

I would like at this point to refer to an incident which illustrates excellently the inability of the IUS or its strongly partisan members, to admit that anyone in the student world outside the IUS can do any good. At one point during the opening plenary, when I chanced to be outside the Congress Hall, the delegate from Iraq gave his intervention and in the course of it accused the ISC and COSEC of being supporters of the old regime of Huri Said. In my absence the British delegate pointed out that this was grossly unfair as the ISC had sent a Research and Information Commission investigator to Iraq during Said's regime, and that the ensuing report came out very strongly against the Said government. When I returned to the Congress Hall I spoke on a point of order and explained, fully how I, as that investigator, visited Iraq and recounted whom I had seen. At this point a member of the Iraqi Democratic (Communist) Youth Organization got up and said that most people I saw have since been declared traitors to the new regime. Despite admitting privately that I had spoken to the very people whom he, who was in London at the time of the investigation, had asked me to see, he would not admit this in public. Other Iraq students later came up privately to say that they remembered my visit and to say that I was the only outsider, during Said's regime, to come into the country to investigate cases of student oppression. No one from the IUS had come until after the overthrow of Huri Said.

Finally, I want to finish this part of the Report by stating that there are very obviously certain questions which cannot be asked, or topics which cannot be discussed, especially if the person asking or trying to discuss is from North America, or presumably from parts of Europe. When such questions are asked the person is called a "provocateur" or a "reactionary" or a representative of "negative forces." I will give three examples of this.

The most obvious example, of course, is the reaction to the Canadian intervention. The intervention itself, and a summary of what was said, is included in the appendix. The extreme bitterness of the attack, the personal insults included, and the vituperative nature of it, was matched only by the enthusiasm and length of the rhythmical clapping that followed every insult. With the exception of a few neutrals and the Observers, everyone else showed his complete and obvious approval of phrases like "you running dog of American Imperialism", which I am told was translated into Arabic as "emasculated dog of American Imperialism", "You are dishonest and don't represent your students", "How much are you getting paid for telling lies". It was clear to anyone who had yet any doubts, that certain topics were taboo, and that you couldn't even ask the IUS for its own version of these events. (Perhaps one should add that one Delegate from Bulgaria, and Mr. Pelikan, were the only ones from the Cominform countries to apologize for such action.)

Another example of the extreme reaction caused by certain questions is one asked by myself in Commission. The IUS Constitution includes a clause stating the different forms of discrimination that the IUS is opposed to, and this includes discrimination on the basis of "political conviction". For some reason, in the Resolutions of the Peking Congress and in the Report of the Executive Committee, "political conviction" as the basis of an undesirable form of discrimination was left out. I asked whether anyone knew why this was so. Immediately, the Rumanian delegate went into a long and acrimonious dissertation stating that this wasn't the place to ask questions about the Peking Congress, that I didn't understand the issues involved, that I was only interested in obstructing the work of the Commission and that I should be ignored and that the Commission should not be held up by such trifling matters.