

Appointment Contested

Dr. Eklund's appointment, while it was adopted by a large majority, including both developed and developing countries, in the Board of Governors, was not unanimous, and it was clear that some members of the Board had serious objections to it. Despite the abuse which had been heaped upon him in its meetings by the representative of the Soviet Union, however, Dr. Eklund accepted the Board's appointment and agreed to its submission to the General Conference for approval. It was generally recognized before the opening of the Conference that this would be an important item on the agenda, but it was not foreseen that it would virtually overshadow all other issues and that the main opponents of the appointment would either abandon or raise in only the most perfunctory manner some of their perennial interests, in order to concentrate more completely the attention and energies of the Conference on this question.

The main opponents of Dr. Eklund's appointment included the members of the Soviet bloc as well as some African and Asian countries, in particular India. The U.S.S.R. and its satellites maintained that there had been no prior consultation about the appointment of a new Director-General and that the West was trying to impose its own candidate on the Agency. The West, the Soviets said, had already held the Director-Generalship for four years and to give it to them again for a second term would be a violation of the principle of equitable geographical representation. The West had to realize that there were three groups of powers in the world and that major international offices such as this one must be rotated among them. The Director-Generalship should go this time to the uncommitted Afro-Asian countries, which the West was determined to exclude from leadership. Executive heads of all United Nations organizations, moreover, the Soviets claimed, must be accepted unanimously, and this was not the case with Dr. Eklund.

Indian Objections

India also maintained that there had been a lack of prior consultation about the appointment of the Director-General. A second major reason for the Indian opposition to Dr. Eklund's appointment was the contention that the Director-General must have the support of all countries, especially of those most advanced in the field of atomic energy. India could not, its representative declared, support a candidate who was not acceptable to both the United States and the Soviet Union. Other African and Asian representatives who opposed Dr. Eklund's appointment echoed the Soviet and Indian arguments about a lack of prior consultation and the requirement that the Director-General must have the support of both the United States and the Soviet Union, and many of them strongly pressed the claim of Africa and Asia to both greater and higher-level representation in the Secretariat.

Those delegates who supported Dr. Eklund's appointment, including the Canadian delegate, reminded the Conference that he had been appointed by an