

Copy for information

24, Av. Impératrice Joséphine,
Rueil-Malmaison,
Seine et Oise,
France.
6-11-1955.



My dear Thom,

Thank you very much for your letter of the 3rd. November. I too think that it was wise not to go to the Unesco meetings for the first time, as an observer and that too on your own expense.

I am very sorry to learn that circumstances in the General Secretariat have obliged you to combine the November and December issues. Will it still be devoted completely to Europe or are you going to combine your ideas for the issue of November with that devoted completely to Europe? However if you could come to a decision soon, as to the contents of this number, people outside the General Secretariat may be able to help you to get the articles.

I know that you have been having a tough time with translations into French and such other details. But still it seems to me that we have taken an extremely long time even for the English version of the minutes. Was not the editing of Jeremy quite to your taste and did you have to bring about a lot of changes?

Regarding the circular to the members of the D.C. please do not consider the absence of replies as an excuse for not sending the circular regularly. If some members have not replied to your circular, it is not wise to aid them in their inaction by your taking the attitude that they would be needing some more time for reflexion and so you would better wait a little longer before sending the next circular. Moreover this will prevent the others who have been prompt in answering your circular from bringing in their help more frequently. If your circulars go out regularly, when they accumulate, it will certainly prick the conscience of those who have not been quite prompt in their reaction and oblige them to take more active interest.

Coming to the article on exiled students or more generally - as they would say in French - 'Les sans patrie'. it may be good perhaps to ask both Zygmunt and Laslo for suggestions. If Laslo offers to write the article then you can judge for yourself whether it could be published or not. I am making this remark because I do not know whether he could treat the problem generally with the central idea I suggested. At least, he will be able to suggest some one else.

If you are willing to have the D.C. meetings on the 31st which is a Saturday, then why do we not have our entire meetings on the three holidays viz, Saturday 31st, Sunday 1st and Monday 2nd. If the meetings were to end on the 30th, then I could understand having them on the 27th, 28th and 29th and the joint meeting on the 30th. This would perhaps permit some of the participants to get back home for New Year. But since you are willing to have meetings even on the 31st, it is clear that most participants, unless they are staying very close to Paris will not be able to get back home for New Year's day. The only difficulty I could imagine for is that Don Guano will not be able to assist from the 1st onwards. I think that in that condition we should be satisfied with the presence of Père Louis.

To awaken our Christian conscience to the problems of the exiled because they are our brethren and members of the same family

From your letter I gather that you have been thinking in terms of three days for our meetings, two for ourselves and one for joint meetings. I would prefer that we have three full days for ourselves. That is why I would request you to arrange for four days no matter what dates you choose. Personally I prefer the 30th, for the joint meetings, in order not to disturb the program of the 'ICMICA' and the 31st, 1st and 2nd for our meetings. Yesterday evening I met Père Faidherbe and he told me that any dates between the 26th December and 3rd January were good for him. He wants the exact number of participants sufficiently early so that he could arrange for lodgings. Please try to find the number early and pass it on to Père Faidherbe so that we may not be obliged to find ourselves in the same situation as in Leicester.

What is this brain wave about 'getting onto' ex Roger Millot? Please fix the final dates and I shall see whether I can get leave. If I do not succeed no question of approaching other people to influence a decision.

I would certainly have liked to meet you before the meetings, though I know it would not be of much use from the experience I had last year. I continue to keep thinking that a discussion between the President and the General Secretary will contribute to the success of the meetings. 'Maif', isn't it? But I do not think that on that count I should ask for leave for the whole week.

I read with interest your comments on the Statutes. You know, I suppose, that the few remarks I sent to Zygmunt, were meant just to help him to have an idea as to how other people are thinking about the problem and does not represent a position taken by me. I have still an opinion though the remarks I made are the ones that struck me most. I shall take a position regarding the different changes when I will have read the report prepared by Zygmunt. Just one remark. You introduced your comments saying that the statutes should be vague, in that case what do you think about paragraph h in article 16. Has the Interfederal Assembly ever fixed the dates of our public functions and meetings?

Regarding representation at international meetings, I wonder whether we have seen each other's point view quite well. I am saying this because of your statement 'I agree with you that the President should be consulted before sending any non-staff member to a meeting! It is the specification non-staff member that is worrying me. I believe that we should consult each other on any type of representation at any meeting. I think that this is quite in the spirit of the statutes. However I do not think that this could be easily clarified by correspondence and so shall wait till I meet you next.

I believe the Finance Committee is a structure created by the Treasurer and the Finance Committee as such is not responsible to the Movement. It is the Treasurer who is responsible to the Movement. So I wonder whether my presence at the Strasbourg meeting will be welcome. However I would like to be there because that will give me the occasion to meet you and discuss certain points regarding the next D.C. meeting as well as the Movement in General.

I went through or rather read carefully the reply you want to send to the IUS. I think it would be advisable to add a statement that since we are already in touch with the UNESCO with regard to



a similar project, though of wider scope, we prefer to wait for the reactions of the UNESCO and go ahead with our project. Further since we are planning a preliminary meeting in 1956 to which we expect to invite representatives of International University organisations we are unable at present to consider the invitation of the IUS. Don't you think such a reply will be more to the point? Perhaps diplomacy demands that we beat about the bush!!

Père Faidherbe was very pleased with the Altenberg meetings. Has Laslo written to you? What does he think about it? What about the Arts and Engineering sub-secretariats? Have you had any contacts with the engineering sub-secretariat? Could we not ask the different sub-secretariats to send a report to the D.C. meeting? Here again I would like that the reports be prepared in advance so that the members can read them calmly. I for one have never been able to find the time during our meetings to read the various reports and and do justice to them. If we have the reports in advance we will be able to consider them without being distracted by the day to day worries that will be caused by the meetings.

I shall try to prepare a circular as soon as I will have had the time to read the minutes. Meanwhile, in your next circular could you include a provisional agenda for the next D.C. meeting which will permit the D.C. members to give their suggestions.

Your letter to the federations designated to choose candidates for the D.C. is excellent. I hope unlike last year the federations will reply quickly.

I too received a letter from Hugh Buckley saying that Mr. Caron was willing to take up the job. From the copy of your letter to Ray, I understand that you would still insist on Hugh taking up the work. If I were sure that Hugh did not have any other difficulties which prevents him from shifting to Ottawa and finding the time to devote for the work I too would have insisted. It is true perhaps that Deans usually do not have the time for other work. But if Hugh thinks that he himself would not be able to combine his professional work and the chairmanship of the N.A. Commission I think we are putting him in a difficult position by insisting that he accept the work. I can imagine the situation myself. However I am writing to Hugh and will request him to do as he judges best.

That is all for the present. My very sincere wishes to all there and in the union of prayers,



Yours sincerely,

F. L. N.