



International Atomic Energy Agency

General Conference

GC(V)/OR.57
5 December 1961
GENERAL Distr.
ENGLISH

FIFTH REGULAR SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE FIFTY-SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Tuesday, 3 October 1961, at 3.20 p.m.

President: Mr. QUIHILLALT (Argentina)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
22	Appointment of the Director General (continued from the 56th meeting)	1 - 99

* GC(V)/171.

APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL (GC(V)/165, 173, 174, 176) (continued from the 56th meeting)

1. Mr. BORISEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the Agency was faced with a crucial choice: either the spirit of co-operation and mutual understanding would triumph and the post of Director General would be occupied by a candidate acceptable in practice to all Member States, or else, under pressure from the United States and other Western Powers, a candidate approved by those Powers alone would be surreptitiously pushed through to fill that high office. The latter eventuality would be very damaging to the Agency and would seriously hinder its work.
2. The delegates of certain countries had been at pains to prove that, in choosing a Director General, their only consideration was the personal qualifications of the candidate. Was it then really true that the United States had been the only country in the world where a suitable candidate could be found to be the first Director General of the Agency? It was common knowledge that the United States had made its support of the Agency contingent on a United States national being Director General; it had not even hesitated to violate the arrangement for choosing another candidate concluded with the majority of the countries concerned. In order to maintain the spirit of co-operation in an organization that had just been set up, the delegations of many countries which did not share the United States view had not officially opposed the appointment of a candidate of the Western Powers. Now those same Powers were again imposing a candidate of their choice, yet expressed surprise that many Member States protested against that shameful procedure and accused those opposing them of introducing political arguments into the Agency's discussions.
3. He asked the Western Powers what reasons had prompted the choice of the first Director General and were now prompting the choice of the second, if not political reasons which they were attempting to disguise behind talk about the personal qualifications of the candidate.
4. The Byelorussian delegation could not agree with the delegates of the United States, France and certain other countries that Mr. Eklund's qualifications made him virtually the only possible candidate for the post of Director General as well as a scientist of outstanding ability. Without underestimating Mr. Eklund's qualities as a scientist -- the contribution of every scientist to the development of nuclear science was valuable, whatever its

importance - he appealed to delegates not to offend the national honor and sentiments of a large number of scientists from different countries. He agreed with those delegates who had said that the majority of States Members of the Agency could put forward a worthy candidate for the post of Director General.

5. He then drew the attention of delegates to the following sentence from Mr. Eklund's telegram accepting his appointment as Director General: "I have noted that the decision of the Board of Governors was broadly supported and that both industrialized nations and developing countries concurred in the decision". It was well known that many countries, including both industrialized and developing countries, had vigorously opposed his candidacy in the Board, and Mr. Eklund had been fully informed on the matter. Many countries would find it difficult to collaborate in the Agency with a Director General who had such an idea of broad support.

6. He asked delegates to work out a solution which would satisfy all States Members of the Agency without exception.

7. Article III.B.3 of the Statute, which defined the Agency's functions, specified that it should allocate its resources "bearing in mind the special needs of the underdeveloped areas of the world". His delegation considered that only a representative of the Afro-Asian countries could fully understand every aspect of the needs of the developing countries and perform the duties of Director General in conformity with the principal objective of the Agency.

8. For the reasons he had explained, the Byelorussian delegation again emphatically protested against the approval of the appointment of Mr. Eklund as Director General of the Agency. It supported the eleven-Power draft resolution (GC(V)/176), for which it would vote.

9. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) said that Canada, as one of the five countries most advanced in the technology of atomic energy, could not hold aloof from a question of such importance as the appointment of the Director General.

10. The Board had appointed Mr. Eklund to the post of Director General in June. In accordance with Article VII of the Statute, that appointment would take effect only after it had been approved by the Conference. The Board had taken its decision by 17 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions; and the 17 countries which had voted in favor belonged to six of the eight geographical areas mentioned in the Statute.

11. Some delegates had suggested that the Board should have postponed its decision till September; the Canadian Government considered that it had been essential for the Board to take a decision in June, in order to give Members of the Agency sufficient advance notice before they were called upon in the Conference to consider the appointment made by the Board.

12. During the discussion, various arguments had been advanced against the appointment made. It had been said that the choice ought to fall on a representative of an Afro-Asian country, a less-developed country or, lastly, a country that was uncommitted from the military or political point of view. The delegate of the Soviet Union had advanced all three arguments. The Canadian Government, for its part, agreed that an increasing number of key positions in organizations of the United Nations family should be given to qualified persons recruited from Afro-Asian countries, especially recently established States. Canada had given many proofs of its goodwill with regard to the new countries. He was unable to agree, however, that the principle of giving preference to nationals of less-developed countries applied without qualification in the present case. Persons with all the qualities required for performing the duties of Director General could certainly be found in Afro-Asian countries, and in Latin America, and his delegation would have been glad to support such a candidate if one had been put forward; but that had not been the case. His delegation also rejected the argument that since the first Director General had been a United States national, his successor must necessarily be from a less-developed country.

13. The Byelorussian delegate had asked what were the motives of the Western Powers. For its part, Canada was guided only by the desire to see the best qualified candidate appointed, and considered the Director General's country of origin to be a subsidiary question. After asking the advice of Canadian scientists, in particular Dr. Lewis, his delegation had come to the conclusion that Mr. Eklund fulfilled the required conditions. No one but the delegate of the Soviet Union had made any personal criticism of Mr. Eklund. The Canadian delegation did not think that the Director General must necessarily be a scientist. Four years previously it had supported the candidature of the first Director General, who was not a scientist. It seemed, however, that it would now be to the Agency's advantage to have a scientist at its head, since that would make it easier to obtain the support of scientific circles throughout the world.

14. The director of an international organization could not be regarded as the representative of a government or of a political bloc. Mr. Eklund was a scientist who was also an administrator, and in addition he had had wide experience of international co-operation, since he had acted as Secretary to the second United Nations Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva in 1958. To suggest that he would be an instrument in the hands of certain organizations or certain Powers was an absurd accusation without any foundation.

15. The Canadian delegation categorically rejected the argument of the Soviet delegate that the Board's decision had not been preceded by adequate consultations^{1/}. The difficulty had been that a first candidate, from an Asian country, had been officially put forward in November 1960. At the beginning of 1961, before the Government of the United States or any other government had approached Mr. Eklund, it had been known that the Soviet Union, and some time later India, had decided to support Mr. Sudjarwo, without consulting other governments. The Canadian and other Governments had subsequently come to the conclusion that the candidate in question did not fulfill all the conditions required for the post of Director General and had therefore sought another candidate. In February and March 1961 conversations had taken place between different members of the Board, but they had been inconclusive. It could not well have been otherwise, when two of the most important members had taken the premature decision to support a candidate of their own choice.

16. The Canadian Government wished to collaborate with the Soviet Union, but would not go so far as to agree to what it considered an irrational veto of a qualified candidate solely because he came from a European country which had attained a high degree of development.

17. As to the conversation which was said to have taken place between Mr. Emelyanov and Mr. Eklund, without wishing to cast any doubt on Mr. Emelyanov's good faith, he thought there must have been some misunderstanding, and that probably Mr. Eklund had merely said, as he had said elsewhere, that he would not accept the post of Director General unless he had the support of a large number of countries. It seemed that that condition had been met and that Mr. Eklund had found the support he had wished to obtain in large areas of the world.

^{1/} GC(V)/OR.56, paragraphs 17-18.

18. The eleven-Power draft resolution, in spite of all the courtesy with which its authors had submitted it, contained a rejection of Mr. Eklund's appointment. If it was adopted, the Conference would be reversing the decision of the Board. The Canadian Government approved the Board's decision and would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

19. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) said that the views of the socialist countries on the composition of the secretariats of international organizations were known to all. With regard to the Agency, the representatives of the socialist countries on the Board had shown moderation and a spirit of conciliation which the Western Powers had refused to recognize.

20. The post of Director General had been occupied for four years by a representative of the Western countries. It was now the turn of a representative of the socialist countries. Nevertheless, since the Agency should first of all serve the interests of the underdeveloped countries so as to enable them to catch up as soon as possible, the socialist countries considered that the new Director General ought to be a national of one of those countries; their own turn would come later. Moreover, the appointment of such a candidate would show that the underdeveloped countries were at last playing the prominent part on the international scene which was their due.

21. The Polish delegation had a right to hope that that argument would find favor with the Western countries, whose representatives were in the habit of making declarations of friendship toward the underdeveloped countries. It had a further reason for hoping that its point of view would be unanimously approved: four years previously, when Mr. Brynielssen's candidature had met with general agreement, the United States delegation had changed its mind and presented its own candidate. The Polish delegation had given way on that occasion, as it wished the Director General's appointment to be decided unanimously. It had considered then, as it did now, that if the Director General was not appointed unanimously, the Agency was bound to disintegrate. Many of the delegates present could testify that there was no example of an international organization whose Director General had not been unanimously appointed by all its members.

22. At the June meetings of the Board, the Governor from Poland had stated, with regard to Mr. Eklund's candidature, that his delegation had nothing against Mr. Eklund, that Poland maintained good relations with Sweden and that

its opposition was a question of principle. The Polish delegation must admit that it had changed its opinion regarding Mr. Eklund. The fact that he had taken no notice of the opinions expressed about him made it impossible to retain confidence in him. It might well be wondered what the situation in the Agency would be if, after all that had been said, Mr. Eklund was appointed Director General.

23. At the Juno meetings of the Board, the Polish delegation had made numerous attempts to reach a compromise and had asked that other candidates should be put up; but no other name had been submitted. Under those conditions, the Board had been practically confronted with an ultimatum. The supporters of Mr. Eklund, having exhausted their arguments, had then said that it was too late to propose other candidates.

24. Referring to the eleven-Power draft resolution deferring the appointment of the Director General, he said that as far as his delegation could see it was the only way to reach a decision which could obtain the unanimous support that was essential. His delegation would support the draft resolution without reservation and regretted that those who opposed it had been so off-hand in their treatment of a draft resolution submitted by eleven countries which were deeply interested in the Agency.

25. Judging by the tone of the French delegate's statement^{2/}, it seemed that France did not admit the possibility of finding a candidate in another country. However, there was no shortage of outstanding scientists in the rest of the world, as was shown by the presence of Professor Bhabha, the delegate of India. It was known that the great scientists had many qualified scientific workers around them, so it would not be difficult to find a candidate in that country. It was not a question of personalities; the real problem was the future of the Agency and one thing seemed certain: if Mr. Eklund was appointed, the Agency could not fulfill the hopes placed in it by many countries.

26. The Polish delegation was convinced that it was not too late to find a solution which would cause no embarrassment to anyone. Its wish was to continue to co-operate with the other delegations to the Conference and it hoped that the eleven-Power draft resolution, which respected all opinions and was intended to provide a last-minute solution acceptable to all, would be supported by the majority of Members.

^{2/} GC(V)/OR.50, paragraphs 51-54.

27. Mr. LEE (China) thought that during the discussion everything possible had been said about the qualifications of Mr. Eklund, who was particularly well qualified to fill the post of Director General. During the general debate the Chinese delegation had already stated that it supported his appointment.^{3/}

28. He did not think any of the arguments advanced against Mr. Eklund were justified. It had been said that the Director General should be chosen in turn from among nationals of countries belonging to the Western, Eastern and Afro-Asian blocs. But the very idea of such blocs was arbitrary and artificial. It might be wondered what rational motives lay behind such a demand.

29. It had also been asserted that the successor to the present Director General, who was a citizen of the United States of America, should be a national of an underdeveloped country or, in any case, of a country whose economic and social conditions were different from those of North America. The Chinese delegation fully agreed that posts in the Secretariat should be distributed equitably among the various geographical areas but that did not apply to the post of Director General. It had been claimed that if the new Director General came from an advanced Western country he would not be able to understand conditions in the other geographical areas. But those areas were represented in the Secretariat by a number of high-ranking officials who were fully qualified to advise the Director General on the needs of their respective areas. There was no basis whatever for fears on that score.

30. Some delegates said that the appointment of the Director General should be decided unanimously, but they were the first to sow discord and spread dissension in the Agency.

31. The delegate of the Soviet Union had spoken of violation of the Statute in connection with the appointment of Mr. Eklund^{4/}; but the Canadian delegate had cited the relevant provisions of Article VII, which made it quite clear that in choosing that candidate the Board had not violated the Statute in any way. It was rather the eleven-Power draft resolution which was not in conformity with the spirit of the Statute; hence the Chinese delegation would vote against it.

^{3/} GC(V)/OR.52, paragraph 77.

^{4/} GC(V)/OR.56, paragraph 23.

32. Mr. ZHMUDSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the principles on which international co-operation between countries of different social structures should be based precluded giving preference to any one country or group of countries. The Ukrainian delegation was not urging that at the present stage of the Agency's activities preference should be given to the socialist camp, but it could not relinquish its rights in order to please the Western Powers.
33. Four years previously the Ukrainian delegation had agreed to the appointment of Mr. Cole, a national of the United States of America, to the post of Director General. That had been a real concession made to the United States and to the group of countries supporting it, because it had been necessary to get the Agency started without delay and any discussion on the appointment of the Director General would have been prejudicial to its start. Four years had elapsed and the States Members of the Agency were again faced with the same problem.
34. The Canadian delegate's remarks suggested that he had forgotten what had happened four years before. From the same platform, without troubling to present any arguments, the delegates of Canada and France had declared: "This is what we want, this is what we have decided and this is how we shall vote.". The representatives of the socialist countries and certain other countries had long been aware of what those gentlemen wanted and what they were seeking to obtain. The only thing they did not want was true international co-operation. The United States and the countries supporting it wished to make the 76-member international organization their fief, but the peoples of the world wanted no such thing: they were seeking true co-operation.
35. In the Agency, as in all other international organizations, there were representatives of three well-defined groups of countries: the socialist countries, the Western countries and the uncommitted countries. There was no legal reason why the work of the Agency should be directed by representatives of one and the same group of countries for eight years. If the Canadian delegate attached no importance to the country of origin of the future Director General, he should refrain from speaking and, more particularly, should not advocate the candidate of the Western bloc.

36. In reality, the purpose of the Western Powers' diktat was to obstruct any co-operation in the Agency. All who favored such co-operation should support the appointment of a candidate from the Afro-Asian countries as Director General. There could be no other course if it was desired that due consideration should be given to the interests of that group of States, since it was they that were most in need of the Agency's assistance. A representative of those countries could evaluate the extent of their needs better than anyone else. That was the first reason why the Ukrainian delegation was opposed, in principle, to the appointment of a representative of the Western bloc as the second Director General of the Agency.

37. The second reason for its opposition to the appointment of Mr. Eklund was that in presenting his candidature the Western bloc had departed from the procedure normally followed in international organizations and had taken no notice of the opinion of a number of countries which had requested that Mr. Eklund should be invited to the meetings of the Board. That unprecedented attitude was contrary to the elementary rules of international co-operation.

38. Thirdly, the Ukrainian delegation considered that Mr. Eklund was not a suitable person to be Director General, either on account of his administrative qualities or on account of his moral qualities. He had insufficient experience of the work of international organizations and what limited experience he might have acquired as Secretary-General of the second Geneva conference did not qualify him for carrying out the many tasks of the Agency. Moreover, if, in the present situation, he continued to disregard the opinion of a number of countries, in particular the opinion of the Soviet Union, that would prove his lack of high moral qualities. If Mr. Eklund were a true scientist, he would understand that the contemporary development of science called for international co-operation and was much more important than the salary of a Director General, and he would refuse the post.

39. In the opinion of the Ukrainian delegation, the only reasonable decision likely to strengthen international co-operation in the Agency in the present situation was to adopt the eleven-Power draft resolution. He asked all participants in the Conference to show understanding and to make every effort to prevent the abnormal situation that had arisen in regard to the appointment of the Director General from paralyzing the Agency's activities - to quote the words of the Tunisian representative^{5/}.

^{5/} GC(V)/OR.56, paragraph 73.

40. In conclusion, he said that if the Western Powers did not take into account the arguments put forward by the delegations of a large number of countries and if, by using the voting machine, they secured the appointment of Mr. Eklund as Director General, they would be responsible for the deterioration in relations within the Agency.

41. Mr. QUANSAH (Ghana), drawing attention to the fact that he was one of the sponsors of the eleven-Power draft resolution, said that statements made during the meeting showed that the Board had recommended the appointment of Mr. Eklund without prior consultations between its Members. He did not question the qualifications of Mr. Eklund who, as a scientist and an administrator, would certainly be capable of performing the duties of Director General of the Agency if he could count on the co-operation of all Members. However, it appeared that one of the great atomic Powers and many other States were refusing him their support. Thus, an embarrassing situation had been created and it would be difficult to find a solution unless Mr. Eklund, as a gesture of conciliation, agreed to withdraw. By so doing, he would give proof of his disinterested attitude and would enable Member States to come together and agree on another candidate.

42. Mr. RANDERS (Norway) said he wished to speak as a scientist. He was sorry to see that diplomatic methods of work were raising difficulties that did not really exist. He had participated in the Agency's work as an advisor to the present Director General, whose organizing ability he had greatly admired. He had also acted as a panel chairman and as Governor from Norway.

43. At the present stage of the Agency's work, the person needed was one qualified in atomic science and familiar with technical assistance questions. Mr. Eklund was known for his interest in assistance to underdeveloped countries and he also had first-class scientific qualifications. He (Mr. Randers) saw no reason for not approving the appointment made by the Board.

44. Since the main activity of the Agency was essentially scientific, the only problem was to find a man qualified in science and technology. No consideration of nationality should enter into the matter. It was generally agreed that the appointment recommended to the Conference was satisfactory in every respect. If some delegations thought differently, it was to be feared that they had a peculiar conception of the duties of an international civil servant.

45. No Swedish citizen - or for that matter Scandinavian citizen - who was an international civil servant would tolerate any pressure, even from his own country. That principle must be vigorously defended if the international organizations were to be prevented from becoming a mere puppet show.

46. Norway would firmly oppose any text that changed the appointment procedure while there was a candidate of recognized competence. He was convinced that Mr. Eklund would be able to prove his skill in directing the Agency and show his interest in the underdeveloped countries as well as in all the other countries of the world.

47. He called on all delegates of developing countries not to weaken the feeling of unity to which all scientists and all citizens of the Scandinavian countries were so strongly attached. No one in that part of the world could agree that one of its scientists might become the tool of some plot by obscure forces.

48. He asked the Conference not to make a political or diplomatic issue out of an extremely simple problem, the solution of which was within its reach. In order to extricate itself from an unfortunate situation, the Conference should appoint Mr. Eklund Director General and hope that a national of an underdeveloped country would accede to that high office in the not too distant future.

49. Mr. ESCHAUZIER (Netherlands) thought that the Director General could be selected from any part of the world. It was certainly desirable for the candidature to receive unanimous support, but the rule of democratic procedure should be accepted and, in the event, it must be recognized that Mr. Eklund had been approved by a large majority. The minority should understand that they must respect that rule, and it served no useful purpose whatever for them to attack the majority in offensive terms.

50. Mr. Eklund had himself shown his intention of tackling the problem of assistance to underdeveloped countries. He was well qualified to collaborate with all Member States. He (Mr. Eschauzier) joined with the Norwegian delegate in asking the Conference to approve Mr. Eklund's appointment.

51. Mr. HADI (Indonesia) recalled that at the Board's meetings in June 1961 Indonesia, like Sweden, had been directly involved in the question of the appointment of a Director General. At that time, the Indonesian

candidate had been warmly supported by the representatives of seven States, while two Governors had abstained. He wished to express his gratitude, and that of Mr. Sudjarwo, to those who had voted for him.

52. Although the Indonesian candidature was no longer a factor, serious difficulties remained. Approval of Mr. Eklund's appointment by the Conference would depend on the votes of the Western Powers and be contrary to the wishes of several other countries.

53. Since the post of Director General had been occupied by a representative of the West for four years, it should, in accordance with the principle of the equality of rights of Member States, now go to a nominee from another geographical area. One of the Agency's most important duties was to supply technical assistance to the developing countries, and he believed he was expressing their views also in saying that the new Director General should come from that group for the simple reason that he would have a clearer idea of the needs of countries which resembled his own.

54. Some representatives of the Great Powers had complained that there had not been enough consultation with a view to selecting a candidate acceptable to all Member States. It was to avoid further deterioration of the situation that eleven African and Asian countries, including Indonesia, had submitted a draft resolution which suggested the only solution possible to a delicate problem which was of the greatest importance for the Agency's future.

55. Mr. EMELYANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the Canadian delegate, said it was well known that Mr. Wershof endeavored by every possible means to obstruct collaboration and complicate the Agency's work, collaboration and peace being words which were equally abhorrent to him. When, in the Board, some time previously, speaking as Governor from the Soviet Union, he had pronounced the word "peace", Mr. Wershof had immediately requested that he be ruled out of order. That had aroused the indignation of all Governors, and the meeting had had to be suspended. Mr. Wershof had been obliged to withdraw his revealing and unprecedented request.

56. It was a matter of common knowledge that, at the fourth session of the Conference, Mr. Wershof had tried to prevent the delegate of India from speaking - and had earned a well-merited reprimand. Mr. Wershof did not know what Mr. Eklund had in fact said but was trying hard to discredit the Soviet representative.

57. Mr. Eklund had stated that he could not accept the post of Director General unless he had the support of both the United States and the Soviet Union. When the Governor from Poland had proposed that the Board invite Mr. Eklund to attend its meeting, Mr. Wershof had said that that would not be necessary. Why?

58. As the Tunisian delegate had quite rightly pointed out, representatives of the Western countries had appropriated all the leading posts in all United Nations organizations, e.g. from its foundation to date, the International Labour Organisation had been directed by a United States national; the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization had had a United States national as Director General from 1948 to 1956, and now had an Italian; the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations had had as its head a United Kingdom national from 1945 to 1948 and a United States national from 1948 to 1956; the International Civil Aviation Organization had been headed by a Canadian and by a Swede; the International Telecommunication Union had as its head a United States national, and so had the Agency.

59. That could not be considered right. The domination of a single group of States in an international organization was prejudicial to the very principle of international collaboration and contrary to the aims of the organizations themselves. That policy operated within the Agency, and the Western countries were not prepared even to discuss any alteration in what was an intolerable situation. That state of affairs could not be allowed to continue.

60. The discussion had shown that all the Afro-Asian countries which were not yet Members of the Agency were opposed to Mr. Eklund's candidature. Only the isolated voice of the representative of Chiang Kai-shek had been heard in its favor, but everyone knew that he represented nobody.

61. The socialist countries were also unanimously opposed to the candidature which it was sought to impose on the Agency.

62. What forces supported Mr. Eklund? The answer was very clear. He was the candidate, not of all the Member States, but of a single group, viz. the countries of the West.

63. In insisting on Mr. Eklund, the Western countries were assuming a great responsibility insofar as the Agency's future was concerned. The Tunisian delegate had rightly said that if the appointment of the future Director General was imposed, the Agency's activities would be paralyzed in consequence. To prevent that happening, collaboration and not dictation was wanted. The eleven-Power draft resolution pointed the way to such collaboration.

64. Mr. MAHMOUD (United Arab Republic) regretted not being able to support the candidature of a man who was a scientist and the citizen of a friendly country, but whose nomination had taken place without prior consultations with a view to obtaining the agreement of the various Member States. The senior posts in the Agency should not be monopolized by any one group of States. No one could deny that the countries of Africa and Asia were not adequately represented, mostly occupying subordinate posts. The other international organizations had undertaken to remedy so deplorable a situation, and the Agency should follow suit.

65. He failed to see how the Agency could function satisfactorily when the Director General, irrespective of his personal qualifications, had to face the opposition of a group of States that included one of the world's two main atomic Powers and also the Afro-Asian States, whose interests did not appear to have been taken fully into consideration.

66. His delegation was most anxious that there should be consultations with a view to finding an acceptable solution and had therefore co-sponsored the eleven-Power draft resolution. It was to be hoped that the Conference would adopt it and thereby end the present dissensions and pave the way for conditions which would enable the Agency to operate smoothly.

67. Sir Roger MAKINS (United Kingdom) shared the views of the delegate of Norway and considered that the issue was being unduly inflated. Mr. Eklund's nomination had been supported by a large majority in the Board, and could thus be said to have a wide measure of support. No objections had been raised against him personally and his experience was not questioned; he was recognized as a scientist and as a first-class administrator. The only possible reproach was, in fact, that he belonged to a "bad" region, and so would not have the collaboration of certain Member States. That argument was

inadmissible; the appointment of a Director General could not be made conditional upon his belonging to any given geographical area. Moreover, it was difficult to see how any better solution could be found by adopting the course suggested by the sponsors of the eleven-Power draft resolution. The United Kingdom delegation had therefore decided to approve the appointment made by the Board.

68. Mr. IPPOLITO (Italy) stressed the technical nature of the Director General's functions; his duty was to carry out the decisions of the Conference and the Board.

69. The outgoing Director General had done his work with remarkable tact and efficiency, and there was no doubt that Mr. Eklund would do likewise. The Conference knew Mr. Eklund well, as he had been Secretary-General of the second United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held at Geneva in 1958, but probably knew less of his remarkable scientific career and his experience in international co-operation; he was one of the organizers of and most active participants in the meetings and symposia of the European Nuclear Energy Agency, and had close links of esteem and friendship with the leading figures in nuclear science. The Italian delegation would give him its full support, and was sure that he would guide the Agency effectively, devoting particular attention to assistance to the developing countries.

70. Mr. BHABHA (India) pointed out that the Board's decision did not in any way preclude the Conference from referring the question back to it for reconsideration in the light of new facts; there would be nothing discourteous in that. The Statute itself provided, in Article VII.A, that the Director General be appointed by the Board "with the approval of the General Conference". That approval was not merely an automatic formality. It conferred certain responsibilities on the Conference, which had a perfect right to refer matters back without any discourtesy to the Board. During the Board's discussions, a large majority of Governors had supported the nomination of Mr. Eklund, some had opposed it, others had abstained. The Indian delegation had explained the reasons for its own abstention. Now the situation was very different. The matter had been considered by the Conference and by many countries which were not represented on the Board. It had become clear that the appointment of Mr. Eklund had not secured wide support and even that there was strong

opposition. In those circumstances it seemed to be quite legitimate to ask the Board to reconsider the question. It appeared unwarrantable that so reasonable a request should be rejected by those who, assured of their majority, sought to impose their own point of view. That was not an attitude conducive to genuine international co-operation.

71. It had been stated that India demanded that the Director General should come from a certain region. In fact, the Indian delegation had gone no further than to suggest - and that point must be stressed - that the candidate should appropriately come from a region with a different economic and social pattern from that of the United States. The fact that that suggestion had apparently never been considered hardly betokened a conciliatory attitude or a spirit of co-operation.

72. Much had been heard of what was alleged to have been said in discussion between Mr. Eklund and the delegate of the Soviet Union. He himself merely wished to emphasize that the director of an international organization must have the support of all groups of countries. It was clear, however, that Mr. Eklund had not the support of the Soviet Union, the socialist countries or of a large number of African and Asian countries. To accept the post of Director General under those conditions would seem to indicate a lack of political sense. He would urge all delegates to consider the problem in a spirit of conciliation, so that the Agency would be enabled to work harmoniously. In asking the Board to reconsider the question of the appointment of the Director General, the Conference would not be opposing the Board's decision, but it would pave the way to a more satisfactory solution.

73. Mr. SINACEUR (Morocco) said he was astonished and saddened by the turn the debate had taken. Mr. Eklund was not present at the meeting, but it was public and a record of it would appear; the candidate designated by the Board for the post of Director General could not fail to be affected by what had been said about him, and particularly by those who claimed he was not a sufficiently representative candidate. Unacceptable to one of the two Great Powers, his appointment contested by a group of uncommitted countries, would Mr. Eklund have the requisite authority? It had been said that qualifications and not geographical distribution should count in appointing a new Director General. But although Article VII.D of the Statute stated that the paramount consideration in the recruitment of the staff should be

to secure employees of the highest standards of efficiency, technical competence and integrity, it also said that "subject to this consideration, due regard shall be paid to ... the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible".

74. Other delegates had claimed that, as the statutory procedure had been followed to the letter and as the Board's designation of the Director General had been perfectly in order, all that remained for the Conference to do was to endorse the appointment. That purely mechanical and formalistic approach simply ignored the facts.

75. At the United Nations as elsewhere, 1961 had been called "The Year of Africa" and still more African countries would soon become independent. Those who wanted to be formalistic would do well to reflect on the consequences. If, in a few years' time, the emancipation of the Afro-Asian peoples resulted in a reversal of the majority in the various organizations of the United Nations, there would undoubtedly be an outcry and accusations that the new majority was being unco-operative if it in turn adopted the same mechanical ideas. The countries which were economically underdeveloped refused to be considered intellectually underdeveloped. Given as good an education, their nationals were perfectly able to measure up to those of the advanced countries - it was only necessary to mention as an example Mr. Mongi Slim, the current President of the United Nations General Assembly. That would apply equally to an African or Asian candidate for the post of Director General.

76. But what was the way out of the present impasse? Unless there was to be a compromise - and he himself could not see any sign of it - Mr. Eklund was the only person who could help. The Moroccan delegation therefore associated itself with Ghana's appeal to Mr. Eklund to withdraw his candidature; that decision could bring nothing but credit to the illustrious Swedish scientist. Mr. Eklund's maintenance of his candidature, however, would in no wise alter Morocco's attitude to the eleven-Power draft resolution which it had co-sponsored.

77. At the request of Mr. Sinacour (Morocco), a roll-call vote was taken on the eleven-Power draft resolution (GC(V)/176).

Australia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favor: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Ethiopia, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina.

Abstentions: Holy See, Lebanon, Viet-Nam.

78. The eleven-Power draft resolution was rejected by 42 votes to 22, with 3 abstentions.

79. Mr. REGALA (Philippines), explaining his vote, stated that, at the time of the designation of the Director General by the Board in June 1961, the Philippines had first voted for the Indonesian candidate, considering it preferable that the Director General should come from a developing country; that candidate, however, had received only 8 votes against 13, with 2 abstentions. At the second ballot, two countries which had voted for Mr. Sudjarwo - Thailand and the Philippines - had transferred their votes to Mr. Eklund in the belief that the second Director General should be designated by a large majority of the Board.

80. The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to discuss the draft resolution submitted jointly by Bulgaria, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (GC(V)/173).

81. Mr. EMELYANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that all the reasons for inviting Mr. Eklund to meetings of the Conference at which the question of his appointment to the post of Director General was being examined were set out in the explanatory memorandum submitted with the draft resolution.

82. It was quite unheard of to attempt to appoint in his absence a future Director General, the highest official of the Agency; it was unprecedented in the practice of international organizations, the Agency included. The first Director General had been present at the meetings of the Board and of the Conference at which his candidature had been discussed. The attempt made to impose a candidate in his absence could only be interpreted as a dictatorial maneuver, and must necessarily provoke the opposition of States which were trying to achieve genuine collaboration within the Agency.

83. Replying to the United Kingdom delegate's statement that it would be unsuitable to invite Mr. Eklund because it would be considered most unusual in the United Kingdom for a person whose appointment was under discussion to be present during the actual discussion^{6/}, he said that an international organization of 76 States having varying structures and traditions could not be bound by United Kingdom customs. Mr. Eklund must be invited to the Conference and find out what the various delegations thought about his appointment.

84. He could not believe that Mr. Eklund would agree to accept the post when he knew that groups as important as the non-aligned Afro-Asian countries as a whole and all the socialist countries opposed his candidature. It was a matter of profound regret to him to see Mr. Eklund become a plaything in the hands of a group of countries which were imposing on the Agency policies incompatible with genuine international co-operation. It was for that very reason that the draft resolution had been submitted.

85. Mr. SMYTH (United States of America) stated that the draft resolution was improper and not in the interests of the Agency. It would require Mr. Eklund to appear before the Conference, but the real object was to submit the candidate to attack and humiliation. Mr. Eklund was not unknown. Numerous scientists in every country had learned to appreciate his

^{6/} GC(V)/OR.53, paragraph 76.

talents as a high official in his own country and as Secretary-General of the second United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. If the sponsors of the draft resolution had genuinely desired to obtain further information about Mr. Eklund and his scientific views, they had had plenty of time and opportunity to do so. Any government could have written, telegraphed or telephoned to Mr. Eklund, or arranged to have its diplomatic representatives in Sweden talk directly with him.

86. At its last series of meetings, in September, the Board had emphatically rejected a proposal identical in substance to the present draft resolution. Naturally, the Conference had the right to approve or disapprove of the Board's choice. But it was neither right nor proper to cross-question the candidate as to whether he had really known his own mind when he accepted.

87. The United States delegation was absolutely opposed to the draft resolution as being beneath the dignity of the Conference and harmful to the prestige of the Agency.

88. Mr. NADJAKOV (Bulgaria) considered that the debate on the appointment of the Director General would have taken a different turn if Mr. Eklund had been able to present himself before the Board and, later, before the Conference. But, contrary to established procedure in international organizations, the candidate had been prevented from doing so. The Bulgarian delegation would therefore be happy to see the Conference decide to invite Mr. Eklund; the doubts raised by the delegate of Canada about the authenticity of the discussion in Moscow between Mr. Eklund and Mr. Emelyanov could be cleared up at the same time. Once Mr. Eklund knew all that had been said in the Board and in the Conference, he would no doubt himself see his way to extricating the Conference from the difficult situation in which it was placed. But if he was not disposed to draw the obvious conclusions, it was for the Conference to decide if the post of Director General should be entrusted to a man who had been appointed, not unanimously, but in the face of strong opposition. The Bulgarian delegation hoped that the Conference would support the draft resolution, but would not insist that it be put to the vote.

89. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) explained that Poland had co-sponsored the draft resolution in the hope that the Conference would invite Mr. Eklund to attend and find out what a large minority, more than one-third of the Member States, thought of him, his work and what he could do at the Agency. A similar proposal had been submitted by Poland to the Board in September 1961.

90. He was astonished that the United States delegate should speak of humiliating Mr. Eklund. In point of fact it was the United States more than anyone else that was creating a situation that might be humiliating for the Swedish scientist, whose presence, incidentally, would also permit the Canadian delegate to clear up his doubts regarding the conversation that had taken place in Moscow between Mr. Emelyanov and Mr. Eklund. Had Mr. Eklund said he would not accept the post of Director General if opposed by the Soviet Union, or had he not?

91. In his letter to the Board, Mr. Eklund had said that he would accept the post of Director General if he had the support of a substantial majority. But the vote just taken on the eleven-Power draft resolution clearly showed that, if a two-thirds majority had been required, the appointment would not have been confirmed. After the discussion that had taken place at the Conference, no one could conscientiously say that Mr. Eklund's acceptance would be a matter for congratulation on the part of the Agency.

92. The PRESIDENT took it that the sponsors of the three-Power draft resolution (GC(V)/173) were agreed that it need not be put to the vote. He therefore proposed that the Conference vote on the nine-Power draft resolution. In accordance with a request made to him, the vote would be by roll call.

93. A roll-call vote was taken on the nine-Power draft resolution (GC(V)/174).
South Africa, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favor: South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal.

Against: Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Poland, Romania.

Abstaining: United Arab Republic, Burma, Ceylon, Holy See, Iraq, Morocco.

94. The nine-Power draft resolution was adopted by 46 votes to 16, with 6 abstentions.

95. Mr. PHUONG (Viet-Nam) explained his votes. His delegation had abstained from voting on the eleven-Power draft resolution because, while in general approving the preamble, it considered that the operative part was not such as to facilitate a solution. It had voted for the draft resolution approving Mr. Eklund's appointment, since it was anxious that there should be no break in continuity; an interregnum would be prejudicial to the interests of the Member States, and of the developing countries in particular, and must be avoided.

96. Mr. HESBURGH (Holy See) explained why his delegation had abstained. The reason for the presence of the Holy See at the Agency's meetings was its desire to promote the use of science and technology for exclusively peaceful purposes. The Agency constituted an important means to that end and its duties were not only of a scientific, but also of a moral character. It would need the wisdom of Solomon to find a universally acceptable solution

to the controversy which had arisen about the appointment of the Director General and to bring peace out of the existing discord. Not possessing that wisdom, the delegation of the Holy See did not presume to judge the rights and wrongs of the case and had therefore decided to abstain. It did believe, however, that whatever decision was taken should be dictated by the desire to ensure the growth and proper operation of the Agency.

97. His delegation firmly believed in the aims for which the Agency was founded and would spare no efforts in working to achieve them, since it saw in a sincere desire to use science for peaceful ends the best hope of mankind. If it was desired to have an Agency and that the Member States live and work in hope and friendship rather than in fear and hatred, a more rational method of communicating with one another and of understanding one another must be found without delay. The problem certainly could be solved; and if it were not, the Member States would have failed miserably in their responsibility to respond to the deepest hopes of mankind.

98. Mr. DAGUERRE (Senegal) explained why his delegation had voted first for the eleven-Power draft resolution and then for the confirmation of Mr. Eklund's appointment. The delegation of Senegal had taken part, in an informal meeting, in framing the eleven-Power draft resolution without, however, co-sponsoring it. It considered that a means must be found of breaking the deadlock and had voted for the draft resolution in a spirit of solidarity with the Afro-Asian countries. It had subsequently voted for Mr. Eklund because it did not want to expose the Agency to a year's interregnum. It had furthermore wished to pay tribute by its vote to the candidate's nationality, since he was a compatriot of the late Mr. Hammarström, to whom the less-developed countries largely owed their admission to the United Nations family. It was thanks to him that their voice was now making itself heard.

99. The PRESIDENT said that consideration of item 22 was concluded for the time being. It would be resumed at a later date to enable the new Director General to take his oath of office before the Conference.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.