

Secondly, I want to prevent a possible, mistaken impression that the IUS is the same monolithic organization it was in the early middle fifties. I have indicated previously that the number of African, Asian, and Latin American Unions joining the IUS is slowly growing. The number is still far below the participation in the ISC but it is significant. Most of these students won't raise strong objections to most of what the IUS says and does because it is mostly against West European and American imperialism, which they also oppose. They don't care too much about the very important matters that the IUS leaves out or doesn't condemn, because they don't want to antagonize the IUS Secretariat, and because, they say, these other questions, like suppressions in Hungary and East Germany, are too far away when they have overwhelming problems at home. So none of them will get attacked the way I did. If they raised embarrassing questions they wouldn't get travel grants again.

Moreover, we must not overlook the growing split between the more "conservative" East European on the one hand and the Chinese, sometimes joined by a few others, varying in composition, on the other. Let me give two illustrations. In the resolution on place Rumania proposed an amendment which would have stated that peace should be promoted by a number of rational and international agencies, including the United Nations. The Chinese immediately proposed deletion of the United Nations because, they said, everyone knew it was a tool of American Imperialism. Bulgaria tried a compromise by using the wording, "the United Nations as expressed in its Charter". Finally the Chairman suggested that the interested delegations should get together and work out a compromise. Three hours later, no compromise was achieved and the Chinese opposed the Rumanian amendment alone. In the final plenary, they alone abstained on the resolution.

Another split arose over a certain wording in the peace resolution to the effect that "the struggle for peace is necessarily bound up with the struggle against imperialism". The East Europeans and certain others wanted the word to be "usually" but the North Africans and the Latin Americans insisted on the original wording. By a close margin, in a real and true division, "usually" was adopted in the final plenary.

I don't want to over emphasize these divisions because they arise on only a few points and there is unanimity or near-unanimity on most others, but I do want to point out that they exist.

In conclusion, then I believe that the IUS is more intransigent now than ever before at least since the mid-fifties. The co-operative and compromising "spirit of Prague" has disappeared. Perhaps this is a result of growing self-confidence as a few more members join every year, even though their purposes don't always coincide fully with those of the controlling majority.

I believe we should continue attending IUS Congresses as Observers, and should not consider any form of membership. Frankly, apart from every other consideration of divergence of beliefs, ideals, purposes aims, etc., which would prevent membership, I cannot see anything to be gained by any form of membership. I do believe though that we should try to convince other National Unions, especially from non-imperialist countries, to come to IUS Congresses as Observers. There are many important questions that should be asked and the occasional comments that should be made. If the whole task of doing this falls on two or three people, as it did this time, it is too difficult. If we can be joined by several others like views and aims, much can be done.