisions reached by the conference at Honfleur in 1939, and Elizabeth Page's trip in 1946.

2. Within the frame-work of this over-all policy, each International Center is under a Local Center Committee made up of representatives of the local group, Friends Service Council and American Friends Service Committee with equal responsibility.

The local group may be a Yearly Meeting, as in France, or a committee of interested Friends and like-minded persons, as in Shanghai.

3. All matters affecting program and appointment of staff for the Friends International Centers are decided by the Local Center Committee in consultation with the three sponsoring bodies.

4. The AFSC Centers Committee and Desk are the channels of communication of AFSC on foreign Center matters with Friends Service Council and the Local Center Committees.

There is no need for correspondence from the Local Center Committee to go through either a Relief Mission or Unit, or through the Commissioners Office, in the case of European Centers.

5. Because of necessity to preserve a consistent policy in all branches of Friends work in each country, the Relief Mission or Unit if one exists has an advisory connection with the Local Center Committee.

This connection is advisory only and not in any way administrative.

6. Because of this close connection between Relief Mission or Unit and the Local Center, the appointment of representatives from this Mission or Unit in the Local Center Committee is welcomed.

7. The connection of the AFSC European Commissioners Office with all European Center Committees is an informative one only.

Since staff from the Commissioners Office could not, from a practical point of view, be drawn off to serve on all European Center Committees, the advisability of representation of this office on any one Center Committee is questioned.

In discussing the above policy it was felt that in questions where the beginning of a new program or service by the Local Center is contemplated, the Local Center Committee should consult with the Relief Mission or Unit in working out the suggestion to be forwarded to Friends Service Council or the American Friends Service Committee.

It has been agreed that wherever the Local Center Committee feels it would be helpful, carbon copies of numbered correspondence with the Local Center will be supplied as a matter of routine.

(This policy has been accepted for Europe but has not yet been submitted to Asia.)

ADMINISTRATIVE  
RELATIONSHIP  
WITH FRIENDS  
MISSION BOARD

1. Question of acceptability of any plan for a Friends International Center in Jamaica to the American Friends Mission Board was cleared, and preliminary exploration of possibilities made with the Board before discussion of actual participation was begun with Friends Service Council.

2. Details of participation of American Friends Board of Missions, Friends Service Council and the American Friends Service Committee as equal partners in

administrative responsibility, regardless of financial contribution, were worked out at the Annual Meeting of the Board in April, 1946, and by them submitted to the other participating Bodies for approval.

3. Jamaica Yearly Meeting added, at the suggestion of Friends Service Council, as the fourth sponsoring body with administrative responsibility for program and staff.

Details of this arrangement still being worked out by conference in January. Preliminary statement of April, 1946.

4. "MINUTE 111. The secretary reported the conversation which the Office Advisory Committee had had with William Eves III and Elizabeth Page, representatives of the Foreign Service Section of the American Friends Service Committee, concerning sponsorship of the Kingston Center in Jamaica. It was reported that the Office Advisory Committee and representatives of the American Friends Service Committee had agreed to include the Friends Service Council of England together with the American Friends Service Committee and the American Friends Board of Missions as agencies responsible for supplying the secretary of the Kingston Center. The following agreement was approved by the Office Advisory Committee and the representatives of the Service Committee as a basis for the sponsorship of the Kingston Center:

"4. After further discussion the committee agreed that the Kingston Center be sponsored equally by the Friends Service Council of London Yearly Meeting, the American Friends Service Committee, and the American Friends Board of Missions (provided this is approved by the Friends Service Council) under the following arrangement:

"a. That since the Friends work in Jamaica has throughout its history been sponsored by American Friends of the Five Years Meeting, and in order not to break this continuity or loyalty nor tend to bring division within the group of Friends in Jamaica the secretary of the Kingston Center shall be a Five Years Meeting Friend as long as the present agreement shall continue.

"b. That in view of the differences of opinion concerning programmed and unprogrammed meetings and pastoral system, that care shall be taken to choose a secretary who is free from prejudice for or against either system and would be willing to develop the type of worship services appropriate to the group.

"c. That in order to keep the salary of the secretary in proportion to those of the other Friends representatives from this country working in Jamaica, the salary shall be \$1,800 per year plus an amount not to exceed \$200 provided it is found that the cost of living in the city of Kingston justifies an additional grant in order to equalize the salary with the other American Friends representatives in Jamaica.

"d. That this salary shall begin as of August 1, 1946.

"e. That there shall be no secret correspondence between the Center and the sponsoring organizations nor among the latter; in other words, that all correspondence shall be numbered and copies of all correspondence furnished to the three organizations.

"f. That this arrangement shall be initiated by the minutes of this meeting going out as the first notice to each of the organizations."

A M E R I C A N F R I E N D S S E R V I C E C O M M I T T E E

FROM AFSC FOREIGN SERVICE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES OF JUNE 17, 1946:

MINUTE F-135 MEMORANDUM FROM CENTERS SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FRIENDS CENTERS. The following memorandum was presented to the Committee for discussion and revision or approval before it is taken by Elizabeth Page to be used as a basis of consideration by British and Continental Friends:

While decisions on the future patterns which International Friends Centers will follow cannot be made either here or in London, certain questions must be answered and certain objectives worked out if that sort of service is to be fruitful. Last fall there were several who questioned the need for International Friends centers. The thinking was that proper organizing of visitation among Friends abroad and encouraging them to undertake what lay at hand would fulfill their useful purpose; but as the months went by and letters came streaming in, we on the Philadelphia staff became aware of two things; first, the fidelity with which local Friends had kept their international centers going during their isolation, under great difficulties; and, second, the strong desire of local Friends to have the international centers continue. This caused a general rethinking, conferences, discussions, in the Centers Committee here and abroad, and the exchange of letters with center staffs in various places and other concerned Friends. The conviction has been growing that there is something the Society of Friends may do through the Friends Service Council and the American Friends Service Committee which cannot be done by yearly meetings or the Friends World Committee.

The touchstone for determination of this unique contribution which the home committees can make is the need for international understanding and reconciliation. Bearing this in mind, certain objectives are becoming clear. The Friends International Center is not primarily to undertake relief operations, although frequently and for a short period they may provide assistance. It should always be in such a form that other organizations can use it as a pattern for administration, or such an operation that another organization may be found to take it over. Neither should it primarily work to extend the Society of Friends, although groups of convinced Friends are likely to grow up around them. These groups should be encouraged to organize as monthly meetings and to have their own independent life. They should be tied wherever possible to the local yearly meetings if one exists, and if not, should be under the care of some other established yearly meeting.

These two lines of activity should be mere by-products of the main objective, which is a service to non-Friends in areas where international tension exists. The main purpose of the international center should be the demonstration of a way of living which resolves conflict and because of the very existence of such a group should provide an atmosphere of calm where tension may be lowered and differences of opinion can be examined with a detachment otherwise impossible. Reports from the field in a number of widely separated places indicate that the traditional position of the Society of Friends as refusing to take part in conflicts has made it peculiarly fitted to operate these non-partisan gathering places. In India, for example, the leaders of both sides of the present dispute have met at the Friends Centers in Calcutta and New Delhi and have been able to exchange views.

At its present stage, the thinking both here and in England seems to be that Friends international centers fall into three classifications:

(a) The national center where a problem of international tension exists. For example, in the Netherlands, the extremely efficient organization of the resistance movement and the almost universal participation in which have been created an atmosphere of hate and a breakdown of peace-time morals, present a problem almost insoluble to local Friends. Here the national group have called for international help. Another example is Denmark, which has a serious situation of international conflict on its southern border. Here, too, local Friends feel the presence of an international staff in their center would be helpful. In this type of center, the main responsibility would be with local Friends and the part which the home committees would play would be the supplying of staff members when requested or with facilitating the visits of Friends and non-Friends who have some distinct contribution to make to the local situation.

(b) or (b-1) Regional cross-roads where international understanding can be crucial. Such places where the currents of national life converge are likely to be found in post-war Berlin, Vienna, Warsaw, Calcutta, or possibly some other Indian site, and Shanghai. In those places, the organization of Friends international centers should be the main responsibility of the home committee with the cooperation of local Friends.

(c) or (b-2) World cross-roads. Places where the centers of the main world political organizations are placed should be served by Friends international centers. Such places include New York, with the United Nations Organization, Paris with the United Nations Economic and Security Council; and Geneva with the International Labor Office, the International Organization of the Churches, and possibly the International Educational Organization. In these last two classifications, we are inclined to think that the program should be one of two-way interpretation: of the basic ideals and issues of the international community to local Friends and the Society of Friends at large; and the interpretation of the basic motivation which prompts the work of the center to those who make use of it. It would be likely to include young groups, adult classes and lectures, but forefront and more important even than these would be fellowship with the individuals and organizations in the country working for reconciliation. In such a work it would be necessary to provide an intellectually attractive place of meeting for leaders of the governments and the community.

This may mean mature couples heading these last two classes of center on longer service than the usual one to two year term. The thought is not that there would be no younger, short-term workers, but that the continuity and the knowledge of the local complexities provided by a longer term by some workers would serve as a nucleus for volunteers and as a useful guide to visiting Friends. It is obvious such a conception of the center calls for the service of people with the highest qualifications. In fairness, this may mean a rethinking of center budgets.

The above is not intended to be a final statement, but a description of the results so far. Any suggestions and comments you have are earnestly desired.

In thinking this matter through, we wish to ask whether the chaos and confusion of this time does not constitute the greatest opportunity which ever faced Friends. Old forms have been broken. In many places, the faith in forms as such has been shaken, but everywhere there is the expression of need for some solid base in all this swirling change. If Quakerism with its rejection of set forms and its conclusive insistence on the worth and dignity of every individual has something valuable to offer, how can we meet the challenge? To answer this, we need the wisdom of all of us everywhere.

In discussion it was brought out that the distinction needs to be made between Friends Centers which are primarily concerned with spreading the message of the Society of Friends and International Centers which are primarily concerned with fostering better international understanding and cooperation primarily among non-Friends by the removal of prejudices, tensions, and fears through the adoption of the Quaker spirit of reconciliation and indefeasible good will. The concerns of the International Centers and the Friends Centers are, of course, not mutually exclusive but supplementary, as set forth in the second and third paragraphs of the memorandum. International centers may well prove an incentive to growth of the Society of Friends and the formation of an organized group of Friends may happen in connection with such a center. It was suggested that a committee such as the Friends World Committee for Consultation might take responsibility to see that these spontaneous groups of Friends are organized into Meetings; this should, however, not become the responsibility of the International Center.

The Committee expressed a desire that these International Centers not be thought of as the joint responsibility of British and American Friends alone, but that other national groups of Friends might also cooperate later on. It was also reiterated that these International Centers should have personnel of the very highest qualifications and that we must not commit ourselves to establishing any Centers until we have the properly qualified personnel available.

After further discussion,

the Committee approved the memorandum from the Centers Sub-Committee as a tentative framework to form the basis for discussions with Friends in London and on the Continent. The Committee recognizes that it may in practice and development be greatly altered to include not only the suggestions made in this discussion but in other ways to meet other needs and conditions in the future. The principles of the memorandum have the full support of the Foreign Service Executive Committee.

REPORT of an informal and ad hoc conference of representative workers and Friends to consider certain very important problems connected with the future development of Friends' work in France, held June 9th, 1948.

---

PRESENT:

From French Friends: Marguerite CZARNECKI  
" French Mission: Jo NOBLE  
" Commissioners' Office: Comfort CARY, Bill HUNTINGTON, Lou SCHNEIDER.  
" International Centre: Edna PUSEY, Sam LEGG, Franck REVOYRE,  
Gwen & David ROBSON.

---

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Bill Huntington opens the discussion with a report on recent conversations in London between Fred Tritton, Margaret Backhouse, Kenneth Lee, Jim Read, Lou Schneider and himself, immediately prior to Jim Read's return to the States. The conclusion there reached was that the whole of Friends' work, in any given country, should be integrated and that the conception of an International Centre should be broadened to include a unified programme of service and interpretation.

In the discussion of these questions it was emphasized that whereas in the past a distinction had been drawn between temporary relief programmes, and more permanent Centre work, the present conception of Quaker Service included many projects which are essentially of a long-term character, and which go far beyond the distribution of material relief. The neighborhood centres and school affiliation are examples of this trend. We know that in principle our different occupations are all part of one great enterprise, but our experience has been that in consequence of a departmentalized administration we are all too ignorant of each other's work to the great disadvantage of all. However, International Centres were called into being primarily to meet a spiritual need, and if a measure of integration is to take place, the administrative machinery will need to be very carefully considered, and safeguards will be required to prevent the more intangible type of work from being swallowed up by the immediate and urgent necessities of a service programme. In the detailed organisation of the work a clear division of function would need to be established, but the whole work needs to be seen as a WHOLE, composed of inter-related concerns that are mutually helpful, and not as disconnected projects. To ensure this it is felt that a Centre Director should be entrusted with the general direction of all Quaker work in France, though not over-burdened with a mass of detailed administration; that the heads of the different departments, and all other personnel should be Centre workers; and most important that the Centre Committee, composed as now of French, American and British Friends, should be the chief executive body, having responsibility for all important decisions of policy, subject of course to the full approval and normal budgetary limitations of the A.F.S.C. and F.S.C.

Sufficient experience has been gained in the running of Centres as they are at present, to show that tripartite responsibility, while it involves a number of administrative difficulties, has proved itself workable on a small scale, and immensely valuable for the truly international character which it gives to the enterprise. The point was made that if Centres are to broaden their basis and

assimilate the service programme, the difficulties of tripartite administration would be immensely increased. However that may be, every effort must be made to preserve the international character of Centres, not in name only, but in their functioning and organization, for there is always the danger that by the very nature of things rather than from any lack of good will or intention, American participation in funds and personnel will exercise a preponderant influence and control.

It is most strongly felt that the time has come for a European Conference, in Europe, to discuss the whole future of Friends work, with a view to reaching major agreements of principle along the lines suggested above, that would enable Centres to develop with maximum effect, according to the varying conditions in the different countries where such Centres exist or are proposed.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION ON INTERNATIONAL CENTERS, JUNE 3, 1948

Present: Clarence E. Pickett, Elmore Jackson, James M. Read, Julia E. Branson, William Eves, III, Blanche Shaffer, Allen J. White, Margaret McNeas.

James Read outlined three observations based on his recent trip to Europe, at which time he visited the International Centers in Geneva, Paris, and London, and held discussions with Paul Sturge, Margaret Backhouse, Fred Tritton, Kenneth Lee, Bill Huntington, Lou Schneider and some of the Centers' workers.

1. Center workers tell us that they sometimes feel that they are working in a vacuum. They feel the need of having something solid to do which results in Quaker service as well as talking Quaker principles. Not knowing just what programs they should undertake, they concentrate on meetings, lectures and teas, and then wonder whether such a program has significance.

2. The Center workers have the problem of deciding how much attention they should pay to the problems and the growth of the local Friends groups. Although they feel that their duty is not primarily to local Friends, they recognize the need and value of close cooperation with them and sometimes find themselves devoting what appears to be an undue amount of their time and energy along that line. Also much time is spent entertaining traveling personnel.

James Read presented the following possible partial answers to the above points.

1a. Each Center should be beamed at one or more organizations in the country in which the Center is located; examples: UNESCO in Paris, World Council of Churches in Geneva.

2a. The relationship with local Friends groups should be clarified. While recognizing the importance of cooperation with local Friends, the relationship of the Center must not be such that large amounts of time are required to keep the relationship clear.

Comments

It was suggested that there should be a connection between Quaker service and Quaker ministry. At the present time, there is not enough of interpretation of Quaker work in the field. Although this should be done on the spot in relief and rehabilitation work, it can be done easier in an International Center where it does not run the risk of a rice-Christian connotation. The recommendation was made that Centers and heads of missions cooperate in a greater effort to do a better job of interpretation.

A representative conference to discuss Centers' policies should be held soon.

It was pointed out that it is not always possible to relate the Center to a relief project, and Geneva was cited as an example because there is no relief project in Switzerland. At the same time, it was agreed that in Geneva the Center might help in bringing over young people to participate in work camps and that it might cooperate with the college program in the operation of International Seminars.

The following conclusions were reached:

A. The "roving ambassador" service is proving valuable. The work of Roland Bainton, Horace Alexander and Douglas Steers was cited. Such a person knows what he is going to do when he starts out and does not feel rootless on the job. This

work should be continued both on the short-term basis as with Roland Bainton and on the long-term basis as with Horace Alexander when the right persons can be found. When such persons with the spiritual and the intellectual qualifications and the language turn up, we must be willing to find financial support to make their services possible.

B. The student hostel in Geneva demonstrated how, despite difficulties, such an institution can become a real part of people's lives. This type of work with students is an innovation in Europe and presents us with real opportunities. Centers should emphasize work with students. Paris, Geneva and Shanghai were cited as places where a strong and virile student program would be appropriate. Although the AFSC hesitates to operate institutions, it is conceivable that a student hostel is the way that Centers should attempt to give body to their programs.

C. It is felt that the Neighborhood Centers can easily function as International Centers and that thought should be given to the possibility of assigning a person, or freeing one already assigned, to each of the Neighborhood Centers for the purpose of making outside contacts. It was pointed out that Alice Shaffer at the Mittelhof is doing much along this line already.

D. The idea of the International Center concerned with the causes of war and the removal of those causes through the adoption of the Quaker spirit of reconciliation was re-affirmed. It was recognized, however, that the International Centers can not be effective toward this end unless the right persons are found to direct the Centers. Hope was expressed that the Centers Secretary, in cooperation with the Personnel Office, will devise ways to visit the Quaker colleges, the University Friends Meetings, theological seminaries, etc., in an effort to locate promising persons who can be cultivated for these important jobs.

E. It was felt that more long-time commitments should be made. The Centers Secretary was encouraged to work with the Personnel staff to complete work now in progress on a plan for an adequate long-term personnel policy.

MMCN:ip

## SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE FUNCTION OF A CENTRE

### GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Where Friends are known abroad it is generally in connection with Relief Work, or else perhaps in the context of a conference of Peace Organizations where Friends may appear to be one Pacifist body among a host of similar associations. Relief work is in any case a temporary thing, and pacifism is not the principal testimony of Friends; it is of great importance but is secondary, and derives from our convictions about the Christian Faith, which we hold to be not principally a matter of doctrine, but a way of life that should govern all our affairs and relationships.

If therefore we leave the work we do to speak for itself, there is certain to be widespread misunderstanding concerning the nature of the Society of Friends, and it would seem essential that where Quaker Centres are established to be the continuing and more or less permanent outposts of our outreach, it should be our conscious policy to make our clear witness as a primarily Christian body, not of course in any sectarian sense, but in the closest possible fellowship with other confessions and denominations. I believe that we have an important contribution to make in proclaiming the Christian Truth as we see it, as a way and a discipline of worship and work, that exists without visible head or hierarchy, and is a witness, we believe, to have present working and authority of the Holy Spirit. That is to say, our testimony should be, not in vague terms to the importance of "spiritual values," nor yet to the advantages of Quakerism, but simply and humbly to the reality of the Spirit, here and now.

The original conception of Quaker outreach in Europe was in terms of "Embassies," but it seems as though the word "Centre" has now emerged and supplanted it for all practical purposes. The significance of the word should not be overlooked, and the work of a Centre, as such, can be thought of as operating on at least five distinct levels.

#### I. THE GEOGRAPHICAL CENTRE.

In a strictly geographical sense we are a centre, in the heart of great and busy capital city. We need to know our way about and to be able to help others find their way. We ought to be in a position to help visitors under concern to accomplish their task with the maximum of convenience. The extent to which such work should encroach upon the other work of the Centre is open to discussion, but it would be unwise not to recognise the fact that, during the summer months especially, a large proportion of somebody's time will inevitably be taken up with making the necessary arrangements for visitors, and helping them through the maze of formalities in which the unwary traveler is quickly entangled.

#### II. THE CENTRE OF COMMUNICATIONS.

In the realm of what one might term 'vital' geography, we are in the midst of a bewildering world of Societies, Associations, Committees and Federations, and we need equally to know the whereabouts of the different organizations, and also something of personnel and the quality of the work being done. The mechanical aids of a well documented system of reference are necessary, but mere association on the widest scale is not sufficient. A few good relationships that give profound insight into the life of the nation are more valuable than a host of meaningless contacts, and the exchange of much paper.

### III. THE CENTRAL FORUM.

Any International Centre clearly has an important function as a forum for the exchange of ideas. There is an equal need to provide a platform for speakers of different nationalities, and to offer a common meeting ground for men and women of widely differing opinions, confession or party allegiance, to discuss in amity the great questions of the day. While not being in any narrow sense partisan, the Centre should probably aim to be something more than a merely neutral observer, and link up the simple exchange of ideas to a positive educational programme, with opportunities for serious study, and access to the best books available in two or three languages.

### IV. A CENTRE OF WARMTH.

Another very important way in which we should seek to be a Centre is in the sense of being a "hearth" around which folk may gather in a family atmosphere, be they of many nationalities or of one, of many religious faiths or of none, young and old together. It is not necessary to labour the idea, but ways of achieving this need to be thought out and discussed most carefully. The danger lies in the difficulty of finding time and place in a highly organized programme of activities, as the essential qualities of a family circle are a sense of quiet leisure, peace and spontaneity -- in fact the absence of organization. It is only too easy unconsciously to assume and take for granted that organized busyness is important to the exclusion of all else.

### V. THE GERMINAL CENTRE.

It seems highly important that an International Centre should never degenerate into an Anglo-American "Concession" in a foreign capital. Ideally it must be thought of as a seed sown in fertile ground; it must be hoped that it will push deep roots into the native soil where it is planted, and that it will in time put forth a healthy growth, and branch out in a variety of directions perhaps, bearing flower and fruit in due season. Especially in early years it would be wrong to try to "force" the growth of the plant, or to be impatient in the expectation of fruit, but one needs to be watchful that the conditions are as favourable as they can be. One can be aware of the value of cross fertilization with vigorous native growths, and also seek to provide balanced nourishment. For example, it is perhaps necessary to be watchful that the fellowship of the Centre be not confined to a too severely intellectual diet, without sufficient refreshment supplied by the arts and music -- and above all a young growing organism needs the sunshine of worship, and the inspiration of wide horizons.

## SUMMARY OF THE HONFLEUR REPORT OF 1939

The first idea of a Quaker embassy was not to have a group of English and American Friends working in a foreign land. It was not a relief service, nor simply a center of good will, which, since the formation of a group of indigenous Friends, will be set up for them as an integral part of their annual national assembly.

The Quaker Embassy should be an embassy of the city of God or the corps of Christ in the meaning which the Friends have given to the great spiritual and humane concept and in a visible form. These workers must constitute a sort of spiritual civil service of all the nations; when the Christian community is not a national or racial organism, it is a universal society. Of course, the national culture and mentality must remain predominant and when an annual assembly takes shape, the life of this assembly naturally influences the center. But this life must also remain universal and international, also "catholic," like the city it represents.

Among the practical points which the experience at Paris has produced for the first plan, we cite:

- 1) To establish contact with other local and international organizations working on the same lines (problem of pacifism, for example).
- 2) To interpret the life and thought of countries where the Center is set up to circles of English and American Quakers, and vice versa, interpret English and American life and particularly the life of the Quakers to the people of those countries. This service should be expanded gradually to Quaker groups in other parts of the world.
- 3) To serve as "general quarters" to Friends serving abroad:
  - a) practical help, itinerary, lodging, etc. (avoiding, however, becoming a travel agency).
  - b) short introduction to the life and thought of the country.
  - c) assistance with the establishment of personal contacts with personalities of the country, Quakers and others.
- 4) To encourage the international and social reconciliation through family reunions, visits, study groups, meals, the latter either at the Center itself or in the homes of the different workers.
- 5) To serve as a temporary agency while permanent arrangements are being made by others in certain urgent cases: refugees, etc.
- 6) To establish and cultivate good relations with the "thinkers" of the country in order to discuss with them practical as well as spiritual problems.
7. To work together with the local Quaker group for the benefit of the yearly assembly and the Center.
- 8) To help the local group on publications, trips, conferences, to spread the Quaker message and to encourage its practical manifestations in all the possible directions.

- 9) To interpret next to universal Quakerism the special contribution of Quakerism such as is developing in the "National Yearly Meeting."

The work of the International Centers must be the result of a collaboration established on the basis of equality between the local Quakers and those from England and America, without regard to the differences in number or fortune. However, the center can only represent the ideal which it serves if every national group has acquired enough strength and depth in its material and spiritual activity.

The Centers Committee must have full responsibility for the establishment of a budget to submit to the Committees at London and Philadelphia, as well as to the executive committee of the local annual assembly of another group of Friends, everyone proving and specifying its respective contributions.

Mimeographed 10-7-1948 by  
American Friends Service Committee  
20 South 12th Street  
Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania

Report on Conference on A.F.S.C. Administrative Relationship with the Paris International Center, September 23, 1947.

---

Present: Clarence Pickett, James Vail, Julia Branson, Emma Cadbury, Marnie Schauffler, Frederick J. Tritton of F.S.C. and Louise Schmitt of France Yearly Meeting.

The policy, as A.F.S.C. understands it, for operation of Friends International Centers, is that:

1. Over-all policy for all International Centers is worked out by F.S.C. and A.F.S.C. consulting with the local sponsoring groups.

Examples of this are the decisions reached by the Honfleur Conference in 1939, and Elizabeth Page's trip in 1946.

2. Each International Center is under a local center committee made up of representatives of the local group, Friends Service Council and A.F.S.C. with equal responsibility.

The local group in the case of the Paris International Center is France Yearly Meeting.

3. All matters affecting program and appointment of staff for the International Centers are decided by the local center committee in consultation with the three sponsoring bodies.
4. The A.F.S.C. Centers Committee and Desk are the channels of communication of A.F.S.C. with Friends Service Council and the Paris Center Committee.

There is no need for correspondence from the Paris Center Committee to go through either the French Relief Mission or the Commissioners' Office.

5. Because of necessity to preserve a consistent policy in all branches of A.F.S.C. work in France, the French Mission has an advisory connection with the Paris Center Committee

This connection is advisory only and not in any way administrative.

6. Because of this close connection between French Mission and the Paris Center Committee, we have welcomed the appointment suggested by the Paris Center Committee of a representative in that body from the French Mission.

7. The connection of the A.F.S.C. Commissioners' Office with all European Center Committees is an informative one only.

Since staff from the Commissioners' Office would not, from a practical point of view, be drawn off to serve on all European Center Committees, we question the advisability of such representation on the Paris Center Committee. We welcome the appointment by the Paris Center Committee of William Shank, but we think he should be considered in his personal capacity as a concerned and well-informed American Friend and not as representing the Commissioners' Office as such.

In discussing the above policy, we have come to feel that, in questions where the beginning of a new program or service by the Paris International Center is contemplated, the Paris Center Committee should consult with the A.F.S.C. Relief Mission in working out the suggestion to be forwarded to Friends Service Council or American Friends Service Committee.

We wish to make it clear that we are ready at any time when the Paris Center Committee feels it would be helpful to supply to France Yearly Meeting carbon copies of numbered correspondence dealing with matters of program and staff as a matter of routine.

In the course of this discussion, it is clear that during the latter years of the war, and for a short time afterward, there has been confusion as to this division of responsibility. These departures from the general policy, however, are recognized as part of the existing confusion and were not a deliberate change and we hope have disappeared with the ending of the transition period. We have appreciated the frankness with which the need for clarification has been brought to us and we hope that in the future the machinery here outlines will work smoothly. At any time when it fails to do so, we would welcome prompt notification of this fact.

American Friends Service Committee  
20 South 12th Street  
Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania

EXTRACT from Minutes of the Representative Conference of AFSC FOREIGN SERVICE WORKERS  
IN EUROPE - held at Hotel de Haas, Amsterdam, Holland OCTOBER 30 - NOVEMBER 3, 1947.

---

MINUTE 12: International Centers: In the preliminary discussion on International Centers, the following points were made:

A Center should be truly international. It is not necessarily so because, in addition to some staff from a local Yearly Meeting, it has American or British personnel.

A Center should be Quaker. The unity of men should be expressed and sought on the level of the belief in the divine in all men. Pacifism is an essential element in the Center spirit. A Center should be known as a place of reconciliation, a haven where shelter and strength can always be found on common ground.

The pattern of a particular International Center is conditioned by the needs and background of its location. American or British staff should be cautious lest they impose on a Center a preconceived pattern unsuited to the circumstances. Personnel has a great influence on the character and program of a Center but the life of the Center itself should be more lasting than any particular personnel and should not shift with every new appointment.

It is extremely important to have an international staff, and a relatively small number of staff members from the country of the Center is recommended. Staff members should preferably be members of the Society of Friends, should be carefully selected for maturity and long-term service.

In starting international centers, allowance should be made for growth, both in the sense that care must be taken not to begin with too large an imposed pattern and in the sense that facilities must allow for expansion. A healthy center should grow gradually and strongly from a small beginning into a broad vision.

Centers should at all times preserve a spirit of serenity. Too much service work, too hectic staff duties can easily shatter that atmosphere in which is supposed to be found a relief from tension.

The Conference considered the traditional policy of International Quaker Centers in aiming chiefly to reach intellectual groups, persons in advanced educational, cultural and political circles. The Conference felt that the "embassy" service of Centers was not necessarily confined to such circles but could be broadened to touch all sections of society. Labor groups were particularly cited as a field for more outreach from the Centers. Strong concerns were expressed that there was a present danger that the International Centers were not reaching as full an expression of their original vision as they should, that their programs should be re-examined more intensely than was possible at this conference and that ways should be sought for improving their techniques.

The Conference reaffirmed its faith in the International Center as a long-range Quaker enterprise and felt that these Centers could become the hubs from which all Quaker work could spread, emphasizing that Centers can be particularly effective in the individual approach stressed at the Conference and in strengthening indigenous Quaker groups.

The Conference recommended that through consultation and intervisitations among their staffs, the International Centers in Europe look for ways of expanding their services and adding to the vitality of their programs.

## FRIENDS SERVICE COUNCIL

On the Future of Quaker Work in India.

By Horace Alexander.

---

(I am using the word India in its old sense, to include the territories now included in both India and Pakistan.)

It seems to me that the time for any long-term institutional work on the part of Friends in India is past. Reflection on what I have seen of Quaker work throughout the world in the past twenty years, and especially experience in India in the past two years leads me to the view that the whole policy of the Friends Mission Boards in the nineteenth century and of the Service Councils in this century have carried us much too far from the historic Quaker method of supporting concerned Friends to undertake concerns of limited duration. Today there is a most dangerous and often quite disastrous tendency to think in terms of institutions that must somehow be carried on, rather than in terms of Friends or those who like to work with Friends who are plainly under concern for a special piece of work. Without suggesting that we can or that we should swing right back to earlier technique, I would at the same time strongly urge that the first care of both Councils should always be to ensure that no work is carried on unless there are Friends, or men and women very near to Friends, who are under genuine concern for each piece of work that is undertaken. If such Friends are not forthcoming, the work in question should, without hesitation, be closed, or handed over to some other agency. This also means that where Friends are found who are recognised to have a true concern, their work, even though it may be quite away from the recognised centres, should have first claim on the support of Friends.

There are additional special reasons why institutional work should not be continued in India today. All foreign institutional work is being regarded with increasing dislike and distrust as free India takes further hold of her own national life and institutions. Moreover, such work involves an immense amount of detailed administration, which is difficult for foreigners, especially newcomers, to understand, which is often alien to western minds, and which can be very frustrating and maddeningly wasteful of time and effort.

Therefore, I think it will be wise to wind up such work, or hand over responsibility for its continuance to appropriate Indian agencies official, as quickly as possible.

But there remain important spheres of work where Friends are still welcome, and where their efforts will almost certainly be appreciated for many years to come. Subject, therefore, to the observation already made on the importance of true concern, I suggest that the following general policy should be followed:-

(1) Quaker Centers. The City Centres in Delhi and Calcutta and the Rural Centre at Rasulia, possibly others, should be actively fostered. The work of a centre is not easy to define. It will vary from place to place, in accordance with the concern and the qualifications of the centre workers. The Sunday meeting for worship is central to it. In each centre there will be lecture-courses, discussion circles, etc. on public questions of the day, problems of peace and war, on literature and culture and so on. Opportunities will be found to engage in various useful social welfare activities in the city or villages. The premises will be used by other agencies for committees, conferences, etc. They also provide meeting places for people of all religious communities of various nationalities.

(2) Short Term Workers. Each of these centres, if under the guidance of experienced Friends, can provide opportunities for short-term service, say a year or two, for young Friends from America and England. After they have spent, say, three months on language study and assisting in local activities, some of these young, short-term workers would probably find work in close connection with the Friends Centre, whether in Calcutta, Delhi or elsewhere. Others would spend the main part of their time, after the initial period, as seconded workers to some such Indian organization as the Ramkrishna Mission, the Servants of India Society, or at some Basic Education Centre, or Santiniketan or a Christian ashram, or some such social agency in Pakistan, according to their previous training and aptitude and interests.

This is not intended to rule out the possibility that from time to time one or two, with special gifts of imagination and sympathy, might be encouraged to initiate experimental work of their own, especially if such experiments do not involve long term commitments. But it cannot be too often repeated that in India today it is wise for young workers to be well attached to a centre where there are Friends who know the country. Such senior people, if true Friends, far from trying to "quench the spirit" of eager young, will be zealous in encouraging the development of true concerns and original experiments.

(3) Emergency Relief. The reputation made by the Friends Ambulance Unit and continued by the Friends Service Unit for assisting in relief measures at times of crisis is likely to mean that fresh calls will come to us, from time to time, for work of this character. When this happens, it may be possible to draw off some of the young short-time workers from the agencies to which they have been loaned. Judging from recent experience it also seems likely that we shall receive offers of help from a number of sources, including some who are very valuable workers, with previous experience of India and knowledge of its languages. It hardly seems possible to have a permanent reservoir of people waiting to be used in such emergencies. We shall have to do the best we can with the human material available. But it is quite essential that, when such appeals come to us, if we respond we shall make someone with considerable experience of India responsible for the direction of our work.

(4) Lecture Tours and other Short Visits. One of the most valuable things that Friends can do is to send senior Friends capable of lecturing on various subjects of general interests especially in the realms of religion and politics, who can visit Universities, Colleges and other cultural institutions. Such interpreters of the best thought of the West are always appreciated by large numbers of educated Indians.

I believe if the above lines of action can be followed, the contact of Friends with India in the future can be very fruitful. I would add three points that I hope may be borne in mind. Among those who represent Western Friends officially there must be a few who undertake to spend at least five years in India. Secondly, the service of Friends who reside in India as professional men, etc., may often have even greater value than the service of those who are supported by Friends' funds. Thirdly, we must be constantly trying to hand the leadership in all our work to Indians who are capable of exercising such leadership.

COPY

FRIENDS SERVICE COUNCIL

Comment on Horace Alexander's Note by Richard Symonds, 9.2.48.

I have been asked by Horace Alexander to add a comment on his Note on the Future of Friends Work in India and Pakistan. I do so bearing in mind particularly Mr. Gandhi's recent observation to Horace and myself: "White skins are at present at a discount in India." In India, and to a lesser extent in Pakistan, a victorious nationalism sees few jobs which it cannot tackle and in many Provinces has dispensed not only with the Indian Civil Service but the Indian Medical Service. Friends' work has to adjust itself radically to the events of August 15th, 1947, but in India will be assisted by the history of goodwill between Friends and Indian nationalist leaders.

Horace's draft programme seems admirable. A few points may however be underlined.

(1) Categories of Workers. It is suggested that future foreign Quaker workers should be clearly classed either as "permanent workers," committed to a minimum period of five years service, or "student workers" whose primary object is to study languages, economic, social or cultural subjects in Indo-Pakistan.

(2) Need for Technicians. Indo-Pakistan needs Nurses, Doctors, Agricultural and Fishery experts, Engineers of all sorts and lecturers and teachers in a variety of subjects. The most valuable contribution Friends can make is to send out as permanent workers Quakers or near-Quakers with these skills, to exercise them within the general AFSC-FSC framework.

(3) University Lecturers. It is suggested that Horace's paragraph 4 should be given concrete form by the establishment of University lectureships at Delhi and Calcutta. American and British Friends might alternately nominate annually a lecturer to spend one term at each University. American, European and British modern history, literature and current affairs would be suitable subjects. In Britain the British Council might give financial backing to such a project.

(4) Student Workers. Horace's recommendation in paragraph 2 is excellent. Student workers may be encouraged to come out to Indo-Pakistan in the same way as they visit European countries after school or university to learn new languages and assimilate new ideas. It may be observed that Hindustani-Urdu which is becoming the official language of Indo-Pakistan will be the language of the second largest and fifth largest nations in the world, and therefore of considerable value in business, foreign services, etc.

I entirely agree that, except in a large-scale operation as in the Punjab last year, student workers will learn more and be more valuable ambassadors if their field work is with Indian and Pakistan organisations.

Apology. I am not a Friend, but believe from experience that Friends have had, and can have in future, a unique contribution to make in India and Pakistan.

RE/MAC  
23.3.48.

FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTERS

Activity Chart Based on 1947 - 1948 Reports

|                                 | Amsterdam          | Calcutta                           | Geneva                         | Jamaica                     | Paris                        | Shanghai                          |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Worship                      | X                  | X                                  | X                              | X                           | X                            | X                                 |
| 2. Lectures                     | X                  | X                                  | X                              | X                           | X                            | X                                 |
| 3. Retreats                     | X                  | -                                  | -                              | -                           | -                            | X                                 |
| 4. Study Groups                 | X                  | X                                  | X                              | X                           | X                            | X                                 |
| 5. Music                        | -                  | Gramophone<br>Concerts             | -                              | -                           | Chorale.<br>Gramo-<br>phone. | Singing<br>Group.                 |
| 6. Poetry                       | -                  | Poetry Ap-<br>preciation<br>Group. | -                              | -                           | -                            | -                                 |
| 7. Language Classes             | X                  | -                                  | -                              | -                           | X                            | X                                 |
| 8. Student<br>Activities        | -                  | College<br>Women's<br>Fellowship.  | X                              | -                           | X                            | X                                 |
| 9. Radio Broadcasts             | -                  | -                                  | X                              | -                           | -                            | -                                 |
| 10. Counselling                 | X                  | X                                  | X                              | Limited.                    | Refugees.                    | Refugees.                         |
| 11. Information on<br>Quakerism | X                  | X                                  | X                              | X                           | X                            | X                                 |
| 12. Hospitality                 | X                  | X                                  | Luncheon<br>Group.             | X                           | Teas,<br>etc.                | Picnics,<br>Teas, etc.            |
| 13. Library                     | X                  | X                                  | X                              | X                           | X                            | X                                 |
| 14. Relief                      | X                  | -                                  | -                              | -                           | X                            | X                                 |
| 15. Community Service           | Social<br>Service. | Bustee<br>School.                  | -                              | Volley Ball<br>Swim. Instr. | -                            | Receiving<br>Home for<br>Children |
| 16. International<br>Contacts   | -                  | No tangi-<br>ble ones.             | Various<br>Organi-<br>zations. | -                           | UNESCO                       | Nothing<br>tangible.              |

Centers Desk  
 American Friends Service Committee  
 20 South 12th Street,  
 Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania.  
 June 1948.