FOR HIGHER COOPERATION

It is too bad that tension appearing now and then between the U. S. and Latin American countries has reflected at the recent Pan American Congress of Student Organizations held in Rio de Janeiro. According to reports, relations between the United States and other delegations at the Congress were anything but cordial.

No doubt influenced by prevalent local views, Latin American delegations saw in the U. S. delegation representatives of a wealthy power keenly defending material interests in their countries, exploiting local labor and not innocent of meddling in their internal affairs.

The blame for the lack of co-operation at the Congress was not put on the one side of some Latin American delegations, to an outlook out of keeping with the essentially constructive character of a Congress of students thrusting out common problems.

The situation calls for a good deal more tolerance and objectivity on the part of all concerned. We have to accept the attitudes and traditions of our democratic Latin American neighbors the same as they must learn to accept ours. We cannot expect accord from the diplomats when not even the students can manage to agree.

In this with, and in the name of the students of MIT, THE TECH bids a hearty welcome to the members of the Cuban Dormcomm and be free to defend, without outside directives, their interests of their campus living unit and those of all dormitory residents.

REPRESENTATION IN DORMCOMM: A SUGGESTION

The problem of freedom of action held by the dormitory House Committee delegate to Dormcom has given rise to some ill feeling lately. At Baker House it led to the resignation of two members of the Baker House Committee, and at Burton House it has started off action aimed at giving the House Committees greater powers of control over the activities of its Dormcomm delegate.

All systems of order have their defects, and the present one should be revised in such a way that the House Committee has no way of being sure that its views will be well enough defended by its delegate at Dormcom.

You can look inside the water, but you cannot make it drink. While we have been unable to uncover in Robert's Rules of Order any section forbidding a committee to give its delegate voting orders, such a procedure would none the less be inadvisable.

In the case of pending Dormcomms issues known beforehand, it would be more than unreasonable for a House Committee to ask its representative to defend them as well as vote, which he is against. And in the case of new issues, the representative will have to make up his own mind in any way. In addition, the new House Committee did secure the right of telling its Dormcom delegate how to vote, which, as in the case of a secret ballot, be impracticable to control his actions.

We would therefore recommend Burton House Committee to refrain from trying to have Dormcom approve a motion enabling a two-thirds majority of the House Committee alone to amend a subsequent version of this motion without a majority approval of Dormcom. It would be inadvisable, we have already stressed above, even if chances of its approval were good, which they are not.

In its stead, the House Committee should press for a plan entitling, if their Dormcom delegate's views on an issue conflicts with the views of the dorm, to Dormcom, in such instances, a member who supports the stand of the House Committee.

In all other cases, the regular representative should sit on Dormcom and be free to defend, without outside directives, the interests of his campus living unit and those of all dormitory residents.