

doc
CA1
EA
61C17
ENG

Ed Students & Int'l.
Affairs

A memorandum submitted
to the Dept. of
External Affairs

M
b2157391

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF CANADIAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

.....

FEDERATION NATIONALE DES ETUDIANTS DES UNIVERSITES CANADIENNES

CANADIAN STUDENTS AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

43. 247.923

A memorandum
submitted to

THE DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Dept. of External Affairs
Min. des Affaires extérieures

FEB 18 1980

RETURN TO DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARY
RETOURNER A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE DU MINISTERE

Jacques Gérin
Vice-President for
International Affairs

Ottawa, March 1961

INDEX

INTRODUCTION

1. National Federation of Canadian University Students	2
2. International Student Conference (ISC)	2
3. International Union of Students (IUS)	7
4. General trends in the student world today	9
5. NFCUS cooperation in the ISC	11
6. Contacts with IUS and IUS members	14
7. Overseas Commissioners	15
8. Bilateral relations	15
9. Latin America	17
10. World Assembly of Youth (WAY)	19
11. North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)	20

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Scholarships	21
2. Latin America	22
3. Algeria and South Africa	22
4. NATO	22

CONCLUSION	23
------------	----

APPENDICES

1-A Principles of Cooperation adopted by the Eighth ISC	
1-B Principles of Cooperation adopted by the Ninth ISC	
2. Report on the Fifth IUS Congress, Peking	
3. Report on the Sixth IUS Congress, Baghdad	
4. List of Publications	

INTRODUCTION

It is a basic tenet of our conception of democracy that the individual, even when projecting abroad an image of his country, is free from governmental direction or control, is free to voice his own opinions or those of his principals, and is responsible for his actions only to those he directly represents. In other words, there is a complete separation between the official policies of the government and the views of the private citizen or organization, and this holds true even in representation outside the country.

This proposition is stated because it bears immediately upon the scope and effectiveness of the international activities of student organizations. There is no doubt that such activities are greatly reinforced when they receive direct governmental support; however, they then risk becoming a mere extension of state policies, and lose the quality of independence essential to understanding and cooperation in the world student community.

The National Federation of Canadian University Students must maintain this foremost principle of free and independent action. And yet there has been since World War II a considerable increase of student involvement in international affairs which has brought heavy responsibilities to bear upon Canadian students; it has forced development of the Federation's international programme to an extent that surpasses the modest means at our disposal. Also it has meant that Canada itself is now more closely linked than ever with events that affect students everywhere.

Communication has grown between the Federation and the Department of External Affairs as a result of these factors, although relations have always been on an ad hoc basis and have never had any continuing or permanent character. The Government of Canada should now be made more aware of the student role in international affairs; in those fields where cooperation seems advisable the possibilities of a closer association should be fully explored.

Our purpose, therefore, is to provide the Government with what we deem to be essential information on our activities, and to make recommendations in specific areas where Canada might benefit from governmental action in conjunction with or apart from the Federation.

1. NATIONAL FEDERATION OF CANADIAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS (NFCUS)

NFCUS is the representative association of Canadian university students. Its present membership includes approximately 85,000 students from 36 degree-granting institutions - 95 per cent of all full-time university students.

The chief role of the Federation in Canada is to promote the material and intellectual interests of the nation's students; thus one of its essential obligations is to campaign for complete equality of opportunity in education. A second role is to serve as a bond uniting student communities across the country, and to foster a true Canadian spirit and national consciousness despite - and within - geographic and cultural differences.

The founding constitution of 1926 stated that the Federation should be the means for Canadian students to establish contacts and cooperate with other students of the world. This is done through the International Affairs Commission. Responsibility for the conduct of the programme outlined in the course of this memorandum lies with the Vice-President for International Affairs; a student elected annually by the National Congress.

2. INTERNATIONAL STUDENT CONFERENCE (ISC)

History

The ISC was established in 1950 when a number of national unions of students found they could no longer work effectively within the International Union of Students (IUS) because of its partisanship and political bias. The founding members were 20 European and North American countries, including Canada, who met in Stockholm in the First International Student Conference to institute a framework for international cooperation.

These unions have met almost yearly since that time - the Ninth International Student Conference was held in Switzerland from August 21st to September 2nd, 1960 - and the number of national unions participating has grown steadily from the original 20 to the present 70.

Briefly stated, the essential principles of the ISC are as follows:

- a. Participants must be the freely elected leaders of their national unions and representative of the majority of the students of their country;
- b. The Conference is neither a permanent "union" nor an "organization," but simply a meeting ground for students of the world;
- c. Any action by the Conference must be based on the "Principles of Cooperation" (see appendices 1A and 1B) adopted at each Conference, and will only be concerned with problems that directly affect students.
- d. All actions will be universally adaptable and devoid of partisanship.

These principles are fundamental and have never been altered since the inception of the Conference. However, the growth of the ISC from a European to a worldwide assembly of students has naturally brought about an evolution in the nature of the problems with which it must deal.

The activities of a European and North American student union are essentially "syndicalist." These unions are concerned with the material welfare of their students, with educational opportunities, scholarships, and the like. The student in these countries is but a part of a well-educated community and his role in the political life of the nation is relatively minor. A basic principle of these unions is that of "apoliticism," which can be understood to mean abstention from any partisan or one-sided political activity, or abstention from any political activity whatsoever.

However, the problems of students in underdeveloped areas are quite different. In most Asian, African and Latin American countries, students are the major educated group within the community and are therefore at the forefront of social reform. In most of these countries it is the genuine responsibility of the student to undertake what we would call "political"

action, ranging from stands on social problems, such as agrarian reform, to direct involvement in political parties and even in revolutions. To provide a framework for the cooperation of students whose roles differ in this way has not been an easy task. It is to the credit of the ISC that its flexible structure has permitted the incorporation of elements which would not fit within a unitarian association.

The adaptation of the ISC to an evolving situation while still preserving its basic character has been achieved by broadening the scope of responsibilities of the student to include his duties to society as a whole. It has been declared a responsibility of the student to defend and uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to maintain academic autonomy, social justice, the basic freedoms, and the cause of peace.

The means of fulfilling these responsibilities is left to the individual national union according to its particular circumstances. The South African union will fight against apartheid, that of the Dominican Republic against the Trujillo dictatorship, while NFCUS will try to obtain a full measure of social justice within the educational system of Canada.

The present orientation of the ISC is reflected in the principles adopted at the Ninth Conference (see appendix 1B). These are most significant since they give a broader concept of the function of the student and the student union in national and international affairs.

Structure

The ISC is not a federation of national unions of students. It is, as has been stated, a meeting ground, a "Conference." However, in order to carry out an evergrowing plan of action, the Conference has established a permanent Coordinating Secretariat (COSEC) in Leiden, Netherlands. The Secretariat is directed by an Administrative Secretary and five Associate Secretaries selected on a representative geographical basis. It is assisted by a technical staff responsible for specific aspects of the Conference programme.

The Secretariat is in no way an executive body. Its sole responsibility is to implement the resolutions of the Conference. It does not have the power to interpret these resolutions, nor may it act as the representative of the national unions. The unions retain their full sovereignty and only when assembled in Conference can they take common action as "the ISC."

A Supervision Committee of nine unions is elected by the Conference to supervise the activities of the Secretariat and see that it conforms itself to the resolutions. It is not an executive body and it too is bound by the resolutions.

NFCUS was elected by the Ninth ISC to a second successive term on the Supervision Committee, of which it was Convenor (or Chairman) during the first term.

The central operations of the Secretariat are financed by contributions from the participating national unions. Projects are supported by raising funds from various sources, most of these to date being American Foundations.

Programme

The ISC programme may best be described by outlining the work of the eight commissions by which it is determined at each Conference. These are:

Commission A - Principles of Cooperation: Establishes the basis and scope of international cooperation. It discusses bilateral exchanges, world student unity and the means to achieve it, and issues statements of principles.

Commission B - Student Delegations, Study Projects, Seminars and Regional Events: Determines most of the actual programme of the Conference. It has, for the present inter-conference period, decided upon or endorsed some 30 events such as international student delegations to the Middle East, a study seminar in Asia and Latin America, a Pan-African study seminar, a work camp in Chile (sponsored by NFCUS), and other activities which unite students in a common purpose. This Commission has enacted what is by far the most extensive programme of international student cooperation ever seen.

Commission C - Student Press and Publications: One section of this Commission deals with the problems of the student press and its freedoms and responsibilities; for the past ten years it has called an annual International Student Press Conference which brings together student editors from all countries. The other section reviews and decides upon the various publications of the Secretariat: "The Student" magazine, the "Information Bulletin," and others.

Commission D - Social, Economic and Educational Affairs: Is concerned with problems of student welfare, educational opportunities, equivalence of degrees, and material aid to refugee students in particular. Its main achievements in recent years have been the establishment of an experts' Conference on Student Welfare in Europe, and assistance to Algerian refugee students.

Commission E - Student Travel and Exchange: Has convened 12 International Student Travel Conferences, where the travel directors of the national unions meet to elaborate their annual schedules of study tours and exchanges, and has assisted in the implementation of bilateral exchanges between national unions. In this respect the Conference has established, in cooperation with UNESCO, the International University Exchange Fund which acts as a clearing house, and will eventually provide a special fund, for these exchanges.

Commission F - Cultural, Faculty and Sports Activities: Has set up an International Bureau of Cultural Activities to stimulate cooperation in this field; promotes cooperation among international faculty organizations - Engineering, Medicine, Commerce, and so on.

Commission G - Statements of the Conference: Possibly the most important "political" Commission since it deals with human rights and all cases of student oppression and restraint of academic freedoms. This Commission drafts statements of solidarity with oppressed students and indicates the measures necessary to support them in their struggles. It is a fundamental principle of the Conference that no action will be undertaken,

nor any statement made, unless adequate and unbiased information be available. This information is normally provided by the Research and Information Commission (RIC), an independent agency of the Conference that sends teams to "trouble spots" and studies cases of oppression when requested by the Conference or the national union concerned.

Commission H - University Reform: Deals with the problems of the university in its role and structure, particularly on the basis of the principles of university reform developed in Latin America. The Coordinating Secretariat has recently published a collection of documents of great value on this subject.

Commission I - Implementation of Cooperation: Has to do primarily with the structure of the ISC, the role and duties of the Coordinating Secretariat, the Supervision Committee, and the Research and Information Commission. It recommends to the Conference the continuance or modification of the framework of cooperation.

3. INTERNATIONAL UNION OF STUDENTS (IUS)

The IUS was the first postwar international student organization. Founded in 1946, in the general desire for international friendship and cooperation which would bring about everlasting peace, it grouped at one time the majority of national unions of Europe and America. It was established as a cohesive body with a policy-making Executive Committee and a permanent Secretariat in Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Unfortunately, the IUS became an instrument of certain outside forces and eventually its obvious partisanship and political bias forced out most of its members. In 1948 two major events raised the first doubts as to its integrity and independence: the Czech coup d'état, when the IUS refused to protest against the killings of Czech students, and the exclusion from the IUS of the Yugoslav Union of Students for no other reason than that Tito's "independence" was condemned by Stalin.

Its continued silence during the Hungarian repression, its refusal to denounce the invasion of Tibet and India by China, while loudly proclaiming everywhere else in the world its constant fight for peace and against colonialism and imperialism, have been additional proof that the IUS is not in fact an independent body.

It presently has a membership of some 35 student organizations, mostly from Eastern Europe, China and Japan, and six associate members who are also participants in the ISC. Although representativity is not an essential for membership, it can be said that the IUS does represent the student organizations - if not the students - of most communist countries.

Its basic principles of action have been repeatedly stated as being, "the fight for peace and disarmament, against colonialism and imperialism, for national independence, for the democratization of education and improved student living and study conditions."

These are indeed lofty goals. Unfortunately they have been transformed more into propaganda slogans than principles. One also notes that the well-being of students comes last in the list, after the declarations on the fight for peace, etc.

NFCUS, although never a member of the IUS, has always maintained some contact with it. We have attended IUS Congresses as observers and have had continuing relations with its member organizations.

It is hardly conceivable that the IUS, with a highly-centralized unitarian structure, will ever become representative of the majority of the students of the world; however, since it has no inhibitions as to its fields of endeavour and since its resources are extensive, it has been very effective particularly in those areas where students are genuinely involved in the struggle for the independence and development of their country.

4. GENERAL TRENDS IN THE STUDENT WORLD TODAY

In order to limit the range of this heading we shall discuss only what appear to be the three essential forces in today's student world: the development of the ISC, the communist influence and world student unity.

Development of the ISC

This has already been dealt with at length. The expansion of the principles of cooperation to take into consideration the role of students in emerging nations is definitely a milestone of the international student movement. This has meant an acceptance of the fact that Europe and North America are no longer the majority influence in world affairs but that the "new countries" have emerged as the real majority and that their needs and aspirations must be considered on a par with ours. By maintaining basic restrictions on the scope of its action, the ISC has ensured that it will not become a political platform but will remain primarily concerned with student interests.

In view of the unfortunate but very real split in the student world it is essential that the ISC achieve the maximum effectiveness. Not because it forms one bloc as opposed to another - 70 countries can hardly be called a bloc - but because it definitely represents the free and independent as opposed to those bound to a creed of sectarian principles and policies.

There is strong pressure from within to transform the ISC more and more into a political platform. However, we believe that the optimum compromise can be achieved and that universal principles of cooperation can be upheld.

The Communist Influence

There is no doubt that international communism seeks to enroll university youth in the furtherance of its aims. Whereas the proletariat can provide the physical arm of the Communist Revolution, students can be the intellectual arm - and this is indeed an important fact to bear in mind.

The communist cause is greatly aided by the cohesion between communist governments and their youth and student sections. The latter receive unlimited financial support; there is a common purpose and mutual assistance is requisite.

Communist infiltration of the university milieu is of course most successful in those countries emerging from dependence and underdevelopment, to whom the West can easily be depicted as the colonial exploiter. Exchanges, delegations, and particularly scholarships are always available to students from these countries. Communism has a goal and is stopping at nothing to achieve it; evidence of infiltration is already obvious in some areas of Africa and Latin America.

The only counter-influence to communist advances is effective solidarity with students from the emerging areas, and an effective and disinterested plan of moral, technical and material assistance. There is no reason why Canada, for instance, cannot offer as many scholarships to Latin America as does East Germany, save for the fact that students in Canada are left to their own resources while those of East Germany are assured of full governmental support.

This is indeed a field which calls for close cooperation between NFCUS and the Government - and a most vital field at that.

World Student Unity

Ever since the split occurred in the student world there have been calls for unity. Although such of its members as China and Japan apparently reject all forms of cooperation, the IUS has been the most vocal spokesman for unity. This is one call to which we cannot say no. There is everywhere a genuine desire for unity. The question is: for what purpose? and at what cost?

NFCUS sees unity as an ultimate goal to be achieved through cooperation within the limits of the fundamental principles of the ISC. Disruption occurred because these principles of cooperation were not universally applied.

Their universal application remains a dim possibility, yet it is the only path to unity.

In reply to the call for unity, the Eighth ISC decided to organize a Round Table Conference on World Student Unity. However, since the terms of reference of this Round Table were not acceptable to the IUS, it refused to attend. A new attempt was made by the Ninth ISC, this time leaving the door open to all initiatives that would lead to a neutral and independent Round Table. The fate of this proposal is still a matter of speculation since the IUS has not yet declared its views.

There is no doubt that IUS will be ready for unity when it can be achieved on its own terms. The same should hold true for us, but it is much more difficult to agree on such a stand in an open Conference, where all views are aired, than in the closed membership of a Union.

This desire for unity is with us for a long time and will substantially affect international student cooperation in the years to come. It is a factor to be reckoned with.

5. NFCUS COOPERATION IN THE ISC

Since the inception of the ISC in 1950, NFCUS has always made cooperation within the Conference framework the mainstay of its international programme. This, plus the very high respect in which Canada is held abroad - a respect much greater than its contribution has ever warranted - has promoted NFCUS to one of the leading roles in the ISC and resulted in our election for two consecutive terms to the Supervision Committee.

Our work in the international student community can best be described under these headings: solidarity, practical cooperation, and material assistance.

Solidarity

Canadian students have never been of the kind indiscriminately to vote resounding declarations of support for this or that cause. However, our increased contacts with the student community abroad have brought about a growing solidarity, expressed in various resolutions and concrete actions.

The spontaneous reaction of Canadian students to the murders of Hungarian students and to the apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa are specific examples of this new awareness of problems other than our own.

Although mere resolutions may strike some as useless verbiage, they have often proved to be effective means of building up moral pressure in support of a cause. Solidarity has also been expressed through material contributions to students in need of relief, as will be shown below.

Practical Cooperation

Canada's isolated position prevents it from participating in most cooperative events of the student world. However in the past few years, Canadian students have participated in: the International Student Work Camps in Sakhiet-sidi-Youssef, Tunisia, and Concepcion, Chile; the International Student Press Conference in Oxford, England; the International Student Travel Conference in Edinburgh, Scotland; and the International Student Seminar in Lund, Sweden.

A Canadian has served as a staff member of the Sakhiet work camp and of the Latin American study seminar in Sucre, Bolivia. Participation in all these events was possible through financial assistance received from COSEC; for even though Canada is a rich country and should normally be expected to contribute rather than to receive assistance, our participation has always been conditional on aid from foreign sources.

Canadian students have much to gain by participating in such events. They provide a rich experience, an opening on life outside Canada; they contribute greatly to international understanding and friendship, and provide valuable knowledge for our own use. It is hoped our participation will be substantially increased in future.

Material Assistance

There exists a specialized international agency providing assistance to students in some 40 countries: the World University Service (WUS). NFCUS cooperates closely with WUS in Canada and the two organizations have sponsored such joint activities as a university campaign for World Refugee Year. However, NFCUS has also appealed occasionally on its own to its member universities and has secured funds to assist students in Morocco, Chile, Algeria, South Africa and India.

Assistance to Morocco, Chile and India was given in response to emergency situations. On the other hand, needs in Algeria and now in South Africa and the Congo are growing.

Because of the political implications, Canadian students at first were somewhat reticent to commit their support to Algerian students. Yet they require our support. Although we have been able to give some aid to refugee students in Tunisia and Morocco, there is also a pressing need for scholarships to permit them to continue their studies outside Algeria. Money was raised through international contributions to provide some 80 scholarships in Europe and approximately 25 in the United States. The Eastern European countries offered an unlimited number of scholarships which the Algerian student were reluctant to accept but finally had to, in limited numbers.

These are urgent needs that completely exceed the means of Canadian students. Assistance has been requested from university administrations and others and is now forthcoming, after a slow start. It is of absolute necessity that the Government cooperate, if not in providing actual scholarships, at least in facilitating admittance of these students to Canada. The stakes are the minds of men, and democracy should enter wholeheartedly into the contest.

6. CONTACTS WITH IUS AND IUS MEMBERS

It was said previously that while NFCUS has rejected membership in the IUS it has maintained some relations with this organization. The reports of the NFCUS observers at the Fifth and Sixth IUS Congress in Peking and Baghdad (see appendices 2 and 3) provide clear insight into the mechanism of the IUS and our own policy.

NFCUS receives all IUS publications and has recently been invited to write an article for the magazine, "World Student News."

Relations are also maintained with some Eastern European national unions. For the past three years we have sponsored student tours in Russia, Poland and Czechoslovakia. They have sometimes been difficult to arrange but have provided an insight into those countries. We have been fortunate to have an experienced leader to guide the tours on every occasion.

At our National Congress in 1959 we received as an observer the vice-president of the Student Council of the USSR. His visit led to a decision to negotiate a reciprocal exchange of student delegations between the Soviet Union and Canada.

Although NFCUS is highly critical of many positions taken by the IUS and its members, we have not rejected invitations to cooperate. We have had competent representatives in our dealings with these groups; this has ensured that our position at all times would be clearly stated. It has also meant for us first-hand knowledge of IUS activities and subsequent ability to form a considered judgment.

Cooperation with these organizations does not imply a lack of commitment to our ideals but rather a commitment firm enough for us to stand before one and all and maintain our beliefs.

7. OVERSEAS COMMISSIONERS

For many years NFCUS has attempted to perfect a system of student representation abroad which would permit Canadians to participate in many activities which distance now prevents. Canadian students abroad who are sufficiently versed in the affairs of the Federation are accredited with the national union of their country of study. They act as NFCUS representatives in that area.

During the last two years we have had representatives in Australia, Ghana, Germany, France and England. They attended the National Congress of their host country and a number of other events. Unfortunately we lack personnel at the National Secretariat to ensure constant communication with Overseas Commissioners and funds to provide for their representative duties. Thus we have been prevented from making full use of the invaluable opportunities their presence in foreign lands could provide. For instance, Canadian participation in a most important African seminar was impossible last year because we failed to secure sufficient funds for transportation of our delegate.

In spite of these difficulties we hope to extend this system of representation. Also we have invited other national unions to reciprocate by appointing similar representatives to Canada.

8. BILATERAL RELATIONS

Apart from the normal exchange of information, bilateral relations with other national unions generally mean attendance at their national congress and reciprocal visits by delegations.

NFCUS receives throughout the year invitations to attend a number of national congresses but is seldom able to accept. We have had, however, at our own National Congress in 1959 representatives from the United States, England, and the Soviet Union, and again from the United States in 1960.

Contacts are maintained on a regular basis with the United States National Student Association (USNSA). Last year the President of NFCUS and the Vice-President for International Affairs visited the offices of the Association and received in turn a visit from its officers. A regular exchange of information and attendance at national congresses is maintained between the two organizations.

As was mentioned earlier, our National Congress in 1959 resolved to negotiate an exchange of visits with the Student Council of the USSR. After much deliberation a reciprocal programme was agreed upon, and four Soviet students arrived in Montreal October 30th, 1960. They visited 18 cities as guests of the local students' councils and university administrations; there they were shown various academic institutions, local and student governments in session, industrial, business, and research centres, museums, art galleries and tourist attractions. They attended plays, movies and sports events, and appeared on national television.

In order to save expenses and to provide a realistic impression of Canadian life, the four students were housed in university residences or were guests at private homes. Mass meetings were held at each campus and the visitors were called upon to explain the Soviet educational system. Discussion periods followed in which the audiences asked questions on topics of a wide range of interest.

The Soviet delegates returned to the USSR on November 30th, well pleased with their cordial reception and the arrangements that had been made for them across Canada.

Plans have now been agreed upon for the reciprocal visit by NFCUS. Our delegation includes five men and one woman from five faculties and six universities. The president of NFCUS will act as leader; a Canadian student presently enrolled in the Russian Institute at Columbia University will be the interpreter and Sovietologist.

We feel that the six delegates are a truly representative group. They have been carefully screened: first by a local selection board of students and senior faculty members, and secondly by the national selection board taken from student, faculty and government bodies. Over one hundred and fifty applications were examined.

To ensure adequate preparation four days will be allowed for an intensive study period prior to departure. Experts in education, foreign affairs, Slavic studies and the Soviet complex have agreed to donate their time and experience to this seminar.

The delegation will arrive in the USSR May 21st, 1961 and will remain there for one month. Areas to be visited are Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tashkent, Kazan and one of the Baltic Republics.

Generally the programme will parallel that extended to the Soviet students here. Emphasis will be placed on the description of Canada and its role in today's world. Each member will be required to submit reports and articles and to speak on the Soviet system upon his return to this country.

This exchange is not only a symbolic demonstration of good will by both parties. Although a visit of one month is indeed very brief, it will be a period of intensive study which could possibly prepare the ground for academic exchanges of one year's duration. Such exchanges are also foreseen with students of Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Terms for all exchanges will be settled as much in advance as possible to assure complete reciprocity.

9. LATIN AMERICA

Canada has always been considered among the world "blocs" as a European country and indeed our roots are in Europe, our affinities are much closer to Europe than to the rest of America, with the exception of the United States.

However, in the changing context of the world situation it is becoming more and more important that Canada be recognized as an American country. If this is true in the political world it is also very true in the student world.

Latin America is in a period of swift transition and its influence in student affairs is increasing every day. It is a prime target for communist ambitions. In general, students in Latin America are deeply involved in the forefront of political and social change, hence the very great importance of student movements there. Another important consideration which holds true in the student world, is that Canada still has the respect and friendship of most of these countries, not being branded as an "imperialist" nation.

Canadian students will have much to gain by closer alliance and cooperation with those of our hemisphere. We intend to emphasize American affairs in future. We would like to see NFCUS recognized as an American national union rather than a European one; we feel this would be to the mutual benefit of Canada and Latin America. As a first step in this new policy, NFCUS promoted the International Student Work Camp in Chile. This project is intended for students from all the American and Caribbean countries and should create new bonds among them.

NFCUS has never had a "foreign policy" oriented towards aims more specific than general cooperation. We feel, however, that there is now a clearly determined need for this cooperation to be directed to our own continent, despite linguistic, cultural and geographical differences.

Our National Congress in 1960 considered the following concrete proposals as means of practical implementation of such a policy:

- a. Participation as observers in Caribbean student seminars;
- b. An extensive tour of Latin American countries by a Canadian student delegation, as a means of entering into closer relation with the national unions of that area and of learning their problems and aspirations. This tour obviously will involve very large expenditures and will not be possible without a substantial grant; experience has amply shown that ordinary fund-raising

operations will not be sufficient to finance such an undertaking. Direct or indirect assistance from the Government would appear essential. In this way Canada would gain the understanding and sympathy of important sectors of the countries involved; students at times can be excellent ambassadors.

- c. Reciprocal visits to Canada by Latin American delegations. An attempt at such an exchange with Argentina was made a few years ago with the assistance, we believe, of the Canadian Embassy in Buenos Aires.
- d. Long-term academic exchanges of selected students from Canada and some Latin American countries.
- e. The offering by Canada of a number of scholarships to Latin American students. This would be in accordance with the apparent intention of the Canadian Government to enter into a firmer association with Latin America; it seems also to be one of the most fruitful means of making our country known to people with whom we wish to pursue friendly relations.

These projects, let us repeat, will require the assistance of the Government of Canada. We believe the objective to be more than worthwhile; the implications are greater than the mere fraternizing of a few students. We intend to give priority to a policy of Latin American relations. We should be most grateful if the Government were to give such a policy its full consideration and indicate what are felt to be the possibilities of mutual support and cooperation.

10. WORLD ASSEMBLY OF YOUTH (WAY)

The World Assembly of Youth is somewhat the equivalent on a broader scale of the International Student Conference. Its headquarters in Brussels unites all youth movements - students, workers, farmers, and others - in a common effort to uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles incorporated in the Charter of the United Nations.

WAY operates through national committees in some 50 countries. NFCUS is the acting Secretariat for the Canadian Committee; perhaps we should say that NFCUS has been forced to act as the Canadian Committee pro tempore, since this body has been dormant for some years.

An effort to revive operations was made last April, when NFCUS was host to some 16 national youth organizations. This meeting established a working committee to study the possibilities of forming a coordinating body for all Canadian youth movements. One of the principal aims of such a body would be to ensure adequate Canadian representation abroad. Although NFCUS received two travel grants from WAY to attend its Eighth General Council in Ghana last August (these grants were used by the president of the Young Progressive Conservatives and the president of the Jeunesse Ouvrière Catholique), representation of Canadian youth movements in international activities has ranged from not enough to not at all. The same reasons that warrant international student cooperation apply to youth in general. We trust that the Government will be sympathetic to our efforts in these lines.

11. NATO

Although NFCUS as such is not committed to the support of NATO, we have found its youth activities a valuable field of cooperative endeavour. We are grateful to the Government for the opportunity provided us on numerous occasions to participate in NATO Seminars for Youth Leaders. To ensure the widest participation, NFCUS has whenever possible invited other youth organizations to send representatives to these seminars and to use the travel grants made available by NATO. These grants enabled Canadians to attend the seminars held in Oxford and Istanbul. Our Overseas Commissioners, also, have been able to represent Canada at a number of these seminars, such as the ones held in Rome and in Oslo in 1959.

NFCUS has been responsible for the organization of the two NATO seminars held in Canada, the first in Ottawa in 1958 and the second in Halifax in 1960. We have always been very pleased to contribute as much as we can to these activities; it must, however, be made clear that our participation depends entirely on the financial assistance made available to us. We must therefore request continued governmental support to enable us to carry on our activities in this field.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. SCHOLARSHIPS

The Government has already inaugurated the valuable Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme and merits the highest praise for this initiative.

Scholarships appear to be the best medium a country can use to introduce itself to others, to share its culture, its civilization and its experience, and to benefit from the richness of other cultures. The scholarship method is used most extensively by certain countries to promote systems inimical to ours. Can we not learn from their example and open our own country to scholars from other lands? Financial impediments to such plans seem a very poor excuse for Canada to make to the people of Africa or Asia. Our specific recommendations with regard to scholarships are as follows:

- a. That a plan similar to the Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme be initiated for countries of the French Community, and other countries of a French culture in Africa and Asia. Such a plan is now under careful study by our International Affairs Commission and we will be pleased to present further recommendations to the Government on this matter in due course.
- b. That special grants be awarded to facilitate the entry into Canadian universities of refugee students who cannot study in their own countries because of circumstances beyond their control.
- c. That consideration be given to a special plan of Latin American scholarships within the framework of a broad Latin American policy.
- d. That the Government request the cooperation of bodies such as the Canadian Universities Foundation, the Canadian National Commission for UNESCO, the Canada Council, the World University Service and NFCUS in forming a special committee to ensure the proper reception in Canada of Canadian Government Scholars.
- e. That the Government give due consideration to the following resolution of the twenty-fourth National Congress of NFCUS:

"WHEREAS education is generally a pre-requisite for the political, economic and social development of all nations, and
WHEREAS education is in particular a necessary requirement for the successful development of democratic institutions, and
WHEREAS many nations in Africa find themselves critically in need of educational assistance,
BE IT RESOLVED that the NFCUS Congress request the Canadian Government to propose, through its delegation at the forthcoming session of the United Nations, a comprehensive United Nations Educational Plan for needy African states, priority to be based upon the needs as established by the report of UNESCO on this problem."

2. LATIN AMERICA

We have already explained the need for a concrete Latin American policy at the student level and for the cooperation of the Government in its execution. We believe that such a policy would effectively serve the best interests of Canada.

We shall merely repeat here our request for consideration and financial assistance, and summarize its possible aspects:

- a. Canadian student delegation to Latin America;
- b. Latin American student delegations to Canada;
- c. Long-term academic exchanges;
- d. Comprehensive scholarship plan.

3. ALGERIA AND SOUTH AFRICA

Students in these areas continue to suffer. The Government should give them special consideration, either by means of direct financial assistance, as suggested above, or by facilitating their entry into Canada on student visas.

4. NATO

We request that the Government continue its policy of aiding youth leaders to participate in special seminars through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Consideration could also be given to extending these youth seminars to other governmental organizations such as the Colombo Plan and, eventually, the Organization of American States.

CONCLUSION

The suggestions and recommendations we have made involve great expenses and political and administrative problems. However, they merely outline the first steps to be taken if Canada is truly to face the obligations imposed by its position in international affairs. We trust that our Government will soon take these steps.

We have asked for independent governmental action in certain domains: in others we have asked for governmental support of action by the National Federation of Canadian University Students. Let it be well understood that we most emphatically do not want the type of state "support" given to student organizations in communist nations. Such a result would not be in the best interests of Canada.

What we respectfully request is the understanding and active cooperation of the Government in matters that are of national as well as student concern. There are specific projects NFCUS could and should undertake, but cannot without financial assistance from the Government. Our annual budget for international affairs is in the amount of \$1,000; yet even with these slight means we have managed to implement what might be considered an ambitious programme. Our needs arise from our isolation; they cannot be met by private contributions since Canada is not endowed with great philanthropic or educational foundations.

We believe that our endeavours at international cooperation are worthy. We believe that Canadian students must be more deeply involved in the world student community.

They must be involved because of their isolation; because it is too easy for them to forget about the rest of the world and to live in blissful ignorance of their responsibilities to themselves and to others.

They must be involved because of Canada's privileged position as the beacon to which so many countries look for understanding, sympathy and assistance. These we must offer. It is an obligation which falls upon us now as students and which will grow with us later.

In assisting Canadian students to cooperate with others, to participate meaningfully in international student affairs, the Government will make of them better citizens, and the nation itself will benefit.

PRINCIPLES OF COOPERATION

Bases of Cooperation

Expressing the desire of the National Unions of Students of the different countries for mutual understanding and friendly cooperation, the International Student Conference affirms the following principles, which will serve as the basis for that cooperation:

- a. It shall be a practical cooperation on student problems such as the defense and safeguarding of legitimate interests of students (those concerning university education, student needs, student security, student cultural activities, student sport, student health, etc.) and the democratic principles of the University;
- b. It shall be an effective cooperation on the basis of the obligations which students have towards the society of which they are a part, which led them to fight against all forms of oppression (imperialism, colonialism, totalitarianism, etc.) which imply specific political responsibilities considering the fact that the fight for university autonomy, freedom and the development of culture is closely linked to the fight for democracy, national independence, peace and justice for their countries;
- c. It shall be a cooperation on a voluntary basis, and in the spirit of mutual respect and equality;
- d. It shall be a cooperation that excludes all forms of discrimination, and is devoid of any kind of partisan policy.

Scope of Cooperation

The Conference further recognises that the important and complex problems confronting students must be discussed and acted upon subject to the following qualifications:

- a. That problems raised shall concern students as such;
- b. That insofar as any decision on these problems is political, it shall be of a non-partisan nature, and the taking of such decisions shall be clearly independent of partisan political considerations;
- c. That any problems raised shall not involve conflicts or contractual agreements between two sovereign states except when they affect students as such; problems concerning any particular territory may be raised only (i) by the National Union of Students having its base in that territory or (ii) in other cases by five National Unions of Students;
- d. That problems involving fundamental human rights, and especially those concerning education and requiring, therefore, the application of the above criteria, shall be considered only if adequate documentation is made available to the ISC;
- e. That bearing in mind the principles of cooperation, the implementation of decisions taken in accordance with section (c) above shall be made by the Coordinating Secretariat together with the National Unions of Students. It shall of course be for each National Union to act as it thinks appropriate.

PRINCIPLES OF COOPERATION

Bases of Cooperation

The International Student Conference is an effective framework for international student cooperation. Serving as a forum for the discussion and expression of student interests and aspirations, the International Student Conference provides a medium for effective cooperation and action.

In expressing the desire of the National Unions of Students of different countries for mutual understanding and friendly cooperation, the International Student Conference affirms the following principles as a basis for cooperation:

- a. That cooperation rests on mutual respect, equality and non-discrimination among participants, wholly free of any kind of partisan policy and having regard for the sovereignty of each National Union of Students;
- b. That this cooperation rests upon the true representativity of participants from organisations whose formulation of policy and leadership is subject only to the will and the expression of its student constituencies through the free and open democratic process;
- c. That this cooperation shall be a practical cooperation on student problems such as the defence and safeguarding of legitimate interests of students (such as those concerning university education, student welfare and student health) and the democratic principles of the University;
- d. That this cooperation shall be an effective cooperation on the basis of the obligations which students have toward the society of which they are a part, which leads them to fight against all forms of oppression (such as imperialism, colonialism, totalitarianism, dictatorship and racism) which imply specific political responsibilities considering the fact that the fight for university autonomy, freedom and the development of culture is closely linked to the fight for democracy, national independence, peace and justice for all countries.

Through the open exchange of views and ideas, the various conceptions of the role of students in the university and in society can lead to a common and united programme for continued cooperation among National Unions of Students. Within this framework the 73 National Unions of Students gathered at the 9th International Student Conference proclaim the following aims of international student cooperation:

1. That education should be guaranteed to everyone on the basis of equality, without regard to race, colour, sex, economic circumstances, political, religious or ideological conviction, national or social origin;
2. To defend freedom of thought, expression, action and of association;
3. To defend university autonomy and academic freedom;
4. To defend the right of a free student press in which students can express their views and opinions on any subject without interference, pressure or censorship from government, educational authorities or other non-student bodies;
5. To guarantee to all students the right to an education developed in harmony with their own traditions, language and culture;
6. To guarantee to all students the right to leave their country and to return freely;

7. To defend the legitimate interests of students in the fields of cultural activities, sport, health and social security;
8. To support students in the struggle against all forms of oppression - political, economic, social, cultural, and ideological, since
 - a. Colonialism is opposed to the free development of society, it violates the basic rights of man and of peoples and denies fundamental academic freedom;
 - b. Imperialism in all its manifestations whether it be political, economic, cultural or ideological is opposed to self-determination and self-development; exploits the many for the sake of the few; seeks to crush the development of the free and democratic process;
 - c. Totatarianism, in all its forms of constraint - ideological, political, economic, or social - is fundamentally opposed to democratic progress, suppresses fundamental human rights and academic freedom;
 - d. Dictatorship, in any form and by any means, sacrifices human equality, endangers economic, social and political development and is an enemy of freedom in any part of the world;
 - e. Racism, wherever it exists, seeks to destroy the rights of man and of peoples, it denies equal opportunity and the very dignity of man, and it is opposed to the principles and progress of civilisation and to universal cooperation between peoples and races;
 - f. Social injustice wherever it exists consists of the exploitation of man by his fellow man and suppresses the development of civilisation.
9. To fight for complete freedom as a pre-requisite of social justice and peace;
10. To guarantee to students the right and responsibility to seek every means to ensure peace in the world, since
 - a. Peace is necessary for the free and full economic, social, political and cultural development of the world;
 - b. Peace means the application of social justice everywhere in the world and the elimination of violations of the rights of man and of peoples wherever they occur;
 - c. Peace means the end of colonial and imperialist wars and the full achievement of national independence of oppressed peoples;
 - d. Peace means the guarantee of national and social integrity and the free and unfettered development of the democratic process;
 - e. Peace means the achievement and maintenance of academic freedom, free access to education and the autonomy of the university;
 - f. Peace cannot be fully realised without the final cessation of nuclear testing of a military nature and without general disarmament;
 - g. Peace to be consolidated requires the development of a community of nations based on the rule of law replacing the use of force as a means of resolving conflicts.

Scope of Cooperation

The Conference further recognises that the important and complex problems confronting students must be discussed and acted upon in accordance with the Bases of Cooperation adopted by the 9th ISC subject to the following qualifications:

- a. That students have a primary responsibility for directing efforts to the solution of the world's pressing problems concerning students and universities, including the maintenance of students' rights, the fight against all forms of oppression and the achievement of world peace;
- b. That any decision of the Conference shall be of a non-partisan nature, and the taking of such decisions shall be clearly independent of partisan considerations;
- c. That any problems raised shall not involve conflicts or contractual agreements between two sovereign states except when they affect students according to the bases of cooperation adopted by the 9th ISC; problems concerning any particular territory may be raised only (i) by the National Union of Students having its base in that territory or (ii) in other cases by five National Unions of Students;
- d. That problems involving fundamental human rights, and especially those concerning education and requiring, therefore, the application of the above criteria, shall be considered only if adequate documentation is made available to the ISC;
- e. That bearing in mind the Principles of Cooperation, the implementation of decisions taken in accordance with section (c) above shall be made by the Coordinating Secretariat together with the National Unions of Students. It shall of course be for each National Union to act as it thinks appropriate.

This Conference furthermore believes that practical assistance to student communities in need so that they may make their full contribution to their national societies, that solidarity with student communities suffering from oppression of any kind in regard to the rights specified above, that a programme which can increase world wide student understanding by permitting more and more students to have meaningful contact in an atmosphere based on mutual respect and equality and devoid of partisan purpose, will be a significant and lasting contribution to the highest aspirations of all students - national independence, peace and justice.

REPORT ON THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF STUDENTS

PEKING, September 4-14, 1958

by Dave Peel

INTRODUCTION

The Fifth Congress of the International Union of Students, more realistically named than the "world student congresses" of former years, met in Peking from the 4th to the 14th of September, 1958. The executive committee of the IUS could have chosen no better place for the congress than Peking, the capital of the People's Republic of China, for the Chinese are full of an amazing enthusiasm and have achieved an equally amazing stature.

The arrangements that were made for the congress were excellent, following the usual IUS rule. Participants from Europe gathered in Prague, Czechoslovakia, at the end of August and were accommodated in a student hostel while visas for the Soviet Union and China were obtained. In Prague, a beautiful city, we were given opportunities to sightsee, shop and attend concerts, and I would like to thank the Czech students who made my stay there so pleasant.

The group of congress participants of which I was a member left Prague on the 31st of August in a jet airliner, a Tupolev 104A of the Czech Airline. After a few hours of conducted sightseeing in Moscow, we boarded a TU104 of Aeroflot, the Soviet Airline, and soon arrived at Omsk. Weather conditions kept us from proceeding further than Irkutsk, Siberia, where we spent the night of the 1st of September, having almost missed the previous night because of time zone changes. The Chinese Airline took us to Peking after a short stop at Ulan Bator, the capital of the People's Republic of Mongolia.

The return trip was much quicker, leaving Peking in the morning and arriving in Moscow late the same afternoon. The short flight to Prague was made the next day.

From my arrival in Prague on August 26th until I left it again on September 18th, the IUS paid all my expenses. I paid my own fare from Paris to Prague and back, and NFCUS paid my registration fee at the congress. I want to thank the IUS and its travel department for their assistance as well as for the financial arrangements which enabled me to represent NFCUS at the congress.

During our two weeks in Peking we lived in an excellent hotel with very fine service. I was by myself in a double room, as were several of the other observers from "the west". Our meals were served at the hotel and they were extremely good; we had a choice between two hotel restaurants, one serving Chinese food and one, European food. Never in my experience of student conferences have I seen the participants treated so well, and if I seem to dwell too long on the material aspects of the meeting, it is perhaps because they impressed me more favourably than any others.

There were buses and taxis to take us to and from the congress hall which was, however, only a fifteen minute walk through pleasant streets. The hall itself was clearly designed for meetings of this type, and, as is usual again, had every possible facility. There was simultaneous translation in five languages: English, French, Spanish, Russian and Chinese.

Before I proceed to a description of the congress itself, I would like to mention three events which impressed me and which, I think, had some effect on all the western observers. The first was a visit we made to a brand new and very modern textile plant where even the obscure workers in the far corners of this huge factory knew all the right answers and seemed to mean them. The second was the best organized demonstration I have ever seen (a rather small football rally is a riot by comparison, and not nearly as effective), a demonstration by between two and three million people which lasted for twenty hours of street parades and speeches against the United States "aggression" in the Toiwan Straits. The third was the "garden party" given for the participants, where we were all paraded through long lines of young people, about twenty-five thousand of them, all clapping the rhythmic clap that we use at a dull baseball game but which to them is the ultimate sign of approval, and all shouting the Chinese equivalent of "long live world peace."

It is in this light, then, that this report should be read: the congress took place in an almost unbelievable atmosphere of enthusiasm, and enthusiasm about a growing and powerful China that had put its past behind it and was afraid of nothing, a China that had extended its friendship to all nations fighting "western imperialism" and had been eagerly accepted by them, a China that knew it has the world's largest population and greatest potential for progress and could hardly wait for the next year to come to see what new records had been broken. This all made an impression on the observers from western countries; the impression that it made on observers from non-committed countries, or upon students who already had leanings to the far left of politics, should not be underestimated. This feeling of the strength of the new China permeated almost every aspect of the congress. It lent great weight to all actions and all sympathies of and for the "socialist camp."

THE CONGRESS

The history of the student movement, a necessary background to an understanding of the congress, is readily obtainable and will not be given here. Suffice it only to say that, as the representative of NFCUS, I was an observer only at the congress and my participation was limited. Canadian student representatives participate actively in the International Student Conference (ISC), a meeting much more to the liking of Canadians.

a. Participation

There were approximately 250 participants in the congress, and they came from some 70 countries or colonies. The number of representatives was greatly reduced from the 650 or so attending the Fourth Congress in Prague in 1956, by the terms of the new constitution adopted at that congress. The number of countries was considerably larger than at Prague.

Participants were considered as delegates, observers or visitors. Since the participation in the congress will likely be of some interest, I shall give a fairly detailed account of it.

Delegates were the official representatives of member organizations of the IUS. At the end of the congress, the secretariat published a list showing 35 full members and six associate members. The full members may be generally classified as follows:

1. national unions of students or the student section of the youth movements of the people's democracies (USSR, China, German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, Albania, Mongolia, Poland, etc.);
2. national unions of students in other countries, some of them also participants in the ISC (Bolivia, Sudan, Ecuador) and some of them not (Japan, Iraq);
3. organizations of students from colonial or dependent countries (French West Africa, Togo, Guadeloupe, Cyprus, British West Africa, Cameroon, etc.);
4. organizations of students from one country studying in another (Jordanian Students' Association in the United Arab Republic, Palestinian Arab Student Federation); and
5. student organizations of a somewhat debatable nature, some of them claiming to be national unions in a country where another national union exists (India, Mexico), some of them of a character not readily definable (Venezuela, Nepal, Burma).

The six associate members are all national unions of students which attended the ISC: Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Ceylon, Pakistan, and Israel. Israel, while apparently retaining its membership, was not represented at the congress. Morocco and Algeria became associate members during 1957, while Ceylon and Pakistan joined during the course of the congress, although membership negotiations had been carried on earlier.

The observers to the congress, aside from persons representing member organizations but above that organization's quota of delegates, can be generally classified in four main groups:

1. those representing national unions of students (Canada, England, France, Brazil, Belgium, Finland, Italy, Sierra Leone, Chile, Philippines, India, Peru, Uruguay, Cuba, Guatemala, Indonesia, Yugoslavia, etc);
2. those representing other student government organizations (Edinburgh University SRC, Babia Student Union, Brazil; Dacca Student Union, Pakistan; San Marcos Student Federation, Peru; etc);
3. associations of students from one country studying in another (Cambodia, Laos, in France; Iraqi Students' Association, in Cairo; Libyan Students, in the UAR, etc);
4. international organizations (WFDY).

Visitors to the congress represented many and varied organizations, from the Sydney (Australia) University Labour Club to the Sheffield (England) University Student Union, from the student councils of Burmese and Spanish universities to a student newspaper in Hamburg, West Germany.

One of the major objections which western observers had in the past to the mechanics of IUS congresses was the seating arrangement - no distinction was made among the several categories of participation. In Prague, in 1956, there was a clear division made between members and non-members. It was, however, a sign of things to come that there was no distinction at all at the Peking congress: members, observers, and visitors sat together in alphabetical order of the English name of the country from which they came. Thus the card reading Australia, for instance, was in the front of the congress hall, but the only Australian there did not pretend to represent anything but a small minority of the students of his country. In the light of other developments, however, this seemed a minor point on which to raise objections; questions on it asked unofficially were brushed aside.

b. Programme

All thought of student cooperation or unity, which in retrospect seems to have been, along with colonialism, the major issue of the Prague congress, was pushed hurriedly to the background in Peking. What everyone talked about there was that grand old cliché, "the fight for peace." This sounds commendable and very much like something with which we could wholeheartedly agree, until it becomes clear that the "fight for peace" (itself a delightful contradiction in terms) is really the "fight against imperialism." This word "imperialism" was, after a few of the more common verb forms and pronouns, the most frequently used word of the congress. One of the western observers once had the temerity to ask one of the most blatant misusers of the word to define it; his request was, of course, ridiculed by the plenary session and no definition was even attempted beyond "everyone knows what it means." What everyone, or nearly everyone, seemed to know was that imperialism means everything that is not communism, and those few delegates who tried to use the word carefully were often badly misunderstood. To the large majority of delegates, then, the theme of the conference was, "the fight for communism," and they had a lovely time.

The report of the executive committee, discussion of which was the first point of the agenda of the congress, was entitled "Development of the International Student Movement, and the Contribution of the International Union of Student Organizations to the Defence of the Interests of Students and the Promotion of International Student Cooperation." This remarkable 53-page document contained a mixture of propaganda and half-truths and apparently "fully proved the correctness of the fundamental principles of the IUS." The discussion which was supposed to centre on this report lasted five days (it was scheduled for three) and brought out some of the most violent political attacks that I have ever heard. Almost every delegate or observer made a speech, lasting from 15 minutes to over an hour, in which he said anything at all that he wanted to say. Many speakers, particularly from the smaller people's democracies, did not once mention student problems or even students. Most speakers devoted less than a quarter of their time to student questions, and many of them spent this time in wild and unjustified criticisms of the ISC and COSEC, often entering into minute and imaginary detail. The political situation of the speaker's country or of the world as he saw it occupied most of the time of nearly all the speakers, and by the time they finished expressing their solidarity with some countries or their hatred for others they had little breath left for anything else.

The heroes of this congress were the Arabs. The recent revolution in Iraq and the situation in Jordan and Lebanon were on everyone's tongue. Attention was also paid to the colonial countries of Africa. These two areas of the world have long been popular topics with the IUS; student aspects of the problems facing them have also taken much of the time of recent ISC's. It was, however, interesting to see the tremendous amount of attention paid to students from the countries of Latin America. Most of the Latin Americans at the congress had very strong feelings against the United States; this bound them to most of the members of the IUS. Some of the Latin Americans were probably communist as well, but certainly many were not. They found sympathy for their "anti-imperialist" tendencies, however, although what they meant by this term was certainly far from the meaning attached to it by the delegates from eastern Europe, and both of these groups had not the same thing in mind as, for instance, the Africans using the phrase. There was, however, this great "anti-imperialist" comradeship which bound everyone together, and it was not until the end of the congress that differences began to show.

Imperialism, then, was the subject of most of the speeches given during the first five days of the congress. Western imperialism was what was meant, of course; no one except a few observers mentioned any other kind. The usual suggestion of an improper action by any country not considered as "the west" come with the mention of the word "Hungary." At this, the hands of the Hungarian delegation shot into the air, and a long apologia followed, explaining with fantastic stories and terrible logic that what happened in their country in 1956 was a fascist counter-revolution that had practically no support from the people, and that the Russians only arrived to help when there was a direct threat of an aggressive intervention from "the west." This tale convinced no one except those who wanted to be convinced, but after several tries at a reasonable discussion of at least the student aspect of the Hungarian events ended in failure, the subject was dropped. A few organizations retracted what now seemed like embarrassing statements that they had made in 1956, when there was some support for the Hungarian uprising even in Eastern Europe, but neutral countries who were clearly shocked at the stories told by the Hungarian delegates and equally clearly did not believe them, preferred to leave the matter alone rather than run the risk of losing the sympathy of the communist countries for their own causes. The majority of the fairly large group of delegates who had strong private feelings on the Hungarian question decided that there was little to gain by bringing these into the open, and it was obvious that many of them had quite a bit to lose by doing so. There was tremendous bitterness on this question from most of the communist countries. I think, on the whole, that the Hungarians were surprised at how easily they got off.

There is no point in describing the political side of the speeches on the first point of the agenda. They were for the most part bitter partisan attacks, and anyone who reads the newspapers can imagine them quite well. Some of them were, perhaps, justified; they were, however, outside the scope of a student conference as we understand it, and are of no particular importance to Canadian students as such. As a lesson in propaganda technique, though, some of them were indeed interesting specimens.

As I have said, most of the speakers who spent any time on student cooperation did so with attacks on the ISC and COSEC. (I make an exception here, of course, of several of the observers.) Gone out the window was the conciliatory policy that was in evidence at the Prague congress. Also gone, apparently, was any real desire that may have existed for cooperation between the IUS and western national unions. We will cooperate, the members said, but cooperation itself is such a big concession that we will make no others and cooperation must be on our terms. These terms, of course, are completely unacceptable to most western unions and to many others in the ISC, and the IUS is well aware of this. But the IUS is no longer the somewhat bedraggled remnant of an international organization that it was even two years ago. Its point of view and plan of action are appealing to a growing number of student organizations, and with this increased strength it apparently feels it can ignore not only the ISC but also many of its participating national unions.

According to the popular line, COSEC completely controls the ISC, and COSEC is a tool of the imperialists. COSEC, therefore, cannot be countenanced. The IUS is willing to cooperate with COSEC, it says, and with the national unions attending the ISC, but only on either very narrow and specific projects or on unacceptable terms. The IUS says it will cooperate with anyone on the problems and issues facing students today. It goes on to say that the main problem facing students is the fight for peace, which is surely the basic problem and hence should be the basis for student unity and cooperation.

To join in the fight for peace and thereby cooperate with us, you must express solidarity with everyone who is attacked or oppressed by the forces of "imperialism," you must act to ban nuclear weapons, you must protest to governments on their international policy, and so on. The argument is simple - peace is the basic interest of students, hence it must be the basis of cooperation. Looking at it this way, it is easy to laugh at proposals for cooperation on student travel.

This position, of course, has an immense appeal and gives a tremendous attraction to the IUS in the eyes of many students. Anyone who will not cooperate with an organization that wants peace obviously does not want peace; everyone opposed to peace is a terrible villain and must not be touched.

The flaw in this argument cannot be understood by many people, and it is not difficult to see why. In a country where there is only the state and life depends on this political fact, or in a country that has been suppressed or where freedom has been trespassed upon, a student, as does every citizen, sees everything from a political point of view. Politics, to these people, cannot be separated from other parts of life; a student does not exist outside life, and life is politics. The problems of these students are political problems, and to separate politics from problems is absurd. For us, this is sometimes difficult to understand unless we know something about life in these countries; but whether we understand it or not we must be ready to accept it, to allow students from other countries to think as they like without imposing upon them distinctions which seem logical to us.

There is, of course, another side to this coin, and it is this that some of the observers to the congress, particularly the Scottish participant and myself, tried to make clear to the congress. Needless to say we had very little success for one sees what one wants to see. What we tried to make clear was that, while we respected the right of another national union to think and act as it liked, it must give us the same respect and allow us to manage our own affairs in our own way. It must not lay down as an exclusive basis for cooperation a problem on which we, as national union, could not express an opinion or with which we could not even concern ourselves. To tell us that we must take a stand on world peace is simply to interfere in our internal affairs, and we will tolerate this no more than would any other national union. I used the federal state as an example, pointing out that we were bound by our constitution in the same way a federal government is, that our powers were strictly limited by the will of the students who constitute the union, and that we cannot go outside certain limits.

To say for example that world peace is a common problem for all students may well be true, but by the very will of some of these students, for example the students in Canada, it is not a common problem for all national unions, and NFCUS can express no opinions on political questions concerned with world peace or with any other subject. If, then, there could be cooperation on the basis of a mutual respect for each other's views, we were willing to cooperate. But if someone told us that to cooperate with them we must be willing to do things that we could not constitutionally do, we obviously could not cooperate.

A copy of my speech on this point has been sent to the National Secretariat, and those who are interested may read it. My ideas are perhaps more clearly expressed there than they can be within the confines of this report, and I have already, perhaps, gone too far outside the ordinary bounds of a report.

After the speeches of the first five days, which obviously accomplished nothing because they were intended to accomplish just that, the congress moved to a few days of commissions where the work was supposed to be done. It was in these commissions that the resolutions to be presented to the final plenary sessions were drafted, and where the broad outlines of the IUS programme for the next two years were drawn. The length of time devoted to speeches on the first point of the agenda caused some consternation to the steering committee, (which had been elected from a prepared list at the beginning of the congress and was not simply the IUS executive committee as it had been at Prague) and as a result it cut the time allotted for commissions and extended the congress one full day. The congress then prolonged itself, in an all night session, until 11:00 am the following day, and so was true to the tradition of most international student meetings.

There were six commissions, on the following subjects:

1. the role of students in the maintenance of peace;
2. the activities of students for the reform of education, the defence of student rights and the improvement of living and studying conditions;
3. the activities of students against colonialism and the participation of students of newly independent countries in national construction and the elimination of the legacies of colonialism;
4. the student activities in the field of culture, faculty work, travel and sport;
5. the student activities in the field of press and publicity, and
6. the first point of the agenda.

It was impossible for me to attend all these commissions and had it been possible there would not have been much point since they all discussed much the same thing and it had already been thoroughly discussed in five days of plenary sessions. The commission meetings that I did attend, no matter which commission it happened to be, were still talking about imperialism in some form or another, and it was often difficult to tell to just which commission one was listening. Participation by observers was rather ore limited, by common consent, in the commissions than it had been in the plenary sessions. There was work done there, resolutions were drafted and sometimes discussed, there were a few important steps taken on legitimate problems by some serious delegates who were interested in something besides propaganda, and a general programme was decided upon. But since all the commission work came before the final plenary sessions, I shall devote time to a description of the commissions in this report.

c. Resolutions

The resolutions formulated by the various commissions were presented to the final sessions of the congress by a "reporter" from each commission who was in most cases a member of the IUS executive. Many of the draft resolutions presented had been changed in form from the presentation adopted in commission but only a few had been altered in substance. The resolutions varied in length from several lines to several pages; some of them were amended many times and hotly debated, others were summarily passed. It was clear that many of the IUS members had not read many of the resolutions; indeed, often they did not even have a copy of the resolutions for which they voted, and the resolutions were almost never read aloud.

It is difficult to know on what basis to discuss the resolutions. The decision by commissions is an obvious one, but it would tend to be confusing and might not bring out the more important factors. I cannot, of course, discuss or even mention the majority of the resolutions, for there was a very large number of them. They will no doubt soon be published by the IUS and anyone interested in reading them may then do so. Perhaps the decision most relevant to this report is to discuss first the resolutions that concern primarily student problems and activities, then those which are of a political nature but still have a basis in student affairs, and thirdly those which are outright political statements and affect students only incidentally if at all.

1. The congress resolutions on strictly student problems cover a fair amount of ground and cover it fairly well. They are mainly concerned with the particular activities of the IUS and are not, perhaps, very interesting to us. Canadian students show interest in these fields by participating in the ISC, which does a much thorough job than does the IUS. These resolutions did not arouse much interest even among the IUS members, most of whom were more concerned with political questions.

The most high-minded of the subjects in this group ended up in a resolution, a statement and a programme of action on the democratization of education, the improvement of study and living conditions of students and the defence of their democratic rights. These three papers are fairly well written, and there was no reason why they could not be supported by any students, as far as their surface appearance is concerned. It is the interpretation put on such words and phrases as "democratic rights," "social needs," "reform," "state responsibility," and so on, that gives rise to difficulties, and there is much room for misinterpretation in these documents. The programme of action includes publication of information on the subject, the support of various conferences and seminars on a variety of educational problems, solidarity campaigns, relief projects, and a scholarship scheme. The scholarship scheme was the subject of another resolution: the IUS coordinates scholarships granted by students in one country (usually a people's democracy) for study there by students from the countries (preferably colonial or newly-independent) of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The other resolutions, on sport, press, travel, faculty work, culture, etc., either avoided controversy or outlined a programme for the IUS and its respective bureaus to follow. The IUS may certainly do what it likes, and while many of the projects are commendable, some are partisan and hard for Canadian students to justify as the work of an international student union. These resolutions require no detailed comment.

2. The distinction between resolutions of a political nature which are based on student affairs and those which are political and affect students incidentally if at all is not always an easy one to make. In some cases it must be made subjectively; in others, some sort of objective judgment can be made. The titles of the resolutions are often misleading; for example, the "General Resolution on Latin America" is primarily concerned with the activities of some student organizations in that part of the world and what the IUS can do to assist them, while the "Resolution on Solidarity with the Students of Yemen and Oman" is a simple propaganda statement demanding that British troops leave the area and containing no reference to students. Titles can be misleading.

Many of the resolutions which I would put in this second category are on subjects and situations that are not new and on which the IUS has previously taken a stand. The ISC and even NFCUS have taken a similar stand on some of them (Cuba, and Algeria, for example). Some of them are broad ("Resolution on the Student Fight against the Legacies of Colonialism and for National Construction in Newly-Independent Countries") and some are very narrow ("Resolution on the Struggle of Japanese Students against the "Efficiency Rating System" for School Teachers"). While some of them take a definite political and partisan stand, a stand which may appeal to the congress but certainly would not appeal to the majority of Canadian students, others simply state a position in favour of student rights that have been suppressed or ignored by a government. The main point to be drawn from these resolutions, I think, is that while some of them may well be justified and while all the students of the world would possibly agree on a few of them they were all passed (nearly all unanimously) when the congress had heard only one point of view on each question. Indeed, in many cases, it heard nothing at all. There was never any attempt to hear a word about the other side of the issue, no queries were made about what were alleged to be facts, there was never a bit of an investigation into any of the situations pronounced upon, not a question was asked. Time after time, a resolution was proposed in a commission, the mover perhaps said a few words (usually very biased and violent) in support of it, it was seconded, passed, put before the plenary session later, and passed without a murmur. The delegates showed no sense of responsibility whatsoever, giving their support indiscriminately to resolutions on situations of which they had no knowledge or only the sketchiest outline of a prejudiced report. This has long been the IUS approach and was exactly what was expected. We cannot, of course, raise objections to the resolutions in this category that were statements of policy only; most of the resolutions, however, are objectionable because of their political statements and their utter lack of responsibility.

3. The resolutions in the third category should, in my opinion and in the opinion of many of the observers, never have come before a student congress at all. While those of the second category can be justified because they directly affect students, these bore no relation to students in any capacity other than as citizens. The IUS, of course, makes no attempt to limit itself in scope, and so may jump into any political controversy it chooses. It only chooses those, naturally, on which there is a general degree of agreement. Thus the congress passed resolutions condemning United States' aggression in the Formosa area, supporting the positions of Indonesia on West New Guinea, and Guatemala on British Honduras; but when there was disagreement among members on a political question, as there was for a moment when a Pakistani delegate mentioned Kashmir, the subject was quickly brushed up. While some delegates did not necessarily agree with every one of these resolutions, they did not find it advantageous to disagree publicly.

4. There is one resolution that does not fit the three general categories that I have outlined. It is perhaps the most important resolution of the congress and was certainly the most controversial, taking over six hours of discussion in the early hours of September 15th. It was the resolution from the commission on the first point of the agenda; and it had that same long title. When it first appeared it reflected the bitterness in student affairs that was prevalent in the early days of the congress, and repeated many of the political and ideological statements of the executive report. It had been made clear during the congress, however, that the report and this general attitude were completely unacceptable to the "western" national unions as a basis for future cooperation. These national unions were obviously interested in finding some basis or some field for cooperation for they had sent their observers to Peking - most of us made this point and it was not denied, only ignored.

There were a few organizations among the members of the IUS who felt that a more moderate position should be taken, and they proposed a series of amendments to bring this about. Unfortunately they were not well organized among themselves, and since there were many other amendments, the whole situation was in a muddle for a time and tempers rose occasionally. The result was a somewhat changed resolution, not as changed as the western observers would have liked, but considerably more moderate in tone. Most of the changes were proposed or consistently supported by Ceylon, Pakistan, Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco, with usually the support of the West African Student Union, Sudan, India, and a few others. One of the more complicated of the many involved votes even saw the Soviet Union on the losing side, surely the first time in many years that this has happened. There was no consistency in the voting of the representatives from the people's democracies; they were often split among themselves and did not seem to be following any definite policy. The resulting resolution leaves out much of what was blatantly political in the original, and several references to "imperialism" were removed. Attempts to restrict it to "student interests" failed, however, and the resolution still requires as a prerequisite to cooperation much that is undesirable and unconstitutional to many western unions. Those few members who sincerely wanted cooperation between those national unions who adhere only to the IUS were bound to lose, of course, for they were striking at the very heart of the IUS itself, which is something quite different from the sum of its members. Had they won and managed to have a resolution passed that was a model for cooperation, there would have to be many more changes in the IUS before such cooperation could be possible. Some of them realize this, and will keep trying for these changes. It is unlikely that they will succeed.

OBSERVATIONS

While much of this report has been what might well be called "observations", there are still a few comments to be made.

First of all, it must be made clear that the IUS is a communist organization; of this there is no doubt. This is not to say that all its members are communist organizations; many are not, but have joined for reasons of their own. The IUS certainly supports causes and groups that are not communist, and this support is important to these groups. However, it never takes a stand or makes a statement that could in any way be interpreted as contrary to the current communist party line. (Some of its statements from eight or ten years ago would look pretty silly today, but it is the current line that counts.) The Communist control is still there, and it is still obvious. One does not have to be particularly sharp to see delegates turn to discover what the Soviet Union is doing before they vote, or to overhear Soviets or acknowledged communists from other countries trying to convince a delegate with an independent turn of mind what line he should take or what vote he should cast. This is not simple imagining on the part of western observers, for some of the non-communist members have complained about it in disgust. Since most of the non-communists are there to champion their own causes (and who can blame them?) they usually go along, for not to do so would endanger their support from the organization.

Another observation worthy of a few lines concerns the attitude of the Chinese delegation. It did not, as host, say very much. What it did say was always extremely political and much more narrow and intemperate than any other delegation. The Soviets were very moderate and cooperative in comparison to the Chinese, upon whom we could always count for the most reactionary interpretation of the party line. This began to annoy some of the other delegations after a time. An interesting example of this attitude was the Chinese treatment of the Yugoslavs.

Yugoslavia's national union of students, it will be recalled, was expelled from the IUS in 1949; since then it has attended the ISC and has constantly spurned the intermittent wooing of the IUS to get it back. The Yugoslavs sent observers to this congress, their first attendance at an IUS meeting since 1949, and this delighted many of the delegates from the people's democracies. It did not delight the Chinese, however; China's leaders are currently condemning Yugoslav "deviationism" and relations between the two countries are strained. The Yugoslav observers at the congress were studiously ignored by the Chinese, who treated them as though they were not even there. They did not offer the slightest applause after a very mild and inoffensive speech by the Yugoslavs, while they usually, with their 200 or so unofficial observers at the back of the hall, controlled the applause which was generally tumultuous - they even applauded us, but not the Yugoslavs.

The IUS takes great joy in congratulating itself; I shall not attempt a psychological analysis of the reasons for this, except to say that I suppose some one has to congratulate it. Hardly a resolution, a report, or a major speech went by without some reference to the success of the IUS, to events which had proved the correctness of the policy of the IUS, and so forth.

There are still gaps in what the IUS does, gaps which are noticeable even to a few of its members. It proclaims loud and long on the plight of students in many countries, but it says not a word on the plight of many students in, for example, the Eastern European countries. Its silence on Hungary's students in the 1956 crisis was several times mentioned. Nor, of course, is anything said of the expansionist and imperialist policies of the Soviet Union and China - "imperialism," as has been pointed out, was not defined; a definition would have been impossible to find that condemns the United States, Britain and France while excluding the actions of China and the USSR.

The value of what the IUS does was, believe it or not, raised in a discussion between representatives of a couple of member organizations and some of the observers. It was pointed out by the members, and of course it had long been clear to the observers, that the IUS will pass a resolution on almost anything and does, indeed, say so much with so little knowledge of the subject that most of what it says has no effect. Western observers have long been aware of this; it is one of the major differences between the IUS and the ISC. The ISC is responsible for what it says while the IUS is not. The fact that this idea was obvious to a few of the members at the end of their first IUS congress is encouraging. I know that two of the new members, at least, were quite disgusted with the IUS at the end of the congress. They intend to retain their membership, but it will be a skeptical membership for some time. Their illusions about the IUS wanting student cooperation were dispelled.

Some members of the IUS are sincere in wanting cooperation among all students. The national union of Sudan has proposed a conference to this end, which likely will be held in Khartoum in 1959. If we are invited and if it is financially feasible, I think NFCUS should attend. There is nothing new about the idea of a "conference of cooperation" but we must not be discouraged by the past failures or unsuccessful attempts.

There is, of course, the old question of the representativity of the IUS members. The question still remains, and was even brought up, in private, by one of the members. An Arab himself, he said that most of the Arabs at the congress represented nothing at all, let alone the majority of students in or from their countries. No information on representativity was given or asked for, although there was an elected credentials committee which was supposed to examine this question.

The question of elections is another interesting one. To no one's surprise, Jiri Pelikan was again elected president in a session that was open only to members. There was apparently some slight discontent when nominations were opened for the executive and finance committees: a delegate arose and read a long list of names, one of those named then rose and named the nominator, and that was that. One of the members named, Nepal, was not even at the congress, but this disturbed only one or two delegates. Their objections were quickly silenced.

The same closed meeting heard the financial report, but the question of where the money comes from is still a mystery to at least some of the members. It is certainly still unanswered for the observers who had nothing to go on but the published report of finances. It is all neatly explained, but there are no answers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite all that we cannot approve or accept of the IUS, it is an international student organization and an important one. With its growing strength throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America it no longer feels any need to placate the western unions. To a very large extent it represents international communism, but that is not all it represents. In spite of this and our other objections to it, it is not impossible for us to cooperate to a limited extent with the IUS, and cooperation with some of its members is very easy.

NFCUS has never pretended to ignore the IUS; we have always had, in fact, fairly good relations with it in a very limited way. I believe that these relations should continue in much the same way as they have in the past. We must realize, however, that the IUS is likely to become more difficult in the future, as it feels stronger and stronger. The old idea, once held within the IUS, that it needs to show itself as all innocence has disappeared. It is once again boasting about being partisan and hence might well take a sterner view with those "on the other side." We have little to lose if it does, but it would be unfortunate.

NFCUS must, obviously, reject any form of association with the IUS. We can, however, continue and enlarge our cooperation on practical matters with it and with its member organizations. We should send observers to the next IUS congress if we are invited to do so, if only to keep ourselves informed of new developments. I think that we should, in other words, continue our present relationship.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I would like to thank again the IUS for its hospitality and NFCUS for the privilege of representing it. I hope this somewhat lengthy and hastily written report has clearly expressed my views and impressions as well as given the relevant facts, and that it will meet with the approval of the XXII National Congress of the NFCUS.

H. David Peel
Chief Overseas Commissioner

REPORT ON THE SIXTH CONGRESS OF THE I.U.S. HELD IN BAGHDAD
OCTOBER 8th-17th, 1960

By Walter S. Tarnopolsky, NFCUS Observer.

INTRODUCTION

In line with its policy ever since 1948, when NFCUS first entered the arena of post-World War II international student affairs, NFCUS sent an Observer to the Sixth Congress of the I.U.S. in Baghdad. It was my privilege to be chosen in that capacity and I want to thank NFCUS and its Executive for their confidence in selecting me.

It was my original understanding that, as had been the custom in previous years, NFCUS would pay part of my transportation costs, the portion London-Prague return, and that the I.U.S. would pay the remainder. Upon arrival at Baghdad, however, I was informed by the I.U.S. technical staff and by Mr. Pelikan, that NFCUS would pay the whole amount. In the ensuing confusion it was finally settled that the I.U.S. would advance the money required to return me to my wife and studies, and that at a later time the question of who would stand the cost would be settled between the I.U.S. and N.F.C.U.S. To whoever finally paid my transportation costs, my sincere thanks.

At this point I should like to thank the General Union of Students of the Iraq Republic for the excellent facilities they provided, and also to thank the very capable and genial manager of the hostel in which we were housed and fed, for his hospitality, which was of the traditional Middle Eastern variety, for his thoughtfulness and his warmth.

We were housed and fed in a very comfortable and attractive new student or youth hostel which had been opened only some weeks before. The Congress sessions and the grand and lavish opening reception were held at Ammanah Hall and its gardens. Before the Revolution of 14 July 1958 this sumptuous building was used by the King for embassy parties and receptions and was thus ideally suited for seating very comfortably some 300-400 participants, and for giving them adequate room for resting, lounging, conversing, and presumably for contemplation.

BACKGROUND

Basing my justification on the fact that there is no point in repeating what is available in existing publications, I will not recount the history of the international student movement since 1945. I would strongly suggest, however, that without at least reading the brief background material available in the report on the IVth I.U.S. Congress at Prague, it is difficult to understand a report on an I.U.S. Congress today. Furthermore, the whole of that report should be read because it marked, in my opinion, the high point of I.U.S. compromise with our own viewpoints, a compromise which has since disappeared.

The very excellent and penetrating report prepared by Dave Peel, who was the NFCUS Observer at the Vth I.U.S. Congress at Peking, must also be read because it shows very clearly the growing departure from the spirit of Prague" if so it can be called. Since Dave and I were both at Prague, both our reports tend to refer back to that Congress as the baseline for comparing affairs in the I.U.S. as they are today.

Referring then to the reports of the IVth and Vth Congresses let me quote a paragraph from each which perhaps best and most briefly summarizes the state of each of those congresses.

IVth Congress Report:

During the ten years of its existence the I.U.S. has changed the concentration of its attacks, either through official publications or at Council or Congress meetings, three times. First, the barrage of criticism was levelled at Fascism, then it switched to the West and the I.S.C., and now at colonialism. The last change is most welcome, and is perhaps one of the biggest changes in I.U.S. policy in recent times. The NFCUS Observer at the Congress were pleased to note that no longer was the West blatantly attacked, that no longer was abuse heaped upon themselves, and that no longer was there indiscriminate, unfounded, unjustified criticism of the International Student Conference, all of which had occurred at least from 1948 to 1954 and to a lesser extent even to the summer of 1955.

Vth Congress Report:

All thought of student co-operation or unity, which in retrospect seems to have been, along with colonialism, the major issue of the Prague Congress, was pushed hurriedly to the background in Peking. What everyone talked about there was that grand old cliché, "the fight for peace." This sounds commendable and very much like something with which we could wholeheartedly agree, until it becomes clear that the "fight for peace" (itself a delightful contradiction in terms) is really the "fight against imperialism."

The IUS says it will co-operate with anyone on the problems and issues facing the students to-day. It goes on to say that the main problems facing students is the fight for peace, which is surely the basic problem and hence should be the basis for student unity and co-operation. To join in the fight for peace and thereby co-operate with us, you must express solidarity with everyone who is attacked or oppressed by the forces of "imperialism", you must act to ban nuclear weapons, you must protest to governments on their international policy, and so on. The argument is simple - peace is the basic interest of students, hence it must be the basis of co-operation.

The Vth Congress, as I will try to show in the following pages, continued its attacks on colonialism, but now all the various objects of attack are jumbled together and colonialism is attacked as being a product of "militarist and imperialist circles in the United States," and concurred in by the "imperialist lackies" in the ISC. The I.S.C. is not attacked as such, because too many of the members are now from Asia, Africa and Latin America, and since they could not possibly be called either imperialists or "imperialist lackies", the IUS leading lights now talk of the "positive" and the "negative" forces in the ISC. They say that unfortunately, COSEC is still controlled by the "negative" forces, which of course, are "lackies of the American imperialist and militarist circles." In the concentration of hatred on the United States there was practically nothing said about the empires of France, Belgium, the Netherlands, or Great Britain, except incidentally to any attack upon the United States. When the delegate from Outer Mongolia made his main intervention and could not stretch the facts to the point of attacking the United States for interfering in the affairs of his country, not to be outdone, he criticized it for ignoring his country.

Opening Plenary

As happens at all congresses and conferences, this one opened with plenary sessions, adjourned to commissions, and re-assembled in a final plenary to adopt resolutions prepared in commissions, to adopt the financial report, and to hold elections. The big difference from congresses as we know them is that opening plenary took five full days. This consisted of speeches or "interventions" as they are

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

what category he belonged to. The Chairman of the Credentials Committee, despite this clear statement by Mexico, stated that it was not at all clear who was the National Union, and that the IUS had at previous Congresses accepted the Mexican group that was present. At this juncture the Bulgarian Delegate pointed out that the IUS Constitution made no provision for denying Delegate status to any group which was a member of the IUS at the previous Congress. As long as a group had membership, in the IUS once, even if its membership had gone down to one member, as long as it had not disaffiliated it could be a Delegate and the Credentials Committee could not go into their status.

In reference to the Indian Delegation, the Congress was informed that since there was no recognized N.U.S., that the All India Student Federation was being seated. Later the representatives of the A.I.S.F., came up to tell me that they had not recognized the new National Council of University Students of India, but that they had stated that they had expressed support for its aim to unite all Indian students.

Finally, it should be stated that the IUS still in listing the Congress participants, lists everyone together, Full Members, Associate Members, Observers, Visitors, etc. It must, of course, be stated that it indicates the capacity of each person, but it has known for a long time that its method of listing participants is misleading. Furthermore, several resolutions refer to the beliefs or feelings of "Participants at the Vth I.U.S. Congress" rather than just to the Delegates. On numerous occasions it has referred to resolutions passed at an IUS Congress "in which some sixty-five national union unions participated", clearly indicating that everyone present, including Observers and Visitors, concurred. This is obviously intended to mislead. We have told the IUS that though we are interested in their activities we are in no way associated with their resolutions, but this does not prevent the misrepresentation of support which the IUS constantly permits itself.

In line with the previous paragraph one last item should be added regarding seating arrangements. After years of criticism by NFCUS and other non-members of IUS, the IUS finally, at the Prague Congress, seated Observers and Visitors separately from Delegates. In Peking, however, everyone was again seated together without distinction. Unfortunately this was also done in Baghdad. A large number of Observers, however, myself included, moved from their allotted place to the back of the hall.

COMMISSIONS

On the evening of the sixth day of the Congress, on Thursday the 13th of October the congress commenced its work in Commissions. There were five of them.

- A On International Student Co-operation and Unity.
- B On Student Activities for Peace
- C On Activities of Student Organizations Against Imperialism, Against Colonialism and its Legacies.
- D On Student Activities in the Field of Democratization and Reform of Education, Culture, Relief, Travel, Sport and Press.
- E On Amendments to the I.U.S. Constitution.

There were never more than two Commissions meeting at any one time, but since there were usually two, it was necessary to alternate my time between whatever two Commissions were meeting. Actually it didn't matter too much. In the first place, most of what was said in Commissions was a repetition of what had been said in the opening interventions. In the second place, and partly as a result of the first, the same things were being said in all commissions, regardless of what each was ostensibly to deal with. In the third place, and this point I want to elaborate on further, it didn't matter what was being discussed as the Resolutions weren't being prepared in the Commission anyway.

When the Commission on Democratization and Reform of Education first met, we were informed that there would be a general discussion for as long as the participants wished, then sub-commissions were to be elected to draft resolutions, and then these draft resolutions were to be presented for final discussion and amendment before presentation to the Final Plenary Session.

The participants first became aware that there was going to be a change from this procedure when the Chairman read out the names of people, or rather countries, who, he said, had "volunteered" to draft the various resolutions that would be required. The Representative from British Guiana declared that he wanted to be on the sub-commission dealing with IUS Scholarships, but he was informed that since there were already some volunteers, his labour would not really be required. Despite his persistence he was firmly refused admission to the sub-commission, and a long wrangle followed as members of the IUS Secretariat, who declared that they were speaking as representatives of their respective countries, and who were all on sub-commissions as "volunteers" insisted that time would be saved with preparation of resolutions by these sub-commissions. (Needless to say volunteers had never been called for, and until the announcement of who had volunteered the remainder had not known that there were any.)

Later the same day it became perfectly clear why the representative of British Guiana could not join the sub-commission he wanted to join. The instant the Commission completed its general discussion it was presented with a six-page resolution on the first point of the agenda, which resolution had been translated into the Official Congress languages and duly mimeographed in those languages -- a job taking many hours of work. At this point a number of us asked the Representative from Martinique, who was a joint-proposer of the Resolution with Poland, when the Resolution had been prepared. He told us that it was the previous afternoon. (The Commission had not started its work until the evening of that day!)

This preparation of drafts even before the Commissions had started any work was the common practice. On the night of October 15th I went into the office of the technical services staff and asked whether they could give me any resolutions for the Commission dealing with World Student Unity. Even though that Commission didn't start its work until the following afternoon, I was given four draft resolutions, running into many pages, for each of which there were apparently several "volunteer" draftsmen. The discussion in Commissions could take any turn it wished, but eventually it would result in a draft resolution which had been prepared beforehand and which reached and passed through the final plenary session with few amendments, and no major ones.

SOME GENERAL REMARKS ON DISCUSSION, VOTING, AMENDMENTS, ELECTIONS

I want to state a few general things about Congress attitudes to such matters as the above and parliamentary procedure. On the first day, at the opening plenary, the Standing Orders were being discussed, and a few amendments were proposed, particularly to the matter of discussion of motions and amendments. A number of motions were presented, there was no vote on any of them in particular, and at a certain point the Chairman, a job skillfully handled by Mr. Pelikan, made a suggestion, presumably incorporating all the amendments proposed, and then asked if there were any objections, no, any abstentions, no, new paragraph adopted.

This attitude to voting persisted until the end. The first real vote came on the seventh day of the Congress, during one of the Commission sessions. Until that time every motion was adopted by the Chairman asking if anyone cared to object or abstain, and since no one ever did, there was never a request for those in favour, no one paid attention to the voting, and every suggestion of the Chairman was accepted. On the seventh day, however, a motion was proposed by Peru, which the Chairman was reluctant to accept. However, when it came time to vote he called it in the usual way -- any abstentions, no one, against no one. At this point he paused, realizing his predicament, but he asked who was in favour, and there were three votes. Realizing that this had gone wrong the Chairman asked for a revote, but Bulgaria suddenly woke up, made a suggestion which was contrary to the Peruvian motion, and the Chairman with evident relief, simply stated that he would accept the Bulgarian suggestion. There was no revote, but the Peruvian motion, which had passed, no one against, no one abstaining, three in favour, was simply dropped.

Perhaps the typical attitude to amendments was that exhibited by the representative of Cyprus, who was also a member of the IUS Secretariat. The draft resolution he had presented was being discussed, and a number of points were raised, and a number of amendments were proposed. He got up and said, however, that his draft resolution was drawn up in very general terms, that he was noting the discussion and the points raised and that at a later time he would incorporate them into his draft resolution. "Don't worry" he said, "I will keep them in mind and will incorporate them".

I have just referred to the Cyprus Delegate who, though he worked in Prague as a full-time member of the Secretariat, spoke for Cyprus. This was done by all the full-time members of the Secretariat present, except for Mr. Pelikan, the President, who never went so far as to say that he was really there as the representative of the Czechoslovak students. Mr. Cieslar, the Polish member of the Secretariat, made a statement that though he was responsible in the IUS for culture, sport and travel, and that though that was the topic of discussion, he really represented the Polish Student Association.

Perhaps at this point I should refer briefly to the election procedure at the Opening Plenary. When nominations were called for the Steering Committee, the Delegate from Cyprus got up and stated that he had consulted Poland, Sudan, and Ecuador, and that they proposed the following. (Then followed the list.) There was no question or objection and the list was presumably adopted. For the Credentials Committee, FEANF stated that they had consulted a number of people and proposed the following. Again the list was adopted without opposition.

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.

The third example that I want to give, which really goes to show the extreme sensitivity of certain delegates, was the result of a question by Dudan. The question was directed to the Soviet delegate and the British one, and was whether there was a study in the respective countries of the ideologies and cultures of other peoples. The Soviet Delegate gave a long description of the courses available in the Soviet Union in the study of other countries, and described how the various subject peoples had full freedom for their own cultures. The British Delegate mentioned some schools like the School of Oriental and African Studies, and said that as long as facilities permitted, anyone could study anything he wanted, and that in that study, for example of Marxism-Leninism, the original works were used unexpurgated. Also, he said, in Russian language classes Pravda and Izvestia were studied as original sources. The Soviet Delegate immediately got up and stated that this was an attack on the Soviet system of education and he would have to answer.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In writing my conclusions I want to correct one or two impressions which some readers of this report may get, but which would be mistaken. The first impression I would like to prevent is that because the IUS Congress is a partisan, political forum where most discussions have no concrete, valuable conclusions, the IUS itself can be dismissed as an organization that does nothing and is unimportant and to be ignored. Nothing could be further from the truth. The IUS does some very valuable work, or else gets credit for some valuable work being done. The IUS Sanitorium in Peking has treated hundreds of African and Asian students. The IUS itself distributes tens of scholarships in the Communist world for students in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Besides these, the governments of Eastern Europe give several hundred more. The IUS annually takes tens, perhaps hundreds of students from economically under-developed countries on tours through Eastern Europe and China. The IUS has given technical assistance, by way of typewriters, mimeographing machines, laboratory supplies, etc., to many National Unions when they join the IUS.

Moreover, one should not overlook the fact that for the students of Eastern Europe and China, whether or not they support its aims and ideals the IUS is the only possible international student organization. For many students in Africa, Asia and Latin America who are fighting foreign political and/or economic domination, any support is important. Faced with overwhelming might, as the Algerians are, can anyone blame them for getting whatever support they can? After all, how effective has our aid been genuine as it is? They won't get any more from the IUS, but can we blame them for trying? To many of these students the IUS doesn't look as black as it does to us, and temporarily at least, and for certain limited purposes their objectives can coincide.

Let us not therefore, dismiss the IUS out-of-hand, but let us recognize fairly and genuinely, though fearlessly, what it is and what it isn't, and what it does do, and what it doesn't do, and though we should never hesitate to make our views known, we should never cut those lines of communication which permit us to make our views known. Even if we are violently and insultingly attacked, truth always comes out in the end.

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.

6th Congress of the International Union of Students
Baghdad - Iraq 8th - 17th October, 1960.

I n t e r v e n t i o n

NFCUS, Canada

Mr. Walter Tarnopolsky.

Mr. Chairman, fellow students and student leaders! As the Observer of the National Federation of Canadian University Students I convey to you fraternal greetings. Before coming to the body of my "intervention" permit me first to thank the G.U.S.I.R. for their excellent accommodation and conference facilities and their hospitality; and on behalf of Canadian students, permit me to convey congratulations to all students Iraq who took part in bringing about the downfall of the dictatorship of Nuri Said.

Since I am here as an Observer, I will try to be brief and to limit my comments to two topics arising out of the Report of the E.C., for I think that we are still discussing the E.C. report.

First, let me refer to the twin evils of imperialism and totalitarianism which face many students in the world and which, because they are inconsistent with freedom of education, with student liberties and with university autonomy must concern all students everywhere. I use the two terms imperialism and totalitarianism together because they both involve the use of overwhelming force to suppress liberty and to destroy human dignity and free thought. The only difference between these twin evils is that imperialism involves control from abroad, while totalitarianism may exist within the country with or without foreign interference. As Canadian students, we believe that the university community must be autonomous and free from government interference; we believe in man's right to knowledge and the free use of it, and we believe that knowledge and education must serve truth and humanity, and not only the government or the state. It is for these reasons that we have supported at successive International Student Conferences and at our own national congresses resolutions condemning racialism, imperialism and totalitarianism.

It is in this light that we have, within the limited means at our disposal, opposed racial segregation in South Africa, French suppression and brutality in Algeria, Portuguese imperialism in Goa, Angola and Mozambique, British actions in Kenya and Cyprus, the Batista dictatorship in Cuba, and Said dictatorship in Iraq, American domination in Puerto Rico and segregation in the country itself, to mention only a few. There were many others of a similar nature that we have supported. To the extent that the Report of the E.C. covers these same points we concur.

However, these were not the only suppressions we have condemned. There were others, others which are not referred to in the E.C. Report. The Report of the E.C. says nothing about Tibet. There has been fighting. Students have died. Why? The same thing is true in Hungary. If students have died, surely the IUS should concern itself and say who killed whom and why. On the basis of sources which satisfied us we have our own opinion. Perhaps the IUS has different ideas, why doesn't the E.C. Report say anything?

We have heard criticism of the International Student Conference for its so-called "slanderous resolution about East Germany. I have that resolution here. Most of it consists of quotes from East German sources! Let me read a few.

1. Regulation on the Provision of Scholarships to Students at Universities and Institutes of Higher Education, February 3rd, 1955:

"Students may be granted scholarships provided they support the Workers' and Peasants' rights in the German Democratic Republic.

2. Every student who enters university signs a declaration that he will take upon himself the task to "support actively at all times the policy of the Government of the German Democratic Republic."
3. Decree on the Socialist Reconstruction of higher education in the German Democratic Republic, February 13th, 1958.

"The State Secretariat for higher education has the following tasks:

- (b) To develop policies in the field of universities and other institutes of higher education which serve the construction of socialism in the German Democratic Republic.
- (m) To secure that in the case of all appointments and transfer (of professors) the interest of the Workers' and Peasants' right is decisive influence....."

These East German documents express a policy of the East German government and its Ministry of Education which is inconsistent with our own beliefs in the freedom of thought, with our own belief that the University community must be autonomous. It is our firm belief that the search for knowledge must serve truth and not a government or a political party. The Constitution of the IUS conforms to our belief that there must be free access to education. Why doesn't the E.C. Report say anything about lack of it in East Germany?

Now, let me turn to world student unity, or to say it more specifically a forum to which the representatives of the students of the world, regardless of the ideology or political complexion of their governments, would come to exchange ideas and to plan and work for a better world. We believe that this is possible, and as a part of our belief, we have come as Observers, to every IUS Congress since our National Union started to participate in international student events. We have done this and will continue to do so even though our Union or our representatives personally or their opinions have been criticized or verbally attacked at these Congresses. We shall continue to come even if my opinions are criticized here.

However, we believe that world student unity cannot be based on hate or on one-sided criticism, even though there is much evil in this world to hate. We cannot agree with the implication in the Report of the E.C. that world student unity can be achieved upon a basis of a hate campaign against the United States. Even though we agree that in the Cuban situation, in the Puerto Rican situation, and in other parts of the world there are many citizens in the U.S. who must be criticized and whose policies must be condemned, we cannot agree that the U.S. has a monopoly of evil - there are others on both sides of the "cold war" alignment as well. The Report of the E.C. shows that there can be as much distortion in what is not said as in what is said.

Nevertheless, if we are truly interested in bringing into being a true world student forum, we must recognize that while we all agree on our opposition to forces which prevent free access to education, which discriminate on an economic, racial, political, religious or social basis, and whereas we all agree that we must all work, strive and sacrifice for peace as the only basis for the full and meaningful development of all peoples in the world, we must at the same time recognize that in certain specific cases there may be disagreement. A world student forum which does not recognize differences of opinion, which is one-sided or partisan, which spends its time merely attacking, and not working and planning constructively, will not succeed. There is a growing movement in the world today, as shown in the United Nations, for independence from the two power blocs. The strength of that movement is based upon constructive, not destructive, criticism and upon impartiality. In the same way, for a higher purpose, namely the opportunity for all men to develop their potentialities to the fullest, we must build a framework within which students can express their opinions independently of their governments, and within which they can build and not destroy. When we build such a structure we will have succeeded. In the meantime let us keep trying, and let us not hinder any attempts made.

SUMMARY OF STATEMENTS ABOUT THE CANADIAN INTERVENTION

CUBA - Asked if Canadian students had forgotten to fight for their own liberty.

The political subordination of Canada to England is the same as the subordination of anyone else. Asked if there were not foreign English influences in what had been said by Canada. As for Cuba, there was only one evil in the world, the American one and that of the Yankee friends who joined in the sin of oppressing Cuba. What do Canadians understand by development of people? If development and peace depend upon submission to an Empire, as in Canada's case, Cuba says this is a peace based on slavery and submission to a foreign power.

CHINA - The Canadian mentioned the so-called "Tibetan Question". It is a provocation against the Chinese people and students and against "our" Congress. Tibet is Chinese territory. In 1959 the suppression of the higher classes was an internal matter. No foreign countries can interfere. Why is the Canadian interested in this question? Only one fact must be brought up. At the United Nations Assembly the Tibetan Question was put up. The Canadian is a "running dog of American Imperialism". As to the words he uttered, like "brutal suppressions", etc., he is insincere and is disguising himself as a "hypocritical humanist". Why don't you appeal against earlier British aggressions? This shows your true color as a "running dog of American Imperialism". If you are so aggrieved over the reactionary upper strata then we would be happy to see you share your mournful tears in their company. At the same time, I tell you, "you running dog of American Imperialism", when you slander Hungary and East Germany, we shall repulse you. We know the "reactionary nature of your past". We do not want you to go to China to get your information. There is a Chinese proverb which says, "From the mouth of a dog there can never grow the elephant tusks which produce good ivory".

HUNGARY - We believe in unity for peace, the fight against imperialism and colonialism. Perhaps the Canadian considers our unity harmful and wants to hinder the work of the Congress. His statement does not correspond to truth and reality. We would be ready to give our opinion in full, but we will only inform you of our good will.

PANAMA - We consider that this was just a general statement and a general scheme to make impossible the liberation of countries under colonialism. He should have been more concerned with Nicaragua, Spain, Algeria, etc. We don't know of any communiqué of Canadian students supporting Panama for control of the Canal. The Canadian student is not suffering what Panama is suffering, he is not suffering the exploitation of landowners, he was not shot upon by American Marines. We, like Cuba, have a different idea from the Canadian about peace, love of country, etc.

EAST GERMANY - The Canadian speech was not new or original, it was the language of the "cold war". It is similar to the language of militarists in West Germany today. The Canadian has attacked our educational system, which is a "humanistic system". Is the Canadian Delegate against the fact that youth is being educated in a spirit of peace, friendship, anti-colonialism, anti-militarism? In our country workers and peasants can study, and we are proud that a majority of our students come from these classes. Perhaps he worries because students and professors are living well. In the G.D.R. nobody is being imprisoned who doesn't agree with us. We can give the Canadian better information than he had on Iraq. Why didn't he talk about the main problems in Germany, about the fact that Nazis are back in power in Federal Germany, that 20,000,000 copies of Nazi literature is issued every year? If the Canadian wants he can get more material from us. The G.D.R. seeks peace, in West Germany there are war criminals. You attacked our educational system, but not Fascism. "I forbid you to talk like that." (At this point the most intense, rising and falling, rhythmical clapping, very prolonged.)

PUERTO RICO - Have Canadian students supported the fight of Puerto Rico for independence? If so, his National Union has changed its mind since the ISC where NFCUS voted against the resolution condemning the United States on Puerto Rico.

COLOMBIA - This delegate does not understand the problem of university autonomy. The United States takes the power of universities by buying them. Why did he not protest against American aggression in Guatemala in 1954? He cannot protest because he isn't obeying honest interests. We are not interested in hating the United States but in hating Yankee imperialists. The Canadian came to make provocations. Reactionaries such as he like war.

CYPRUS - Ask the Canadian from what source he heard that students were killed in Tibet, when there is no university in Tibet. Concerning the COSEC Report on Cyprus, it is incomplete and unacceptable to us. We challenge the objectivity of his intervention. He attacked the G.D.R. but has not raised the problem of German revanchism.

BRAZIL - Appeals that provocation of the "gentleman" from Canada should not interrupt our work. His interest dictated to him to make those statements.

JORDAN - There are such things as ideological differences. There has been too much name-calling here and bad words being used because a different opinion has been expressed. We should not attack others for their difference of opinion. (Only statement attempting to bring Congress back to sanity.)

RUMANIA - Rumania voted in favor of giving the Canadian Observer status, because we believed that he wanted to co-operate, but we now don't think that he represents honest Canadian opinion. How many sons and daughters of workers and peasants to school in Canada? He is not one of them. We should like to know how much he gets paid for making such provocations, is it by the day or by the hour? His role is not at all honorable and constitutes provocation. The Rumanian delegation rebuffs and rejects the slanderous words of the Canadian delegate.

CHINA (again) - Because the Canadian attacked China we want a further point of order. He put Tibet side by side with the G.D.R. implying that it was an independent state. Tibet is the territory of China. We are again calling him a "running dog of American Imperialism". That is a simple and objective description of his true face.

LIST OF MAJOR INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATIONS

1. ISC PUBLICATIONS

The Student

A monthly magazine - articles and comments contributed by students around the world.

The Information Bulletin

A monthly digest of information on student events distributed to student leaders.

Reports of all seminars, conferences and special events are published after each event.

2. IUS PUBLICATIONS

World Student News

A monthly magazine.

News Bulletin

A counterpart to the ISC "Information Bulletin."

3. OTHERS

W.Y Forum

A periodical published by the World Assembly of Youth.

Student Mirror

An independent digest of news gathered from student publications all over the world and published in West Berlin.

Monthly national newspapers published by the Students of England and the USA.
National magazines or information bulletins published by the Students of the USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, China and other communist bodies and distributed internationally.

LIBRARY E A/BIBLIOTHEQUE A E



3 5036 20062042 8

DOCS
CA1 EA 61C17 ENG
Canadian students and international
affairs : a memorandum submitted to
the Department of External Affairs
43247923