

as they are perhaps aptly called, varying in length from a few minutes, to over an hour of impassioned, fiery, repetitive oratory from a bearded Cuban Army Commander.

These interventions referred, always to colonialism, almost invariably to attacks on American imperialism, and for varying amounts of time to students and higher education -- some not at all, and a few considerably. Though the opening plenary session was referred to in the agenda as a discussion on the Report of the Executive Committee, and though Mr. Pelikan started it off with a brief verbal report, hardly anyone referred to it, except to say that they agreed with it completely. After such a brief statement of agreement, and not everyone did even that much, the intervention dealt with almost anything else, and would have been just as valid at any other meeting of a political, polemic nature.

During the opening plenary there was no report on, or discussion of, finances. The report of the Executive Committee did not refer to the subject at all. When the representative of UNEF asked, during the opening plenary, whether this was not the place for a financial report, he was informed by the President, Mr. Pelikan, who chaired the opening plenary, that unlike the ISC the IUS gave this report at the end of the Congress, and then only to its own members, who were the only ones concerned in any case.

#### MEMBERSHIP

I will not detail who is now a member of the I.U.S. as this is something that can be quickly ascertained from a quick perusal of literature available from I.U.S. headquarters. Suffice it to say that the number of Full and associate members is somewhere over forty. The small number of East European and Communist members to which the IUS had been reduced by 1955 has now been added to considerably with new members from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Though the IUS still hasn't anywhere near the same active participation that the ISC has, not even from the areas of the world just mentioned, the number is growing. At the same time, the many unrepresentative and splinter groups which once padded IUS membership roles are slowly being dropped. Also, a number of countries passed from full membership to associate membership to complete withdrawal, but this is not referred to at all.

In I.U.S. Congresses the representatives of both Full and Associate Members are given Delegate status, and so are treated on an equal footing, and indeed, any difference between the two categories exists only superficially, to placate certain students in the countries which have Associate membership, and who do not want to be known as Full Members. In the Report of the Credentials Committee, Delegates were referred to as "Coming within Section V of the IUS Constitution." Now, within Section V there are four categories in Section V the various Full and Associate Members came.

When the Report of the Credentials Committee was presented I asked which of the four categories India and Mexico came under, and was told that both of them came under the category of "a country where neither a national union or a co-ordinating committee....exists." In the course of the discussion that followed, I referred to the III Latin American Student Congress which had declared that there was a National Union in Mexico. To add to this, the Delegate from Mexico stated that he wished to make it perfectly clear that he represented only Technical students, that his group was part of the group which was recognized as the National Union of Mexico, and that he would like to know