

THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE
A Biographical Study of the Top
Functionaries of the United Nations Secretariat

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Luis Manueco-Jenkins
1964



ABSTRACT

T H E I N T E R N A T I O N A L C I V I L S E R V I C E

A BIOGRAPHICAL STUDY OF THE TOP FUNCTIONARIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SECRETARIAT

by Luis Mañueco-Jenkins

This study outlines the development of the international civil service, focusing on the United Nations Secretariat and concentrating on its major officials. The central task of this thesis has been to collect and analyze biographical data on the top Secretariat functionaries, in the hope of contributing to an understanding of the types of personnel appointed to the highest level of the leading international organization, and, thus, of the types of personnel likely to reach responsible high positions within the international civil service under contemporary conditions.

Between 1946 and 1964, a total of forty-three officials have been appointed to positions having the rank of Under-Secretary. Biographical data on each were drawn primarily from United Nations publications; international and national biographic directories; information obtained from embassies and information agencies; books and articles written by and about the officials here considered; and The New York Times.

Each person was considered in terms of (1) national origin; (2) educational background; (3) private employment before entering the United Nations; (4) government or public service; (5) United Nations positions held before, and after, appointment to Under-Secretary status, and (6) the reasons for termination of employment at the Secretariat.

The data show that quite a high level of formal education is almost universal among those who have achieved top positions in the Secretariat. Experience at a high level in diplomacy, public administration, and other forms of government service was also found very frequently. Previous participation in United Nations activities also has been frequent among Under-Secretaries. Knowledge of the United Nations' official languages is, and will continue to be, considered essential.

With the growing realization that global responsibilities are best discharged by officials with global outlooks and interests, it seems likely that emphasis will also be placed upon such ambiguously measurable characteristics as cross-cultural educational experience, international travel, a broad awareness of world affairs, and (perhaps most important of all) the possession of an international outlook and of a responsible loyalty to the ideals of the United Nations.

T H E I N T E R N A T I O N A L C I V I L S E R V I C E

A Biographical Study of the Top Functionaries
of the United Nations Secretariat

By

Luis Mañueco-Jenkins

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Political Science

1964

9 31517
1-29-65

P R E F A C E

Few studies have dealt with the United Nations as a social system and those that have done so concentrate on the Security Council or on the General Assembly. Since it is easy to equate the work of the Secretariat with the activities of the Secretary-General, the background, characteristics, and functions of the Secretariat as a whole have so far remained largely unexamined. This thesis will therefore focus not only on the Secretary-General, but on the top echelon of his assistants.

If, after Parsons, one defines a social system as a system of action, then the fact that the Secretariat is so often ignored becomes the more surprising since it is through the action and the work of the staff of the Secretariat that the Organization's social and economic---and at times its political---goals are furthered.

The Secretariat is divided into major units, the heads of which have the rank of Under-Secretary and are directly responsible to the Secretary-General. It is on these top officials that this study will concentrate.

This thesis makes three principal assumptions: that the international civil service plays an increasingly important part in shaping contemporary international relations; that the United Nations may be considered the most influential

of all international organizations in existence today; and that the methods and standards of personnel selection at the top level now prevailing in the United Nations are not likely to be greatly changed very soon.

The fact that no analysis of the biographies of the top echelon of the United Nations Secretariat has been published increases the relevance of this study to the general problems of international order in contemporary society. The main task of this thesis, then, is to collect and analyze biographical data about the top Secretariat functionaries, in the hope of contributing to an understanding of the types of personnel appointed to the highest level of the leading international organization and, thus, of the types of personnel likely to reach responsible high positions within the international civil service under contemporary conditions.

Besides describing the top functionaries selected for analysis, this study covers two other major areas. The first chapter traces the development of the international civil service from its earliest days to the period of the League of Nations. The second outlines the different approaches to administration of each of the three Secretaries-General of the United Nations, focusing on the organizational structure of the top echelon under each of them.

The third chapter contains biographical data on the forty officials who have held rank equivalent to that of Under-Secretary from the Organization's inception to the present. Each person will be considered in terms of

(1) national origin; (2) educational background; (3) private employment; (4) government or public service; (5) any United Nations positions held before, and after, appointment to Under-Secretary status; and (6) the reasons for termination of employment at the Secretariat. The fourth chapter consists largely of conclusions which emerge from an analysis of the data.

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

My deep gratitude goes to Dr. Bruce L. Smith, chairman of my thesis committee, to whom I am particularly indebted for assistance in completing this project. It was under his guidance that this study originated, under his encouragement that it was expanded into a master's thesis, and under his inspiration that it was drawn to its conclusion.

Dr. Wesley R. Fishel and Dr. Baljit Singh also read the entire manuscript and made a number of valuable suggestions that were properly incorporated. Dr. David A. Booth also contributed to this study. None of them, of course, is to be held responsible for any of the conclusions here reached.

The Department of Political Science helped make possible my research trip to the United Nations Headquarters in December 1963.

Special recognition is due my wife---for continued reassurance, helpful understanding, and enduring typing competence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
I. THE ORIGINS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE	1
II. THE SECRETARIAT OF THE UNITED NATIONS	32
III. BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON THE TOP FUNCTIONARIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SECRETARIAT, 1946-64	80
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	132
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	161

L I S T O F T A B L E S

Table	Page
1. U.N. Under-Secretaries: Distribution by Country of Origin, 1946-64.	135
2. U.N. Under-Secretaries: Geographical Distribution, 1946, 1955, and 1964. . . .	137
3. United Nations Secretariat: Top Level Officers, 1946-54	142
4. United Nations Secretariat: Top Level Officers, 1955-64	144
5. Previous Public Administrative Experience of the 43 U.N. Officials with Under-Secretary Rank, to 1964	148
6. Previous Public Administrative Experience of the 43 U.N. Officials with Under-Secretary Rank, to 1964, by Individuals .	150
7. Colleges and Universities Attended by the 43 U.N. Officials of Under-Secretary Rank, to 1964	151
8. Distribution of U.N. Officials of Under-Secretary Rank, to 1964, by Regional Origins and Principal Occupations	153

9. U.N. Officials of Under-Secretary Rank, to 1964, by Principal Occupation and Last Office Previous to Appointment. 154
10. Distribution of U.N. Officials of Under-Secretary Rank, to 1964, by Reasons for Leaving Office. 156
11. Distribution of U.N. Officials of Under-Secretary Rank, to 1964, by Post-Secretariat Occupations 157
12. Distribution of U.N. Officials of Under-Secretary Rank, to 1964, According to Period in Office 157
13. U.N. Officials of Under-Secretary Rank, to 1964, Length of Tenure of Office and Reasons for Leaving 158

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGINS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE

The international civil service, created to meet the demands associated with the growing interdependence among nations, is a relatively recent phenomenon. While some national civil services may be traced back to a distant past, the concept of an independent international civil service did not reach maturity until the early decades of the twentieth century.

The Early Period

The roots of the international civil service, however, are found in antiquity. Treaties between rulers in ancient Egypt and the consular and diplomatic institutions of the Graeco-Roman world are regarded as the first steps toward international administration. The Amphictyonic Council, a congress of delegates from Greek city-states, while "national

rather than international" and "less political than religious,"¹ has been described as one of the earliest examples of international administration.² A strong civil service contributed significantly to the power of the Roman and Chinese empires; conscientious peacekeepers and tax collectors were important elements of the Pax Romana and the Pax Sinica.

From the eighth to the seventeenth centuries, the desire for unity among civilized men in the West and for promoting allegiance to a common law was reflected in the repeated efforts to build world empires.³ These efforts were mainly unsuccessful, largely because of the separatist impact of feudalism. During the feudal centuries, the civil service was reduced to the personal household staffs of monarchs and lords, under which "no distinction was made between policy and administration."⁴

¹Carlton J. H. Hayes, "The Historical Background," The League of Nations: The Principle and the Practice, ed. Stephen Pierce Duggan (Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1919), p. 20. For a description of the Amphictyonic Council, see chap. I, "Ancient Greek Leagues", in Elizabeth York, Leagues of Nations: Ancient, Medieval and Modern (London: Swarthmore Press, 1928). With reference to the Council, she concludes that "in the far-off days of ancient Greece we find the original germ of the fruitful idea of a League of Nations." (p. 8).

²Norman Hill, International Organization (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952), p. 35.

³Hayes, op. cit., p. 21.

⁴Sidney Bailey, The Secretariat of the United Nations (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1962), p. 16.

Prior to the rise of the nation-state system, diplomacy was conducted by ambassadors appointed for particular occasions and "it was not until the late seventeenth century that permanent missions...became a customary practice among states."¹

Bilateral diplomacy became widespread "when the unity of Christendom was broken up by the consolidation of independent states recognizing no political superior."² The increase in the number of units of government occasioned a growing realization that both interests and conflicts were interdependent, and international conferences were now called to discuss problems and to find solutions on a multilateral basis.

The historic conference at Westphalia in 1648---"the first full-dress international conference of post-medieval times"³---marked the end of the Thirty Years' War, established the principle of territorial jurisdiction, and thus set the foundations of the modern international society.⁴ Other conferences, such as the one at Carlowitz in 1698 and the one at Utrecht in 1713, were held to terminate wars and

¹Norman J. Padelford and George A. Lincoln, The Dynamics of International Politics (New York: Macmillan, 1962), p. 342.

²Alfred Zimmern, The League of Nations and the Rule of Law: 1918-1935 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1939), p. 13.

³Ibid., p. 33.

⁴Hans Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations (3rd ed.; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), p. 277.

to settle peace claims, but none was as significant as that of Westphalia, which laid the foundation of the modern state system. Henceforth, conferences, or "congresses" as the more important conferences were called, became an accepted mode of international diplomacy.¹

During the eighteenth century, however, multi-nation conferences dealt for the most part with political matters and met only sporadically. No formal attempts at international administration were made.

The Modernizing Period

Early in the nineteenth century the Napoleonic Wars shook Europe to its roots; eleven European states had joined into three different coalitions against Napoleon, but each had disintegrated before the French armies. Therefore, when the Congress of Vienna assembled in 1814 nearly every state in Europe had claims against France. All major powers, thirty-six German states, plus minor principalities and the Vatican combined to send more than 200 delegations to Vienna to settle disputes and record their claims while also searching for an enduring peace.²

¹Other conferences held during the eighteenth century included those at Cambray in 1721, at Soissons in 1728, at Fockchany and Bucharest in 1772, at Teschen in 1779, and at Rastadt in 1797. For a more complete list of important conferences see: Norman L. Hill, The Public International Conference (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1929), p. 4.

²Gerard J. Mangone, A Short History of International Organization (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1954), pp. 34-35.

The Congress of Vienna "was not only concerned with getting rid of the arch enemy of Europe, but also was interested in the slave trade and in the internationalization of rivers."¹ By extending its consideration to social and economic matters as well as political matters, the Congress of Vienna became the first modern international conference.

The Congress of Vienna established the Concert of Europe, a system of arrangements and coalitions among the Great Powers, "which carried the Continent, without a major war, through the great political developments and the still greater economic transformation of the century between 1815 and 1914."² Under the Concert system, provision was made for periodic meetings of the great powers to consult upon their common interests and to consider what measures should be taken "for the repose and prosperity of Nations, and for the maintenance of the Peace of Europe."³

¹Hill, The Public International Conference, p. 5.

²Zimmern, op. cit., p. 75.

³The full article VI of the Treaty of Alliance and Friendship between Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia signed in Paris on 20 November 1815 reads: "To facilitate and to secure the execution of the present Treaty, and to consolidate the connections which at the present time so closely unite the Four Sovereigns for the happiness of the world, the High Contracting Parties have agreed to renew their meetings at fixed periods, whether under the immediate auspices of the Sovereigns themselves, or by the respective Ministers, for the purpose of consulting upon their common interests, and for the consideration of the measures which at each of those periods shall be considered the most salutary for the repose and prosperity of Nations and for the maintenance of the Peace of Europe." quoted in Mangone, op. cit., p. 64.

Under this provision, several conferences were held, including those at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818, at Opava in 1820, at Ljubliana in 1821, and at Verona in 1822.

Other important Concert meetings were held in Paris in 1856, in London in 1871, in Berlin in 1878, and at Algeciras in 1906. Through these periodic consultations the Concert system "undertook to deal by collective action with current problems ranging from the regulation of international traffic...to the carving up of Africa."¹ In addition, "important progress was made in developing the techniques and creating the psychological prerequisites of successful multilateral negotiation,"² as demonstrated at the Hague Conferences.

Two International Peace Conferences were held at The Hague in 1899 and in 1907. They were called peace conferences "not because they terminated wars [they were actually convoked in time of peace] but on account of their ultimate aim of replacing international friction by international cooperation."³ In contrast with previous meetings, the Hague Conferences were devoted "to building a peaceful system and preventing or controlling war in general rather than to

¹Inis L. Claude, Jr., Swords into Plowshares: The Problems and Progress of International Organization (2d ed. rev.; New York: Random House, 1963), p. 26.

²Ibid.

³Hill, The Public International Conference, p. 9.

maintaining peace in a particular crisis or liquidating a specific war."¹ Under the Convention of 1907, signed by the fifty-four participant nations, three methods of peaceful settlement were recommended: good offices and mediation, international commissions of inquiry, and arbitration. Among its most significant achievements was the creation of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. In addition to military representatives, delegations included "experts in international arbitration."² The need for a system different from the prevalent one (under which the preparation for international conferences was left to a single government and under which when a conference adjourned no agency was left behind to carry out its decisions) was recognized by the Second Hague Conference. One of the voeux approved by the conference recommended a Third Peace Conference and the creation of a preparatory committee to help in its organization.³

¹Claude, op. cit., p. 33.

²Hill, The Public International Conference, p. 39.

³"Finally, the conference recommends to the powers the assembly of a Third Peace Conference, which might be held within a period corresponding to that which has elapsed since the preceding conference, at a date to be fixed by common agreement among the powers, and it calls their attention to the necessity of preparing the programme of this Third Conference a sufficient time in advance to ensure its deliberations being conducted with the necessary authority and expedition. In order to attain this object, the conference considers that it would be very desirable that, some two years before the probable date of the meeting, a preparatory committee should be charged by the governments with the task of collecting the various proposals to be submitted to the conference, of ascertaining what subjects are ripe for embodiment in an international

The general acceptance of the idea of periodic and systematic conferences to deal with international affairs was "perhaps the most significant contribution made at The Hague."¹ Thus, by pointing the way to further international agreement and cooperation, the Hague Conferences "prepared the ground for the later League of Nations and the Permanent Court of International Justice."²

Another major development in international organization was the creation of public international unions. Under the impact of the Industrial Revolution, nation states grew more numerous, complex and interdependent. As they began to experience common problems in health, sanitation, trade, transport and communications, the need for international functional organizations became apparent. The occasional ad hoc conferences, called to discuss specific items and dissolved once agreement on them was reached, proved inadequate to meet the expanding problems of industrial societies. As a result, the concept of a permanent international association developed.

regulation, and of preparing a programme which the government should decide upon in sufficient time to enable it to be carefully examined by the countries interested. This committee should further be intrusted with the task of proposing a system of organization and procedure for the conference itself." Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague, 1899 and 1907, ed. James Brown Scott (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1908), pp. 139-140.

¹Manley O. Hudson, Progress in International Organization (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1932), p. 13.

²Sylvester John Hemleben, Plans for World Peace through Six Centuries (Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1943), p. 134.

A number of governmental, as well as private, international organizations were established as nations and societies recognized that their problems had an international character.

The international river commissions were the earliest to be organized and to represent a type of international administration.¹ The Central Rhine Commission, founded in 1804, was charged with the task of guaranteeing safe passage to all nations for commercial purposes, an important assignment considering the history of the region. The Congress of Vienna reasserted the administrative powers of the Rhine Commission and granted it considerable regulatory powers. A similar commission was established for the Danube in 1856, and was entrusted with far-reaching powers of direct international administration. Other river commissions, reflecting the trend toward international administration, were those organized for the Elbe in 1821, the Douro in 1835, the Po in 1849, and the Pruth in 1886.²

Due to the world-wide impact of its task, the Universal Postal Union, established in 1874, is probably the best known of the international unions. The UPU is of special importance because it marked the first "complete, permanent administrative union which separated the diplomatic agreement

¹Norman Hill, International Administration (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1931), p. 10.

²Mangone, op. cit., p. 70.

from the administrative regulations of the agency."¹

Some of the nonpolitical international unions created organizational measures of fundamental importance to international administration. For instance, the Bureau of the International Telegraphic Union, established in 1868, was "the prototype of the secretariat, the vital core of any modern international organization."²

The expansion of industrial interests brought about the creation of a number of international commissions to deal with economic matters, including the Bureau of Weights and Measures, the Bureau for the Publication of Customs Duties, and the Union for the Protection of Industrial Property.

Private groups also formed international associations dedicated to a variety of tasks. The better known are the World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations, founded in 1885; the International Red Cross, founded in 1863, and the International Chamber of Commerce, founded in 1919.

Between 1840 and the beginning of the First World War approximately 400 permanent international associations were created.³ A number of them have had considerable influence.

¹Ibid., p. 78. A more complete study may be found in: John Fairfield Sly, The Genesis of the Universal Postal Union: A Study in the Beginnings of International Organization (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1927).

²Claude, op. cit., p. 38.

³C. K. Webster, The League of Nations in Theory and Practice (London: Allen & Unwin, 1933), p. 26.

For instance, the Red Cross-sponsored convention calling for the neutralization of medical units in the field led to "humanization" of warfare during the two major world wars. Moreover, the efforts of some of the private unions contributed to the establishment of governmental organizations in related fields. The International Association for the Legal Protection of Labor, for example, was the direct forerunner of the International Labor Organization.

Throughout the nineteenth century, then, governmental and private organizations were established in the fields of agriculture, commerce, health, communications, and technical and economic matters. Others were founded to pursue religious and humanitarian goals. Most had small secretariats serving as centers of action.

Among the major contributions of the international associations were the emergence of an embryonic body of international civil servants and the valuable experience gained in the handling of "the myriad of problems of language, documentation, internal organization, and procedure of large-scale international gatherings."¹ The international associations served as agents of international understanding and cooperation, and probably helped to strengthen the concept of world interdependence more than any of the other two motivating forces: "The Concert stood for compromise; the Hague stood for regulation; the public international unions

¹Claude, op. cit., p. 38.

stood for cooperation."¹ Created because of the growing interdependence among nations, the international organizations themselves were both a cause and effect of ever-increasing interdependence.

The League Period

The progress experienced by international associations during the nineteenth century, particularly in terms of the separation of administration from diplomacy and the acceptance of the concept of permanent staffs, did much to prepare the way for the type of international civil service to be established under the League of Nations. However, it was not until 1919 that a complete system was formulated for a genuine international civil service: "a true international civil service on a significant scale and based on modern public administrative science became a reality only with the establishment of the League of Nations Secretariat...."²

The League of Nations was to be a global institution whose primary purpose would be the maintenance of peace throughout the world. Political concepts, such as the all-important one of power and the very delicate one of sovereignty, determined the heartbeat of the League. The desire for collective security was at the root of its creation. As an instrument to maintain peace and to provide security, the League was a failure. Helplessly, it witnessed the Japanese

¹Ibid., p. 40.

²Tien-Cheng Young, International Civil Service: Principles and Problems (Brussels: International Institute of Administrative Sciences, 1958), p. 10.

invasion of Manchuria in 1931, Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia in 1935, the Nazi reoccupation of the Rhineland, and Hitler's march into Austria in 1938 and into Czechoslovakia in 1939. Later that year came the Soviet Union's invasion of Finland and the German invasion of Poland. Even its staunchest supporters agree that, if evaluated solely on its political activity, the League was a failure:

It must be admitted that the chief purpose for which the League was created was the maintenance of peace, and within twenty years of its inauguration we have been plunged into a major war, which is in itself the climax of several other wars.¹

But if the League failed in maintaining the peace, it undoubtedly succeeded in one area of lasting importance: the establishment of the first genuine international civil service. "It was not for lack of executive efficiency that the League system failed," Ranshofen-Wertheimer asserts in his authoritative study of the League. He adds that the experience of the Secretariat afforded conclusive proof that

international administration is possible and that it can be highly effective; that an international civil service can be created which compares favorably with the best civil services in the world. The League has shown that it is possible to establish an integrated body of international officials, loyal to the international agency and ready to discharge faithfully the international obligations incumbent upon them.²

¹Viscount Cecil (Lord Robert Cecil), A Great Experiment (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941), p. 321.

²Egon F. Ranshofen-Wertheimer, The International Secretariat: A Great Experiment in International Administration (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1945), pp. 427-428.

Similarly, F. P. Walters, a historian of the League, who himself was a top member of the Secretariat, concludes that the creation of a secretariat international in its structure, its spirit, and its personnel was "without doubt one of the most important events in the history of international politics" and that it was important "not only in itself, but as the indisputable proof of possibilities which had hitherto been confidently denied."¹

Up to this time, the secretarial work involved in the conduct of international conferences had been entrusted to the civil servants of the countries in which they had met. The creation of an international civil service, permanent and with specific and significant responsibilities, was a distinct novelty and therefore one of the most original products of the activities of the League.²

According to the Covenant, the Secretariat, established as one of the three principal organs of the League, was to consist of "a Secretary-General and such secretaries and staff as may required". The Covenant was silent regarding character and composition, but the first Secretary-General, Sir James Eric Drummond, insisted from the beginning that the Secretariat be truly international and that its members

¹F. P. Walters, A History of the League of Nations (London: Oxford University Press, 1960), p. 76.

²William E. Rappard, The Geneva Experiment (London: Oxford University Press, 1931), p. 58.

develop a primary allegiance to the League. This was a significant innovation, for the employees of international associations had previously been seconded by their governments, and thus often retained their responsibility to their home governments. In contrast, Sir Eric set out to create an independent and international secretariat, which in time became the most ambitious international secretariat to be established until that time.

Due to Sir Eric's foresight "the Secretariat was a working organization when the Covenant came into force."¹ It soon became apparent that a genuine international civil service would have to be open to nationals of all Member States² and that, once appointed, Secretariat members could no longer be expected by their governments to place national interests above their international responsibilities.³

Lord Balfour, the chief British delegate and first President of the Council, in his report on the Secretariat

¹Dennis P. Myers, Handbook of the League of Nations (Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1935), p. 49.

²While a majority of the members of the Secretariat always were nationals of the great powers, Sir Eric reported that by 1931 there were "forty-three nationalities in the Secretariat." Sir Eric Drummond, "The Secretariat of the League of Nations," Public Administration, IX (April 1931), p. 235.

³Recalling that most professional diplomats took it for granted that an international secretariat could never be "united, loyal, and efficient," Walters reports that Sir Maurice Hankey, who "by sheer administrative efficiency had become in fact, though not in name, the Secretary-General of

set forth the fundamental principles of international administration when he stated:

...Evidently, no one nation or group of nations ought to have a monopoly in providing the material for this international institution. I emphasize the word 'international', because the members of the Secretariat once appointed are no longer the servants of the country of which they are citizens, but become for the time being the servants only of the League of Nations. Their duties are not national but international.

The Balfour Report, undoubtedly drafted under Sir Eric's prodding and direction,² was adopted by the League Council in 1920. In brief, it stated that the two recognized essential principles of an international civil service were its international composition and its international responsibilities.

A number of precedents in administrative matters had been established by the governmental and private inter-

the peace Conference," and who had been offered the top post of the League of Nations, had formally proposed that "the work should be entrusted, under the supervision of the Secretary-General, to nine National Secretaries, one from each Council state, who would have their own staffs and would perform in turn the office of Secretary of the Council." (Walters, op. cit., p. 76.) Another respected historian of the League writes that "had Sir Maurice Hankey become Secretary-General the staff of the League would probably have consisted of detached national units; co-ordinated together, it is true, but encouraged to retain their national basis." (Webster, op. cit., p. 94).

¹League of Nations, "Staff of the Secretariat: Report presented by the British Representative, A. J. Balfour," Official Journal, Vol. I, 1920, p. 137.

²"It was he [Sir Eric] who drafted the famous memorandum of Lord Balfour, which laid down that the Secretariat should be an international body and not a mere collection of national groups." Webster, op. cit., p. 94.

national unions which, as outlined above, had spread into technical and nonpolitical fields. For the most part, however, the Secretariat had to break new ground and institute new methods as the League's responsibilities and activities expanded. Moreover, while the Secretariat's tasks included the regular ones of servicing meetings, conducting research and analysis, publishing reports and keeping records, there were in addition some political areas where it could exert influence. Here the Secretariat was pioneering, since earlier international unions and organizations had had their activities restricted to nonpolitical areas. Secretariat officials remained on their jobs even while the Council and the Assembly were not in session. Their strategic position helped them acquire a familiarity with all aspects of the League's policies, practices, and problems. Thus, they were often able to affect policy determination. Sir Eric himself, whose self-restraining role not once allowed him to address the Assembly, played important behind-the-scenes roles in the decision-making process.¹

¹"His political activity was subtle, indirect, inconspicuous---so much so that it not surprisingly gave the false impression of vacuity. In his formal relations with League organs, the Secretary-General was inarticulate in the extreme; in his public role, he was retiring and uninspiring; it was only in his diplomatic 'behind-the-scenes' character that the Secretary-General of the League was a potent political force." Stephen M. Schwebel, The Secretary-General of the United Nations: His Political Powers and Practice (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), p. 6.

Two major influences, then, helped shape the Secretariat during its formative first decade and illustrated the potentialities of the roles that might be played by future Secretaries-General of the League and, later, of the United Nations. The first was Sir Eric's personality and the second was the British administrative system whose teachings he reflected. Sir Eric's personality allowed him to earn the confidence of Member States; he has been described as

a model of tact, exceedingly resourceful in difficulties, absolutely fair and impartial.... He was no orator at a meeting, but in committee could express his view, when asked to do so, most persuasively. Above all, he acquired the confidence of all nationalities. They were certain that his judgement, usually excellent, would be quite unaffected by national prejudice.¹

This in part mirrored the British concept, which had developed during the nineteenth century, of a permanent civil service based on efficiency and competence and impartiality. One of the most significant aspects of the League Secretariat---its reputation for international impartiality---was a direct result of the combined influence of Sir Eric's personality and background. By 1929, when the Tenth Assembly met, it was observed that the Secretariat "had established its reputation more rapidly and more solidly than any other organ of the League."²

Sir Eric retired in June 1933 and was succeeded by Joseph Avenol, a Frenchman who had been second in command

¹Cecil, op. cit., p. 90.

²Walters, op. cit., p. 419.

for several years. Under Avenol, there was a faint attempt to modify the system and structure of the Secretariat. The British administrative system, in contrast with the highly centralized French type,¹ has been described as one "in which the work comes up from below."² His efforts for administrative reform were for the most part unsuccessful. But he was a master of administrative finance and under his guidance the Secretariat "was freed, in that respect, from the endless anxieties by which it had been obstructed and beset."³ It was through his efforts that "the magnificent Palais des Nations was completed."⁴ On the other hand, his attempt to regroup the League "on the basis of technical cooperation has been much criticized on grounds of facilitating the demise of the League as a political force."⁵ In addition, Avenol engaged publicly in politically controversial matters and consequently often met with the disapproval of Member States. In the midst of a bitter political controversy as to his relations with the Nazi and Fascist governments, Avenol resigned in 1940 after what has been rated "the most painful episode in the League's history."⁶

¹For a comparative study see: William A. Robson (ed.), The Civil Service in Britain and France (London: The Hogarth Press, 1956).

²Edward J. Phelan, Yes and Albert Thomas (London: The Crescent Press Ltd., 1937), p. 66.

³Walters, op. cit., p. 560.

⁴Schwebel, op. cit., p. 218.

⁵Ibid., p. 216.

⁶Ranshofen-Wertheimer, op. cit., p. 381. In evaluating

While stating that Avenol was "a man of high ability" who "did his best to follow the steps of his predecessor," one of his Deputy Secretaries-General points out that "he did not win the trust and liking either of the delegations or of the staff."¹ In evaluating Avenol, Walters concludes that:

His leadership of the Secretariat had been marred by great faults, especially in the last years. He had not kept himself free from the infection of ideological prejudice: his sympathy with the reactionary forces in his own country had made him less than half-hearted in regard to the League itself.²

Sean Lester of Ireland, one of the two Deputy Secretaries-General, was recognized as Acting Secretary-General upon Avenol's resignation. Lester concentrated on maintaining "the continuity of each of the technical and social services of the Secretariat, in such a way that their work could be restarted after the war with the minimum of loss and interruption."³ In 1946, at its final meeting the Assembly "voiced its gratitude to Lester and formally nominated him as the third and last Secretary-General."⁴

this episode, the author concludes: "Suffice it to state--- and it can be stated without fear of contradiction on the part of anybody familiar with the internal events during those fatal weeks---that the leadership did not prove equal to the test." p. 381. A more complete analysis may be found in: Schwebel, op. cit., "Notes on the resignation of Joseph Avenol," pp. 215-224.

¹Walters, op. cit., p. 560.

²Ibid., pp. 809-810.

³Ibid., p. 810.

⁴Ibid., p. 815.

In discussing the influence of leadership upon the international Secretariat mention must be made of Albert Thomas, the first Director of the International Labor Office, which "was in fact a part of the League."¹ The ILO was subordinated to the League mostly in respect to administration, but nevertheless possessed a large degree of autonomy. As the years passed, the two organizations became more and more distinct, with the character of the Director reinforcing the tendency to autonomy. A fighting Socialist politician,² Thomas exemplified the strong leader: in his view, to him "fell of necessity the task of leadership, the task of initiative, the task of taking all those measures which might be necessary to defend the Organization."³ This begins to indicate the contrast between the personalities, and their conception of their offices, of Sir Eric and Thomas.

While Sir Eric looked upon his task as "technical and advisory," Thomas considered himself "an international statesman," and whereas the Secretary-General "avoided

¹Ibid., p. 194.

²"...at 41 he had already behind him many years of political conflict, had held important cabinet office during the war, and was looked upon by many as a future Prime Minister of France...He possessed every endowment for such a career---fierce energy, intellectual power, eloquence and debating skill, and a passionate devotion to the cause of social justice." Ibid., p. 195.

³Phelan, op. cit., p. 253.

taking any step not previously sanctioned by Council and Assembly or clearly entrusted to him under the Covenant," the Director of the ILO "took the initiative in most of the important questions."¹ In addition, where Sir Eric gave the "widest possible initiative to the departmental heads of the Secretariat," Thomas imposed on his staff "a strictly centralized system, supervising and often re-writing every document or letter..."² The record also shows that Sir Eric made "no attempt to be a personal leader: he asked for loyalty to the League, and to the Secretariat as one of its essential institutions, not to himself."³ On the other hand, the loyalty of the ILO staff was "highly personalized."⁴

It has been suggested that one of the most significant facts in the history of international organization is that the International Labor Office survived the war while the League of Nations did not.⁵ Phelan, an advocate of strong leadership by the international executive and an associate

¹Ranshofen-Wertheimer, op. cit., p. 389.

²Walters, op. cit., p. 196.

³Ibid., p. 559.

⁴When Thomas died in 1932, the loyalty of the ILO staff "had become sufficiently deep to survive the change of leadership and became depersonalized. It was transferred to the Office." Ranshofen-Wertheimer, op. cit., p. 389.

⁵Of some relevance here is the fact that "the Labour Organization remained in most respects aloof from the political convulsions by which the League was shaken and finally destroyed." Walters, op. cit., p. 192.

of Thomas from the early days of the ILO, holds that "the history of the League might have been entirely different if Drummond and Thomas had changed places."¹ In this connection it must be remembered that the two organizations were geared for different purposes. Sir Eric himself, commenting on Thomas' leadership, asserted: "It is quite, quite certain that Albert Thomas in my job would have been forced to resign. They wouldn't have stood for it. He would have tried---and failed."²

A brief review of the top echelon of the Secretariat may be helpful in understanding how the League precedent has influenced the United Nations Secretariat, particularly in regard to the method of selecting top-level officials. The top echelon of the Secretariat was known as the High Directorate³ and included the Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretary-General, and the Under Secretaries-General.

In his classic study of the Secretariat of the League, Ranshofen-Wertheimer outlines the functions and responsibilities of the top officials. He points out that "everything that is done in the Secretariat is done under his [the Secretary-General's] direction and in his name" and that all authority "not actually exercised by him within the

¹Quoted by Schwebel, op. cit., p. 210. Thomas had once declared: "The day that I am reduced to the status of Sir Eric, I will resign." Ibid., p. 3.

²Ibid.

³From the French, haute direction.

administration is delegated and can be revoked by him at will."¹

The Deputy Secretary-General² concerned himself "especially with the financial and economic work" but "in spite of supervisory functions" his role "bore in practice a striking resemblance to that of the American Vice-President."³

The most important function of the Under-Secretaries "seemed that of being present, to indicate thereby the existence of normal relations between the League and their country of origin and its willingness to collaborate at Geneva." Thus, their primary tasks were "advisory and representative." Later, however, they were "entrusted with direct administrative responsibilities."⁴

The very frequent changes in membership of the League and the prevalent practice of the Member States of recalling their nationals from the Secretariat upon leaving the League, makes it difficult to follow the exact composition of the High Directorate. There were, for example, four Under-Secretaries in 1919, three after the United States

¹Ranshofen-Wertheimer, op. cit., p. 53.

²This position was first established in 1922. When the first Deputy Secretary-General was promoted to the post of Secretary-General, "the role of the Deputy assumed greater practical importance than it possessed under Sir Eric Drummond." Ibid., p. 55.

³Thus, "the Deputy's official position was considerably higher than his responsibilities." Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 57.

national withdrew in 1920, and two after the transformation of one of these posts into that of a second Deputy Secretary-General. In 1932, by Assembly resolution, there were to be two Deputy Secretaries-General and four Under-Secretaries.¹

The confusing welter of changes can be illustrated by listing the top officials of the League and their periods in office. The original members of the High Directorate included Sir Eric as the Secretary-General and the following as Under-Secretaries: Raymond Fosdick of the United States, Jean Monnet of France, Dionisio Anzilotti of Italy, and Inazo Nitobe of Japan.² After the definite establishment of the post of Deputy Secretary-General, the group included, besides Sir Eric, the following: Joseph Avenol of France as the Deputy Secretary-General and Bernardo D. Attolico of Italy and Yotaro Sugimura of Japan³ as Under-Secretaries. In 1927, Attolico was replaced by another Italian, the Marquis Pauluci di Calboli Barone. When Germany joined the League later that year, a new post of Under-Secretary was

¹Ibid., p. 64.

²Fosdick, who withdrew in 1920, had been the chief civilian adviser to the U.S. Commander-in-Chief in France; Monnet was the head of the French supply organization in London when he joined the Secretariat; Anzilotti was an eminent international lawyer who later became President of the Hague Court; Nitobe was "well-known as an educational leader, and a courageous spokesman for the liberal movement in Japan." Walters, op. cit., p. 78.

³Appointed to succeed his compatriot, Nitobe, in 1926. Ranshofen-Wertheimer, op. cit., p. 62.

created and a German, Albert Dufour-Feronce, was appointed. In 1932, in accordance with the Assembly's resolution, the group included Sir Eric, with Avenol and Pablo de Azcarate of Spain as Deputy Secretaries-General, and the four Under-Secretaries: Yotaro Sugimura of Japan, Ernest Trendelenburg of Germany who had replaced Dufour-Feronce, Massimo Pilotti of Italy who had succeeded the Marquis di Calboli Barone, and F. P. Walters of England. When Japan and Germany withdrew from the League in 1933, their nationals resigned and the posts they vacated were not filled. When the U.S.S.R. joined the League in 1934, a Soviet citizen, Marcel Rosenberg, was appointed to join Pilotti and Walters as one of the Under-Secretaries. Avenol had by then been appointed Secretary-General and Azcarate was the lone Deputy Secretary-General. Pilotti resigned when Italy withdrew from the League in 1937. That same year, when Azcarate was appointed Spanish Ambassador to the Court of St. James, Sean Lester of Ireland was appointed to succeed him as Deputy Secretary-General. Vladimir Sokoline, who had been appointed Under-Secretary to replace his compatriot, Rosenberg, resigned when the U.S.S.R. was expelled in 1939. Thus in 1939, the Secretary-General was French, the two Deputy Secretaries-General were British and Irish, and there was only one Under-Secretary, a Greek national. After 1943, there was only Lester as Acting Secretary-General.¹

¹Ranshofen-Wertheimer, op. cit., pp. 61, 65, 67, et passim.; Schwebel, op.cit., p. 216, et passim.; Walters, op. cit., pp. 78, 556-558, et passim.

If any pattern can be found amidst these changes, it may be the tendency to appoint nationals of the Members of the Council to high Secretariat positions and to replace an outgoing official with a national of the same country. At least up to 1933, if there had been any changes, "a Frenchman had been succeeded by a Frenchman, a German by a German, an Italian by an Italian, a Japanese by a Japanese."¹ Although there was no acknowledge rule to this effect, "an unwritten right had grown up which the great powers were not prepared to renounce."² Each of the great powers insisted "not as a matter of principle but as a practical necessity that one of its nationals should occupy a high-ranking post."³ For instance, Sir Eric himself admitted that "one of the conditions of Germany's entry into the league was that one of her nationals should be given the post of Under Secretary-General."⁴ A group of former Secretariat officials, meeting in 1944 to compile the lessons they had learned through their League experience, evaluated the existence of Under Secretaries-General as "a frank compromise between political necessity and administrative efficiency" and reported that "a proposal for their abolition was rejected

¹Ibid., p. 556.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Drummond, op, cit., p. 230.

solely because it raised 'too many political difficulties'."¹

The smaller nations resented the Under-Secretaryships "as diplomatic posts whose holders were in the service of their governments rather than of the League...."² Instead of abolishing such posts, the Assembly resolved in 1932 that "while each permanent Member should have the right to see one of its nationals enjoying the title and pay of an Under Secretary-General," these officials were "to be in charge of Sections [administrative subdivisions] and thus fully integrated into the structure of the Secretariat."³ By increasing the administrative responsibilities of the Under-Secretaries, this measure presumably diluted their political representative character.

From the organizing days of the Secretariat Sir Eric had been aware that each of the great powers "would expect to see one of its nationals appointed in the rank immediately below himself."⁴ Walters reports that "to this extent his hands were already tied," but adds that it is probable that Sir Eric would in any case "have taken this course in order to ensure easy intercourse between the Secretariat and the countries whose cooperation with the League was of

¹Royal Institute of International Affairs, The International Secretariat of the Future (London: Oxford University Press, 1944), pp. 30-31.

²Walters, op. cit., p. 556.

³Ibid., p. 557.

⁴Ibid., p. 76.

special importance."¹ This is a particularly important point, in that the Secretary-General might have welcomed the requests by the great powers to have their nationals as high officials in the Secretariat. Sir Eric himself reported later that it was believed that "it would be of real advantage to the Secretariat to be able to secure the services of prominent people from countries whose interests were world wide...."² Moreover, while admitting criticism of the "de facto, though not de jure, monopoly of the higher posts by the Great Powers," Sir Eric asserted that "the existing system has worked well and given satisfactory results."³ Thus, while historical evidence reveals that the highest Secretariat positions were in fact reserved for nationals of Members of the Council, this practice may not necessarily have been adopted entirely on the basis of political expediency nor brought about solely as a result of the pressure by the great powers on the Secretary-General.

Furthermore, the Secretary-General "was left an entirely free hand as to the rest of the organization and the appointment of the members of the staff."⁴ Indeed, the major contribution made by Sir Eric and in turn by the League to international administration was that for the rest of the

¹Ibid.

²Drummond, op. cit., p. 229.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 230.

Secretariat "he set himself firmly against all pressures from official sources seeking to impose particular candidates."¹ While he consulted the various governments whenever necessary, he "retained the choice in his own hands and did his best to ensure that all those he appointed should be not only well qualified for the special work they would have to do, but also devoted to the purposes of the League."²

The League of Nations ended not with a bang but with a hardly audible whimper. When the League was officially terminated on 18 April 1946, the world took no notice of this historic event. There was general agreement that the League had been a failure, and failures are not buried with honors. Though the League was officially dead, it left more than a heritage of buildings and properties. As will be shown in the next chapter, it also left a sizeable and important legacy.

The Secretariat contributed substance to the League, providing the stability and continuity required for orderly discussion and negotiation of international affairs in an increasingly interdependent world. Although the League may be said to have failed in the political arena, the Secretariat was indeed successful in laying a foundation for the United Nations to build upon. Perhaps less tangibly but certainly more importantly, the Secretariat left a legacy

¹Walters, op. cit., p. 76.

²Ibid.

of hope, pointing to a future in which dedicated international civil servants may be able to contribute more influentially to the causes of world peace, of international cooperation, and of global understanding.

In praising Sir Eric Drummond as the principal architect of the League Secretariat, Trygve Lie, the first Secretary-General of the United Nations, asserted:

His decision to create the first truly international secretariat was a decision of profound significance---surely one of the most important and promising political developments of the twentieth century.¹

¹Trygve Lie, In the Cause of Peace (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1954), p. 41.

C H A P T E R I I

THE SECRETARIAT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations is today called upon to operate in a world markedly different from that which gave it birth. While the world in which the United Nations discharges its duties is more complex than that of the League of Nations,¹ the experience of the League has been of great value to its successor in world organization. The institutional heritage of the United Nations, largely derived from the League of Nations, included a number of lasting principles and enduring concepts. The League's failure was certainly not conclusive; its sizeable legacy to international relations and administration covered wide and important areas. Its most significant contribution has perhaps been in respect to the Secretariat of the United Nations.

¹In the words of the second Secretary-General of the United Nations to his staff: "we must work harder and hope for less than those who built the League....We are expected to succeed where our predecessors failed. We remember their selflessness and courage, but we know that even more may be required of us, if only in order to save what they achieved...." Wilder Foote (ed.), Servant of Peace: A Selection of the Speeches and Statements of Dag Hammarskjöld (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), pp. 30-31.

The Legacy of the League

The United Nations is clearly a direct successor of the League of Nations. When the founders met in 1945 to draft the Charter of the United Nations, they had behind them a generation of experience which pointed to a number of constitutional and administrative requirements for a successful international organization. Some aspects of the League system were retained for lack of better substitutes, but the concept of the Secretariat was incorporated into the Charter because it had proved notably successful.¹ The League experience proved that the task of creating an efficient international civil service was not impossible.² Just as importantly, it demonstrated that national and international

¹As outlined in the previous chapter, the idea of an international secretariat with a permanent staff independent and immune from control by Member States was accepted within a decade of the establishment of the League. The first Secretary-General of the United Nations was later to recognize that "the League of Nations had set us a standard in international administration which it would not be easy to match." Lie, op. cit., p. 43.

²This may be considered the most important part of its legacy. "In a long perspective the principle of a central permanent international civil service, imperfectly as it was applied, may prove to be the outstanding contribution of the League of Nations to history." C. Wilfred Jenks, "Some Problems of an International Civil Service," Public Administration Review, III (Spring 1943), p. 98.

loyalties are not necessarily contradictory.¹ The international loyalty required for an international secretariat has been defined by Sir Eric Drummond and some of his League associates as "the conviction that the higher interests of one's own country are served best by the promotion of security and welfare everywhere."² Upon this concept---basic to a permanent, independent international secretariat, as pioneered and developed by the League---the Secretariat of the United Nations was built.

The legacy of the League Secretariat is clearly marked in the Charter of the United Nations. The Secretariat is established in Article 7 as one of the six principal organs of the United Nations.³ The Charter provisions dealing

¹"The experience of the League teaches one lesson which should be cherished by all future international organizations: that there is such a thing as international loyalty and that this is indispensable to the success of an international secretariat." Frank G. Bordeau, "International Civil Service: The Secretariat of the League of Nations," Pioneers in World Order, ed. by Harriet Eager Davis (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944), p. 81.

²Royal Institute of International Affairs, The International Secretariat of the Future, p. 18. A similar concept was expressed by the second Secretary-General of the United Nations in an address to a meeting of both Houses of Parliament in London in 1958. The United Nations, Hammarskjöld said, "is here because of centuries of past struggle. It is the logical and natural development from lines of thought and aspiration going far back into all corners of the earth since a few men first began to think about the decency and the dignity of other men. Now the lines between national and international policy have begun to blur. What is in the national interest, when truly seen, merges naturally into the international interest." (*Italics mine.*) Foote, op. cit., p. 174.

³Together with the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and

specifically with the Secretariat are contained in Chapter XV. The Principal characteristics and responsibilities of the Secretariat are outlined in fourteen brief sentences in Articles 97 to 101. A review of these articles will help indicate the influence of the League precedent upon the Secretariat.

Charter Provisions

In Article 97, the Charter follows the League precedent in stating that "the Secretariat shall comprise a Secretary-General and such staff as the Organization may require." The Secretary-General is to be appointed "by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council." While the procedure for appointing the Secretary-General was adopted from the League precedent, neither the Covenant nor the Charter specifies the length of his term of office.¹ Article 97

the International Court of Justice. All Member States belong to the General Assembly, where each state has one vote. Eleven countries compose the membership of the Security Council with five (the Republic of China, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America) holding permanent membership. The memberships of the other six countries rotate.

¹In 1946 the General Assembly adopted a resolution providing that the first Secretary-General should be appointed for five years, and eligible for a second five-year term. The General Assembly and the Council reserve the right "to modify the term of office of future Secretaries-General in the light of experience..." Leland M. Goodrich and Edvard Hambro, Charter of the United Nations: Commentary and Documents (2d ed. rev.; Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1949), p. 493.

concludes with the provision that the Secretary-General "shall be the chief administrative officer of the Organization." In broad language, Article 98 indicates that the Secretary-General "shall act in that capacity in all meetings" of the Assembly and the Councils and "shall perform such other functions as are entrusted to him by these organs." The first part of this provision is similar to that contained in Article 6 of the Covenant, but the second part is a significant addition from which the Secretary-General has derived increased authority. The right granted to the Secretary-General in Article 99 "goes beyond any power previously accorded to the head of an international organization."¹ The chief source of the Secretary-General's political powers, Article 99 declares that he "may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security." The Secretary-General of the League could call a meeting of the Council only "when asked to do so by a member."² Thus while the role of the Secretary-General as the administrator of the United Nations derives from that of his counterpart in the League, it "has clearly assumed greater importance and scope under the provisions of the Charter...which, both expressly and by impli-

¹Report of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations, Doc. PC/20, 23 December 1945, p. 87, quoted in Goodrich and Hambro, op. cit., p. 502.

²Ibid.

cation, gives the Secretary-General greater power and seems to expect more constructive leadership from him."¹

Although the Covenant did not specify that the Secretariat was to consist of anything more than a permanent group of national contingents, under Sir Eric's leadership the decision was made that the Secretariat should be genuinely international. This principle of international responsibility which the League Secretariat had adopted in practice was incorporated in the Charter under Article 100. Indeed, this article "follows almost verbatim the League regulations on independence and international responsibility."² The full text of Article 100, of central importance to the Secretariat, reads:

1. In the performance of their duties the Secretary-General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the Organization.

2. Each Member of the United Nations undertakes to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary-General and the staff and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities.

Its first paragraph is obviously addressed to the members of the Secretariat, who are to promise not to seek or accept

¹Goodrich, "From League of Nations to United Nations," p. 13.

²As Hammarskjöld pointed out in his famous lecture at Oxford University, 30 May 1961. Foote, op. cit., p. 333.

instructions from the outside. Its second paragraph is a clear reminder to all Member States that they must respect the "exclusively international" character of the responsibilities of the Secretary-General and the staff.¹

The principle of the independence of the Secretariat embodied in Article 100 is further buttressed by Article 105, which provides that officials of the Organization shall enjoy "such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Organization." (*Italics added.*) In summary, then, Article 100 is intended to create and preserve a genuine international civil service; it provides for the independence and, therefore, increases the effectiveness of the Secretariat.

The following article, Article 101, grants to the

¹The United States Secretary of State reported to the President that "the intent at San Francisco was to make it perfectly clear that the nationals of member states serving on the staff of the Secretariat could not, in any sense of the word, be considered as agents of their governments." Report to the President on the Results of the San Francisco Conference by the Chairman of the United States Delegation, Department of State Publication 2349 (1945), p. 150.

The provisions of Article 100 are reinforced by the Staff Regulations; under Regulation 1.9, Secretariat staff members are to subscribe to the following oath or declaration: "I solemnly swear (undertake, affirm, promise) to exercise in all loyalty, discretion and conscience the functions entrusted to me as an international civil servant of the United Nations, to discharge these functions and regulate my conduct with the interests of the United Nations only in view, and not to seek or accept instructions in regard to the performance of my duties from any government or other authority external to the Organization."

Secretary-General the power of appointing all the staff, provides for a unified Secretariat, and outlines the criteria for employment in the Secretariat. Under the Covenant, the staff of the Secretariat was appointed by the Secretary-General "with the approval of the Council." In the United Nations, the Secretary-General appoints all staff members under broad regulations established by the General Assembly. This provision stresses the administrative authority of the Secretary-General, who is the only elected official in the Secretariat. The second paragraph of Article 101 provides for "appropriate staffs to be permanently assigned" to the Councils and other organs, while clearly declaring that all such staffs are part of a unified Secretariat. The separate staffs are organized in such a way that each may serve any organ which might require its services.¹ This administrative provision is intended to emphasize the fact that all organs served by the Secretariat share the common task of promoting the purposes of the Organization.

The paramount criteria for appointment, as stated in the third paragraph of Article 101, are "the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity." As already noted, from the League experience the founders of the United Nations were able to draw a formula for international loyalty which

¹There is one exception: since the Security Council has exclusive powers to deal with military and enforcement measures, the special units of the Secretariat concerned with these measures serve the Security Council exclusively. Goodrich and Hambro, op. cit., p. 509.

had been tested in practice. An adjoining clause in Article 101 stipulates that "due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible." The twin principles of competence and geographical distribution, then, are explicitly contained in the Charter.

In concluding this brief review of Chapter XV, it may be said that the Charter affirmed many of the principles already accepted as a result of the League's experience, particularly with regard to the concept of an independent and international civil service. Taken as a whole, Chapter XV provides for a civil service of an exclusively international character responsible, through the Secretary-General, to the whole community of member nations but independent from national pressures. As outlined in the previous pages, the Charter is very specific concerning the juridical independence of the Secretary-General and the staff. All their responsibilities are repeatedly declared to be "not national but international." In particular, the core of Chapter XV is an emphasis upon the independence and the standards of the Secretariat.¹ The concept of an independent international

¹Answering his own question as to why the independence and the standards of the Secretariat are so important, Hammarskjöld once declared: "Countries are arming in order to be able to negotiate from a position of strength. The Secretariat too has to negotiate, not only in its own interest, but for the cause of peace and a peaceful development of our world. The weight we carry is not determined by physical force or the number of people who form the constituency. It is based solely on trust in our impartiality, our experience and knowledge, our maturity of judgement." In "Message for UN Staff Day," 4 December 1953. Foote, op. cit., p. 32.

secretariat, first developed in the League of Nations and carried further in the United Nations, highlights one of the major changes in the history of diplomatic techniques: the introduction of the relatively autonomous multilateral element. This new approach does not substitute for bilateral diplomacy; it does tend to supplement it, particularly in those areas where bilateral contacts and negotiations have proved insufficient. Indeed, the multilateral diplomacy symbolized by the United Nations seems best suited to the needs and problems of a world characterized by a high level of interdependence.

Functions and Responsibilities

The Secretariat represents the United Nations and the ideals of the Organization independently of the special interests of any individual members. Perhaps its most important duty is to represent the collective ideal, the principles and the aims of the United Nations. The Secretariat has been defined as "the only place where problems, programs and policies can be consistently viewed in United Nations terms."¹ Moreover, it has been suggested that it is the Secretariat, more than any other organ, which transforms the United Nations from "a series of periodic meetings of Assembly and Councils into a permanent and cohesive organization."² The Secretariat

¹Goodrich and Hambro, op. cit., p. 494.

²United Nations Secretariat (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1960), p. 8.

undoubtedly provides the international core of the Organization, as distinct from the national character of the delegates who make up the Assembly and the Councils.

The Secretariat provides a wide range of services to the United Nations. Its contributions are mainly on two levels: the day-to-day tasks in each of the several fields in which it operates and the broad functions it performs as one of the principal organs of the Organization. The fundamental function of the Secretariat is service to the General Assembly, the Councils, and the committees and commissions set up by these organs, as well as meetings of various regional bodies, wherever they may be held. In 1963 the Secretariat serviced 3,303 meetings.¹ Besides the administering of its own internal economy, the tasks of the Secretariat include research, analysis, publishing, liaison functions, and field work "ranging from policing armistice arrangements to conducting mass immunization campaigns for children."² In economic and social affairs, including such varied matters as human rights and the work of the Statistical Office, the Secretariat has carried out significant tasks. Growing emphasis has been placed on assistance to governments seeking to accelerate the economic and social development of their countries.

The Secretariat also plays an important discretionary

¹It has been estimated that "each hour of international debate requires nearly four hundred Secretariat hours of work in arrangement, translation, and documentation." Claude, op. cit., p. 201.

²Ibid.

roles in choice of means and degrees when carrying out mandates from United Nations organs. Another broad function of the Secretariat is coordination, including not only the work of all the principal organs and their sub-divisions but also the Specialized Agencies.¹ On occasion, the Secretariat also relates the long list of non-governmental international organizations to the work of the United Nations. In addition, it carries out some special functions requiring technicians such as "legal counselors, economists, demographers, and most important of all and always in the senior posts, negotiators who can deal with representatives of governments and who need to possess some diplomatic ability."²

Because of the world situation and because of the growing prominence of the United Nations, the magnitude of the responsibilities of the Secretariat has tended to increase. As its functions became more widespread, the number of Secretariat members rose from 2,000 in 1946 to 14,000 in 1963. On the whole, the Secretariat has proved to be a dynamic institution whose evolution has been marked by a liberal interpretation of its responsibilities, by a dynamic adaptation to the

¹The Specialized Agencies include the following: International Labor Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, World Health Organization, International Development Association, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Monetary Fund, International Civil Aviation Organization; Universal Postal Union, International Telecommunication Union, World Meteorological Organization, and Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

²Walter R. Crocker, "Some Notes on the United Nations Secretariat," International Organization, III (1959), p. 601.

needs of the time, and by growth of its capabilities, under the guidance of three Secretaries-General.

The Role of the Secretary-General

The Secretary-General of the United Nations has been described as "the direct and immediate descendant of the Secretary-General of the League of Nations."¹ The League Covenant, however, gave the Secretary-General a limited role in the maintenance of international peace, certainly one of the major responsibilities of the Organization. Particularly with regard to the functions and authority of the Secretary-General, the United Nations Charter broke new ground. In the drafting of the Charter, there appeared to have been "general agreement among the participating governments that the chief administrative officer of the Organization---whatever his title might be---should be given a more important political role than his League predecessor."² The Charter provides that the Secretary-General shall report annually to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization and empowers him to bring before the Security Council on his own initiative any matter which in his judgement threatens international peace and security. His administrative strength is unquestioned. In fact, the powers of the Secretary-General are so extensive

¹Schwebel, op. cit., p. 3.

²Leland M. Goodrich, "The Political Role of the Secretary-General," International Organization, XVI (1962), pp. 720-721.

that it has been suggested he may well be considered one of the principal organs of the United Nations.¹

The role of the Secretary-General is largely determined by the character of the United Nations itself.² The United Nations is not a world government. It is an organization created by a Charter which has the effect of a treaty ratified by its members. In simple terms, the United Nations is an association of sovereign states which have pledged themselves to maintain international peace and security and to cooperate in establishing political, economic, and social conditions under which this task may best be achieved. Furthermore, the United Nations is at once an organ for negotiation and an executive organ with practical functions. In theory and in practice, the Secretary-General is the chief administrative officer of the Organization. His role, however, is not limited to that of an administrative head supervising a conference staff. Indeed, the character and magnitude of his role reflect the purposes, principles, scope and programs of action of the United Nations.

Appointed by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council, thus technically ensuring him support by a majority of Member States including all the permanent

¹Hans Kelsen, The Law of the United Nations, pp. 136-137, cited by Schwebel, op. cit., p. 46.

²This account is largely drawn from a discussion by Andrew Cordier /Executive Assistant to the Secretary-General/ on "The Role of the Secretary-General" found in Annual Review of United Nations Affairs 1960-61 (New York: New York University Press, 1962), pp. 1-14.

members of the Security Council, the Secretary-General is to coordinate all United Nations organs, to see that the decisions taken by these organs are properly executed, and to channel communications between Member States and the Organization. Upon him more than upon any other individual falls the responsibility of seeing that the United Nations as a whole function effectively.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations is undoubtedly expected to provide a more dynamic leadership than his League counterpart was able to provide. The political role of the Secretary-General as an international statesman is made unmistakably clear in the Charter, particularly in Article 99, which was apparently based more upon Albert Thomas' example of a strong executive than on that provided by Sir Eric Drummond. In response to developing needs, the position of the Secretary-General of the United Nations has led to increasingly widespread diplomatic and political activities. As the spokesman for the United Nations policies agreed upon by most of the world's nations and on the basis of his political powers granted in the Charter and through Security Council resolutions, he is often regarded as potentially one of the world's most influential diplomats. The subtle elements of prestige and status add to his stature. Each successful United Nations operation increases the prestige and authority of the Organization and, particularly, of the Secretary-General. Through his visits to Member States he may engage in frank conversations with top government officials with a view to

presenting and advancing United Nations policies. His visits to crisis spots may lessen tension and gain support for constructive steps in the implementation of United Nations programs. The uniqueness of his office also enables him to conduct peace-keeping operations no head of state would be likely to perform successfully.

Within the Organization itself, his powers are also extensive. He participates in policy-making through several of his specified responsibilities. Through his annual reports to the General Assembly, as well as in behind-the-scenes negotiations and in public statements, he may focus attention on selected problems and suggest possible solutions. Moreover, he is in "a unique position to interpret the Charter"¹ and has done so in his Introductions to his annual reports. His other written reports circulated as documents indicate his policy approach to matters under review. His direct contacts with delegations may be influential. The suggestions he may make through any one of these media are very likely to affect significantly policies still being formulated.

Everything done in the Secretariat is carried out under the direction and in the name of the Secretary-General. His right to appoint, "without exception, all members of the Secretariat in complete freedom from the pressure of member

¹Cordier, op. cit., p. 6.

governments"¹ is probably his most important privilege in matters of staff administration.² His role as the coordinator of the principal organs and of the Specialized Agencies is certainly more than a simple administrative one. His responsibility for the preparation of the budget is a powerful one. The combination of these powers and his strategic position as the chief permanent officer of the Organization contribute to make the Secretary-General the only official who can claim to represent all of the organs and all of the members of the United Nations. He has certainly become the central character--to some extent even the symbol--of the leading international institution in the world today.

Finally, it may be observed that the end products of most debates in the United Nations are resolutions, often placing a mandate upon the Secretary-General. One of his most significant duties is the implementation of these resolutions. They often are compromise resolutions and are usually expressed in general terms. The latitude he is thereby granted may be very great. The tasks thus entrusted to him "are mostly of such a character that, with the composition of an international Secretariat and of the group of his

¹Frederick Honig, "The International Civil Service: Basic Problems and Contemporary Difficulties," International Affairs, XXX (April 1954), p. 177.

²This privilege, of course, reflects the fact that "a point of capital importance in maintaining the independence of the international civil service lies in the provision that appointment power should be invested exclusively in the Chief Administrative Officer of an international organization, not subject to political pressure." Young, op. cit., p. 228.

closest collaborators...he must carry out the work on a fairly personal basis."¹ With the active support and actual participation of his staff, particularly of his top assistants,² the Secretary-General may then be said to be at the axis of the multilateral diplomacy which is possibly the United Nations' major contribution to international cooperation.

The numbers and titles of the immediate subordinates of the Secretary-General---the officials whose biographies constitute the main part of this study---have fluctuated under each of the three Secretaries-General. The manner of their selection was discussed at length at San Francisco.³ The Sponsoring Governments (China, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States) suggested that four or five top officials be elected by the General Assembly to assist the Secretary-General. They were to be appointed for three-year terms, with one acting as an alternate to the Secretary-General and the others serving each of the three Councils and the Assembly. Anticipating that the office of the Secretary-General would become a politically important one, the Sponsoring Governments openly indicated their desire to

¹Hammarskjold in address at University of Chicago Law School, 1 May 1960. Foote, op. cit., p. 259.

²The potential importance of these top assistants was recognized by the Preparatory Commission: "his choice of staff--more particularly of higher staff--and his leadership will largely determine the character and efficiency of the Secretariat as a whole." PC/20/1945, p. 86.

³UNCIO, Doc. 1155, I/2/74, (2).

have the top posts of the Secretariat considered as political positions to be reserved for them. They sponsored an amendment providing for elected Deputy Secretaries-General. The smaller nations defeated this proposal, arguing that the authority of the Secretary-General was bound to be seriously undermined if any of his subordinates were selected in the same manner as he.¹ In addition, those opposing the amendment did not want the nomination of staff members politically controlled. They stressed the need and desire "to have all the members of the staff from the top down behave and feel like international civil servants."² The Secretary-General, therefore, was given the power to determine the number of his top assistants, their terms of office, and the responsibilities to be assigned to them.

National and International Civil Services

While some similarities may be found between national bureaucracies and the international civil service, "possibly none that are entirely salutary,"³ there are essential differences which combine to increase the administrative difficulties involved. The major difference is that they maintain different relationships to the organs which dictate their policies and to which they are responsible. The powers

¹Goodrich and Hambro, op. cit., p. 498.

²Ibid., p. 499.

³Peter Lengyel, "Some Trends in the International Civil Service," International Organization, XIII (1959), p. 534.

of the Secretary-General are not comparable to those of a chief executive such as a President or a Prime Minister. The international civil service deals with treaties, not laws; it serves a community of nations, not a territorially delineated unit. In addition, "it operates within the framework of loosely-worded resolutions adopted at periodic conferences and not in response to precise instructions from a permanent executive"; moreover, it is geographically dispersed "as few national civil services are, so that coordination and communication are particularly important and difficult."¹ Of related importance is the fact that the assignments of the Secretariat are often in a state of flux requiring a maximum of flexibility in organization.

The formulation of appropriate standards of qualification involves particular difficulties, since candidates must be recruited from a variety of national backgrounds. As the first Secretary-General was soon to discover, in establishing an international administrative pattern it is essential to achieve a synthesis of various opposing national concepts of administration. The fact that the Secretariat is made up of nationals drawn from countries at different stages of development and of experience in administration complicates the task of developing the desired international administrative synthesis. For instance, the American approach to work on a "scientific" basis often runs into European complaints that the "human

¹Ibid.

element" is not sufficiently considered.¹ An additional contrast is found in the fact that from American administrative practice of the United Nations "has derived a tradition calling for a high degree of specialization" while a European tradition has called for "a high degree of permanence of employment and professional flexibility."² Perhaps the central administrative goal is the transformation of national professionals, from whatever country, into effective members of the international civil service. While the question "of giving up one's nationality is not involved and the international civil servant is asked to maintain relations with his native culture,"² the national accent and experience may introduce an element of division. Therefore one of the principal tasks of the Secretary-General is to find ways "to overscore the divisive influences and try to create a unity in which the diversity of the national backgrounds of the members of the administration is fully respected and preserved."³ Due to the nature of their duties a proper balance of nationalities and backgrounds is more vital with regard to the Secretary-General's top assistants than among any

¹Robert Kaplan, "Some Problems in the Administration of an International Secretariat," Columbia Journal of International Affairs (Spring 1948), p. 40.

²Svensi Bjorklund, "Training for International Civil Service," Columbia Journal of International Affairs (Spring 1948), p. 21.

³Hammarskjold in address to American Political Science Association, 11 September 1953. Foote, op. cit., p. 36.

other members of the Secretariat.¹ Their duties, it must be remembered, "are not those of the traditional civil servant but call for high qualities of constructive statesmanship."²

Besides the difficulties involved in the development of an international administrative standard, then, there are problems dealing with the formulation of personnel policies and procedures appropriate to the international character of the Secretariat. In broad terms, the suggested basic characteristics for an international civil servant include: (1) unquestionable professional competence, (2) impartiality, and (3) international loyalty.³ While he must be competent enough in his own field, the international civil servant must count on a broad background to help insure a balanced judgement. This capacity for understanding and cooperation implies certain substantive qualifications such as language proficiency and international and cross-cultural experience. Finally, though the international civil servant is expected to retain his national sentiments, he is required to subordinate them to his international duties.⁴

¹"The key problem is that of building up an adequate 'administrative class' to fill the posts which involve influence upon policy....The essential qualities can be simply listed as integrity, conviction, courage, imagination, drive, and technical grasp---in that order." Jenks, op. cit., p. 95.

²Ibid., p. 94.

³Bjorklund, op. cit., pp. 14-23.

⁴The classic statement on the required international outlook has been provided by Jenks: "A lack of attachment to one's country does not constitute an international outlook. A superior indifference to the emotions and prejudices of

The Secretaries-General

This section will concentrate on the approaches to administration and to the organizational structure at the top level under each of the Secretaries-General. Three men have held the post of Secretary-General of the United Nations; all have been drawn from small nations. The first was Trygve Lie, the Foreign Minister of Norway, who was appointed to a five-year term in 1946 and re-elected for three more years in 1951. In 1952, however, he announced his intention to resign as soon as his successor could be selected. Dag Hammarskjold, the Deputy Foreign Minister of Sweden, was appointed in 1953 and re-elected for a second five-year term in 1957. He died in a plane accident in 1961 while on an official mission in the Congo. U Thant, Burma's Ambassador to the United Nations, was appointed Acting Secretary-General to complete Hammarskjold's unexpired term. In 1962, Thant was elected Secretary-General to serve until 1966.

those whose world is bounded by the frontiers of a single state does not constitute an international outlook. A blurred indistinctness of attitude towards all questions, proceeding from a freedom of prejudice born of lack of vitality, does not constitute an international outlook. The international outlook required of the international civil servant is an awareness made instinctive by habit of the needs, emotions and prejudices of the peoples of differently-circumstanced countries, as they are felt and expressed by the peoples concerned, accompanied by a capacity for weighing these frequently imponderable elements in a judicial manner before reaching any decision to which they are relevant." Jenks, op. cit., 105.

Trygve Lie

Trygve Halvdan Lie¹ was born on 16 July 1896 in Oslo, Norway. He was educated at Oslo University, where he obtained a law degree in 1919. For thirteen years he served as legal adviser to the Norwegian trade unions. He was appointed Norway's Foreign Minister in 1941 and in that capacity led his country's delegation to the United Nations organizing conference held in San Francisco in 1945. There he was Chairman of the Commission drafting the Security Council provisions of the Charter. Lie went to London as the Chairman of the Norwegian delegation to the First General Assembly, which elected him the first Secretary-General of the United Nations on 1 February 1946.

Lie adopted a cautious approach to administration. For the most part he followed the plans for the structure of the Secretariat formulated by the Preparatory Commission and accepted by the General Assembly. His first task was to fill the table of organization with which he was presented upon his election. Lie recalls that "the instructions were so detailed that they limited my freedom of action."²

¹For a more complete biographical outline, see infra, p. 83.

²Lie, op. cit., p. 43. When the League of Nations came into operation, the Secretariat had already been organized under the leadership and insight of Sir Eric Drummond, supra, p. 15. In contrast, when Lie was appointed the United Nations was already "a going concern which had to be serviced continuously, and with no delay..." Ibid., pp. 43-44.

As originally established in 1946, the Secretariat consisted of an Executive Office of the Secretary-General and eight major departments. These departments were: (1) Security Council Affairs, (2) Economic Affairs, (3) Social Affairs, (4) Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, (5) Public Information, (6) Administrative and Financial Services, (7) Conference and General Services, and (8) the Legal Department. The first four departments were related organically to the Councils, while the other four were organized along functional lines.¹ Each was headed by an Assistant Secretary-General, appointed for a five-year term.

Lie considered the choice of the Assistant Secretaries-General to be his "first concern."² He soon discovered that the permanent members of the Security Council had agreed to request and see that one of the top posts was allotted to a national of each of them. While strictly speaking this Big Five understanding was not binding on the Secretary-

¹The Preparatory Commission had several alternatives when discussing plans for the organization of the Secretariat. The main ones were the "organic" theory, under which separate units of the Secretariat would be assigned to each of the various UN organs, and the "functional" theory, according to which the Secretariat would be set up on the basis of the main kinds of work to be performed. The recommended structure represented a compromise between these two theories. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, United Nations Secretariat, p. 14.

²Lie, op. cit., p. 45.

General, Lie "welcomed the understanding as a sign of good will and confidence between East and West."¹

Of the eight original Assistant Secretaries-General, five were in London either as delegates to the General Assembly or as committee members of the Preparatory Commission. Three had been associated with the League of Nations.² The eight were appointed by Lie from candidates submitted to him by Member States at his request.³ Nationals of the following countries were appointed to head the major departments as follows:

U.S.S.R. ⁴	Security Council Affairs
United Kingdom	Economic Affairs
France	Social Affairs
China	Trusteeship
Czechoslovakia	Legal Department
Chile	Public Information
The Netherlands	Conference and General Services
United States	Administrative and Financial Services ⁵

Thus, five of the eight were from Europe, one from Asia, one

¹Lie, op. cit., p. 45.

²Hoo, Kern, and Pelt; see infra, pp. 103, 108, 119.

³"I felt it was both necessary and desirable to secure nominations from the governments, particularly for positions of the rank of Assistant Secretary-General." Lie, op. cit., p. 46.

⁴In Lie's interpretation, "that the Soviet Union wanted one of its nationals to fulfill the premier Assistant Secretaryship could be taken as another indication of serious Soviet interest in the United Nations..." Ibid., p. 45.

⁵It has been suggested that the United States asked for this post, concerned with the internal administration rather than with the external projection of the Secretariat, because "they thought that the administrative tail would wag the dog." In Lie's view, however, this may better be explained as a United States effort "to reassure the other delegates against the impression that the United Nations would be an 'American show'." Ibid., p. 47.

from North America, and one from Latin America. During Lie's tenure, when a national of one of the permanent members of the Security Council departed, he was replaced by a national of the same country. Lie said his understanding of the Big Five agreement was "that it was meant to apply for the five years which I should serve as Secretary-General" and that it "would not necessarily apply after that."¹ In this connection, it is important to recall that the Secretary-General did have the final choice as to the actual selection of those to be appointed Assistant Secretaries-General. To bring about a broader geographical distribution, in 1949 Lie appointed an Indian² to replace the Assistant Secretary-General for Conference and General Services, a Dutch national. In 1952, when a Czechoslovakian national, head of the Legal Department, retired, a Greek jurist³ was appointed to succeed him. In addition, although his post turned out to be only a temporary one, an Australian civil servant⁴ was appointed in 1948 as a ninth Assistant Secretary-General to coordinate internal matters.

Lie regarded the Assistant Secretaries-General as "my official 'cabinet', available for advice on all matters---

¹Ibid., p. 46.

²See Lall, infra, p. 110.

³See Stavropoulos. infra, p. 124.

⁴See Jackson, infra, p. 105.

not least questions relating to their respective 'home areas'.¹ Lie's 'cabinet' usually met twice a week. Its emphasis has been described as highly specialized: "it is more a question of reporting the work of the departments than of evolving genral policy."² Moreover, "there is policy discussion, but no voting, and the Secretary-General, like the [U.S.] President, takes sole responsibility for all decisions."³

From the beginning, Lie delegated to his immediate subordinates broad administrative authority, and as he came to emphasize his political responsibilities, he eventually delegated most of his administrative duties.⁴ He had first approached his administrative tasks with confidence. With his background as Norway's Minister of Trade and Industries and later of Supply and Shipping, he felt that he "knew administration--to the extent, at any rate, that national

¹Lie, op. cit., p. 51.

²Schwebel, The Secretary-General of the United Nations, p. 131.

³Ibid.

⁴Schwebel, author of one of the most comprehensive reports on Lie's tenure as Secretary-General, points out that Lie "formally delegated to the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Administrative and Financial Services virtually all of the administrative job." Ibid., p. 129. In contrast, the League's Secretaries-General had devoted considerable attention to internal affairs and administrative matters. In 1951, Sir Eric replied to Schwebel's query: "I do not feel able to make any comparison between my methods of approach and those of Mr. Trygve Lie. It must be remembered that the atmosphere of the League and of the United Nations are completely incomparable." Ibid., p. 271, n79.

administration bears upon international."¹ He was soon to find out that the difficulties of international administration exceed the difficulties of national bureaucracies many times.

The question of international loyalty--certainly not an issue in national bureaucracies--as a crucial element of the Secretariat has brought the United Nations into direct clash with the policies of certain Member States which, guarding national loyalties and interests, view international loyalty with some misgivings. During Lie's period of office one of the most serious attacks upon the Organization was in fact based on the United States' investigations into the loyalties of its nationals employed in the Secretariat. Indeed, this unfortunate development² has been described as "the greatest crisis in the history of the international secretariat."³ Pressure was applied on the Secretary-General demanding the firing of United States nationals who had admitted past membership in the Communist Party. In dealing with this crisis, Lie insisted on retaining final control

¹Lie, op. cit., p. 43.

²An evaluatory article concludes that "besides causing a great loss of prestige to the United Nations, the whole incident of loyalty investigations into American members of the United Nations personnel also greatly hurt the cause of the United States, both in the United Nations amongst other delegations, and abroad." David A. Booth, "The United Nations, the United States, and the International Civil Service," Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives XXI, (1955), p. 742.

³Mangone, op. cit., p. 207.

over personnel policy while at the same time recognizing the necessity of regaining United States confidence in the administration of the Secretariat.¹

Another influential Member State with which Lie's policies seriously clashed was the Soviet Union. For a number of reasons, including his stand on United Nations actions in Korea, the Soviet Union had levelled a concentrated attack upon Lie, culminating in a flat refusal to recognize him as Secretary-General upon the beginning of his extended term in February 1951. After that date all Soviet communications with the United Nations were addressed not to the Secretary-General but only to the Secretariat. The effectiveness of the office of the Secretary-General thus sharply decreased, Lie announced to the General Assembly in November 1952 his decision to resign. His successor was finally selected the following March and on 7 April 1953, after seven years and two months in office, Trygve Lie delivered his farewell address as the first Secretary-General of the United Nations.

In expressing his views on the role of the Secretary-General, Lie had once declared: "The Secretary-General must be a diplomat, a...politically minded man, and he must understand his duty to keep the Organization together...He must be ready to compromise, and at the same time he must

¹On the problem of allegiance, and for a summary of this incident, see Mangone, *op. cit.*, pp. 202-211. For Lie's views, see Chapter XXI, "The Communist Issue in the Secretariat," Lie, *op. cit.*, pp. 386-405.

never lose sight of the Charter's ideals...It is not an easy job."¹

Dag Hammarskjold

"You are taking over the world's most impossible job." Such were Lie's greetings upon welcoming his successor, who arrived in New York in April 1953.

Dag Hjalmar Agne Carl Hammarskjold² was born on 29 July 1905 in Jonkoping in south-central Sweden, the fourth son of Sweden's World War I Prime Minister. He was educated at Upsala University, where he earned a Bachelor of Laws in 1930. Three years later he received his doctorate in economics from the University of Stockholm. After a successful career in government finance, he was appointed to the Foreign Office in 1947. He became Deputy Foreign Minister in 1951. His first contact with the United Nations was as a delegate; he was Vice-Chairman of the Swedish delegation to the 1951 General Assembly and Acting Chairman of his country's delegation to the 1952 General Assembly.

Although a respected Swedish civil servant, Hammarskjold was little known to the world in 1953. He is reported to have been selected mainly because the big powers expected him to be an efficient and unobtrusive administrator who would avoid a

¹Quoted in Schwebel, The Secretary-General of the United Nations, p. 56.

²For a more complete biographical outline, see infra, p. 82.

politically controversial role.¹ His first year in office was indeed devoted to administrative responsibilities--- "to taking hold of the Organization and to restoring the morale of the Secretariat."² He was, however, to be more than simply an administrator. He became an international statesman, multiplying the stature and the influence of his office. On the whole, his period in office was marked by dynamism in administration, by energetic interpretation of his functions, by positive overtures in promoting welfare around the world, and by successful efforts to bring about compromise solutions of dangerous issues.

When Hammarskjold first took office, staff morale in the Secretariat was at a low point, partly because its original idealism has been decimated by frustration but largely because of the United States loyalty investigations. His predecessor had even allowed FBI investigations to be conducted at United Nations headquarters. One of Hammarskjold's first moves was

¹"A sort of confidential clerk"---as he remarked to an interviewer at the time. Cited in Joseph P. Lash, "Dag Hammarskjold's Conception of His Office," International Organization, XVI (Summer 1962), p. 542. Hammarskjold's civil service ideal was in fact reflected in his statement to the press upon arrival in New York: "In my new official capacity the private man will disappear and the international public servant will take his place. The public servant is there in order to assist, so to say from the inside, those who take the decisions which frame history. He should--- as I see it---listen, analyze and learn to understand fully the forces at work and the interests at stake, so that he will be able to give the right advice when the situation calls for it." Foote, op. cit., p. 27.

²Lash, "Dag Hammarskjold's Conception of His Office," p. 542.

to order United States agents off the premises.¹ He then set out to raise staff members' morale by defending their independence from outside pressures, by becoming easily accessible to them, and by increasing the importance of their role. He publicly stated that "within the limits set by government action and government cooperation," the United Nations "depends on what the Secretariat makes of it."² By repeatedly stressing the role of the Secretariat---"the international priesthood," as he often referred to it---Hammarskjold was successful in raising the stature and importance, and thus the morale and output, of the Secretariat.

In his first official communication with a United Nations organ, Hammarskjold declared that he would defer action on Lie's proposals for the reorganization of the Secretariat.³ While he agreed that the top-level organization was not wholly satisfactory, he proceeded to reorganize it in a direction

¹Their presence, he commented to friends, was "intolerable, absolutely intolerable." Ibid., p. 49.

²In his address at the University of California United Nations Convocation, 25 June 1945. Foote, op. cit., p. 93.

³Several years after he had been in office, Lie concluded that the number of his top assistants "might be reduced to three (or four) provided they were of the highest caliber and could be selected freely by the Secretary-General according to his needs---and without having to please everyone." He proposed to the General Assembly that the eight Assistant Secretaries-General be replaced by three Deputy Secretaries-General, each to head a major group of departments. (GAOR: 7th. Sess., Annexes, Agenda item 69, A/2214, 7 October 1952.) However, he resigned before implementing his proposals for the restructuring of the top level of the Secretariat.

opposite to that proposed by his predecessor.¹ His major reorganization plan was announced in August 1954 to take effect on 1 January 1955. It abolished the post of Assistant Secretary-General and superseded the assignment of the top posts agreed upon in 1945 by the permanent members of the Security Council.

Under his 1955 reorganization of the Secretariat, Hammarskjöld abolished the Department of Administrative and Financial Services and divided the Department of Conference and General Services into a Department of Conference Services and an Office for General Services. He also consolidated the two top grades within the Secretariat---those of Assistant Secretary-General and of Principal Director---into one rank, that of Under-Secretary. Seven officials were thus elevated to this rank. In addition, Hammarskjöld created new positions for two Under-Secretaries without Portfolio² to undertake special assignments and to serve as his major advisers. As a result, there were fifteen Under-Secretaries in 1955.³ Besides the two without Portfolio, they included the following

¹The two differed in their attitudes towards administration. "I never loved administrative details," Lie later wrote Lie, *op. cit.*, p. 43. "Hammarskjöld, unlike Lie, was interested in administration and wished to bring the administrative units under his own personal supervision." Bailey, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

²Later to be called Under-Secretaries for Special Political Affairs. While the two officials originally appointed were nationals from the Soviet Union and from the United States, these positions have not necessarily been reserved for the two super-powers.

³The number of officials with the rank of Under-Secretary increased steadily during Hammarskjöld's tenure. By 1961, when Hammarskjöld died, there were 25 officials with such a

Under-Secretaries with essentially administrative duties as heads of principal departments: (1) for Political and Security Council Affairs; (2) for Economic and Social Affairs; (3) for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories; (4) for Public Information; (5) for Conference Services; (6) Legal Counsel; (7) Executive Assistant to the Secretary-General; (8) Controller; (9) Director of Personnel; (10) Director, Office of General Services; (11) Director General, Technical Assistance Administration; (12) Executive Director, United Nations International Emergency Children's Fund; and (13) Executive Chairman, Technical Assistance Board.

From 1955 to the end of Hammarskjöld's tenure, the Under-Secretaries were nationals of the following countries:

Without Portfolio.....	United States ¹
Without Portfolio.....	U.S.S.R. ² U.K. ³ India ⁴
Political and Security Council...	Yugoslavia ⁵ U.S.S.R. ⁶

rank. There seemed to be a clear distinction in stature between those at Headquarters and those stationed elsewhere. Those in the last category included the Director of the United Nations Office in Geneva, the Executive Secretaries of the four regional economic commissions, and representatives on special field missions. For a complete listing of all Under-Secretaries, see infra, pp. 85-87.

¹See Bunche, infra, p. 94.

²See Tchernychev, infra, p. 127, and Dobrynin, infra, p. 98.

³See Trevelyan, infra, p. 128.

⁴See Narasimhan, infra, p. 115.

⁵See Protitch, infra, p. 121.

⁶See Dobrynin, infra, p. 98, and Arkadev, infra, p. 92.

Economic and Social Affairs.....	France ¹
Trusteeship.....	Chile, ² Yugoslavia ³
Public Information.....	Pakistan, ⁴ South Africa ⁵ , Brazil ⁶
Conference Services.....	China ⁷
Legal Counsel.....	Greece ⁸
Executive Assistant.....	United States ⁹
Controller.....	New Zealand ¹⁰
Personnel.....	United Kingdom, ¹¹ United States, ¹² U.K. ¹³
General Services.....	United States ¹⁴
Technical Assistance Administration....	Canada, ¹⁵ Panama ¹⁶
UNICEF.....	United States ¹⁷
Technical Assistance Board.....	United Kingdom ¹⁸
UN Special Fund.....	United States ¹⁹

The next major reorganization proposal originated with the Soviet Union. Displeased with Hammarskjöld's performance as Secretary-General and in sharp disagreement with some of

¹See de Seynes, infra, p.97.

²See Cohen, infra, p.95.

³See Protitch, infra, p.121.

⁴See Bokhari, infra, p.93.

⁵See Katzin, infra, p.106.

⁶See Tavares de Sa, infra, p.126.

⁷See Hoo, infra, p.103.

⁸See Stavropoulos, infra, p.124.

⁹See Cordier, infra, p.96.

¹⁰See Turner, infra, p.129.

¹¹See Robertson, infra, p.122.

¹²See McDiarmid, infra, p.113.

¹³See Hamilton, infra, p.100.

¹⁴See Vaughan, infra, p.130.

¹⁵See Keenleyside, infra, p.107.

¹⁶See Heurtematte, infra, p.101.

¹⁷See Pate, infra, p.118

¹⁸See Owen, infra, p.117.

¹⁹(Established in 1959); see Hoffman, infra, p.102.

his decisions and recommendations, particularly in regard to the Congo crisis, the Soviet Union in 1960 insisted that the Secretary-General be replaced by three executive officers.¹ Under the Soviet proposal, each would be selected to represent the three groups of states (socialist, Western, and neutralist) into which the world was divided by the U.S.S.R.'s delegation to be divided. This proposal, known as the "troika", never became popular in the General Assembly and "evoked virtually no support outside the Soviet bloc."² A month later President Sékou Touré of Guinea presented the "sub-troika" proposal, which had first been advanced by President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana. Under this proposal, the Secretary-General would not be replaced but would be assisted by a group of three Assistant Secretaries-General to be selected "in accordance with the proposals made by the countries representing the three main political trends in the United Nations."³ They were not to

¹Addressing the General Assembly, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers Nikita Khrushchev declared: "We consider it advisable to set up, in the place of the Secretary-General who is at present the interpreter and executor of the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, a collective executive organ of the United Nations consisting of three persons each of whom would represent a certain group of States. That would provide a definite guarantee that the work of the United Nations executive organ would not be carried on to the detriment of any one of these groups of States. The United Nations executive organ would then be a genuinely democratic organ; it would really guard the interests of all States members of the United Nations...." GAOR: 15th Sess., 869th Plenary Mtg., 23 September 1960, para. 285.

²Bailey, op. cit., p. 76.

³GAOR: 15th Sess., 896th Plenary Mtg., 10 October 1960, para. 80.

be merely assistants to the Secretary-General but official representatives with clearly defined authority, whose opinions he could not dismiss lightly.

The two proposals reflected the recognition of the Secretariat's role and involvement in political matters. If put into effect, however, such proposals would have seriously undermined the authority and independence of the Secretary-General, if not the effectiveness of the Secretariat. Although the Secretary-General can and does take political stands, he may do so only on an international and impartial basis, not in subordination to any country or group of countries. Hammarskjold believed he should express with "full frankness" his views in regard to issues before the Organization, but that his conclusions "must be completely detached from any national interest or policy and based solely on the principles and ideals to which the governments have adhered as Members of the U.N."¹ In response to the remark by Khrushchev that "while there are neutral countries, there are no neutral men," Hammarskjold pointed out that such a belief challenged the "basic tenets in the philosophy of both the League of Nations and the United Nations." He added that if the innovations in international life represented by such organizations--in particular the introduction of "joint permanent organs, employing a neutral civil service, and the use of such organs for executive purposes on behalf of all the

¹Lash, "Dag Hammarskjold's Conception of His Office," p. 543.

members of the organization"---were found to be based on a false assumption because "no man can be neutral", the result would be that "we would be thrown back to 1919, and a searching re-appraisal would become necessary."¹

Firmly believing in the existence of international civil servants, Hammarskjold insisted on retaining his sixteen Under-Secretaries stationed at Headquarters, but indicated a willingness to have five of them---to be selected by him on a broad geographical basis---to serve as his special advisors on political matters. He emphasized his desire to have them selected on a geographical or regional basis, rather than a mere political one.²

In 1960, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, a permanent committee established by the General Assembly, recommended "the desirability of having another over-all review of the organization of the Secretariat."³ It was pointed out that the membership of the Organization, as well as the volume and scope of the activities of the Secretariat, had increased significantly since the previous survey of the Secretariat in 1954-55. Accordingly, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to appoint a Committee of Experts to work with him in a survey and review of the organization of the Secretariat with a view to making pertinent recommendations. The Committee of Experts submitted

¹UN Doc., A/4794, 30 June 1961, paras. 6-20.

²GAOR: 14th Sess., 1959, Suppl. No. 7 (a/4170), para 41.

its final report to Hammarskjold in June 1961. In his last Annual Report on the work of the Organization, Hammarskjold wryly underscored that "the Committee of Experts was unable to agree on any single proposal as regards the organization at the top level."¹ The committee had been divided on most of the major issues it considered. Hammarskjold pointed out that the Soviet expert had restated the declarations made by Khrushchev at the General Assembly. Three members "favoured the maintenance of the present structure at the Under-Secretary level but suggested that political questions be handled by three Deputy Secretaries-General."² This was a reflection of the sub-troika proposal. Other members suggested "the grouping of Secretariat activities into eight organizational units, each to be headed by a top-level official."³ The Secretary-General was not bound by the recommendations of the Committee of Experts, and Hammarskjold's preference was to have five instead of two Under-Secretaries for Special Political Affairs. The five "would be fully integrated in the work of the whole group of Under-Secretaries at Headquarters." He felt they "should be interchangeable and any of them should be available for ad hoc assignments of a political or diplomatic character."⁴ Fully recognizing the preponderance of

¹GAOR: 16th Sess., Supplement No. 1, A/4800, Chapter VI, "Administrative and Budgetary Question," pp. 177-178.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

Western nationals within the top level of the Secretariat, Hammarskjold was thus formulating his second major reorganization in an attempt to institute a more representative system.¹ He died before he could put this plan into effect.²

U Thant

The eldest of four sons of a prosperous landowner, U Thant³ was born on 22 January 1909 at Pantanaw, Burma. He was educated at the National High School and at the University College in Rangoon. His early years were spent

¹Joseph P. Lash, Dag Hammarskjold: Custodian of the Brushfire Peace (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & co., 1961), pp. 281-292.

²When Hammarskjold died he was on a peace mission, flying to engage in cease-fire talks with Katanga's President Moise Tshombe. The General Assembly's Sixteenth Session was to open the day after his death, and his "Introduction to the Secretary-General's Report on the Work of the Organization" is now considered his political testament. (GAOR: 16th Sess., Suppl. No. 2, A/4800). The world reacted as if a statesman of the first magnitude had died. The President of the United States rushed to New York to assure the Organization of his country's continued support. However, as in the case of Lie, the Soviet Union dissented; for some time the Soviets had refused to recognize Hammarskjold as Secretary-General. Upon his tragic death, the members of the Security Council issued the following statement: "Mr. Hammarskjold's death is a great loss to the Secretariat, to the United Nations and to all member states. Secretary-General Hammarskjold was an outstanding leader in recent years in strengthening world peace. His extraordinary diplomatic skill has helped carry the United Nations through many crises and has developed the organization into an important instrument in building a peaceful world community." The Soviet Union's representative refused to support the Council members' statement, on the grounds that "the Soviet Union is known not to have recognized Mr. Hammarskjold as an official of the United Nations and does not share the appraisal of his political activities which is contained in the communique." The New York Times, 19 September 1961, p. 16.

³For a more complete biographical outline, see infra, p.84.

in educational and information work; he was also active as a free-lance journalist. In 1947 he was appointed Burma's Press Director. On several occasions, he served as Advisor to the Prime Minister and in that capacity attended several international conferences. In 1957 he became his country's Ambassador to the United Nations, a post he held until his election as Acting Secretary-General in November 1961.

The reorganization at the top level of the Secretariat was one of the first major issues he encountered. At the same time, both East and West attempted to influence him in his choice of political advisors. The Soviet Union insisted on three top aides, chosen to represent the world's three main political groups and whose advice the Secretary-General would be obliged to follow. The United States, on the other hand, based its recommendation on the plan proposed by Hammarskjold. It suggested that five Under-Secretaries be selected, having advisory roles in political affairs in addition to their administrative responsibilities. Other countries argued that there should be four such officials and, since the Secretary-General came from Asia, that the four should come respectively, from Africa, Latin America, Eastern Europe, and North America. Asian representatives were quick to point out that the Secretary-General would not "represent" Asia and thus reasoned that if regions were to be represented, Asia---with half of the total population of the world---would also have to be represented independently among

the principal advisors.¹ Several Western European nations, objecting to being left out, wanted the number increased to six. The Soviet Union then countered with a proposal of seven in order to ensure one such post for a national of another Soviet bloc country.²

On November 1961, Thant announced in his acceptance address that he intended to invite a limited number of persons to act as his principal advisors. He indicated that his paramount consideration would be to secure the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity, and that he would pay due regard to the importance of wide geographical distribution. On 29 December 1961, Thant revealed that under his reorganization of the top level of the Secretariat he would select eight Under-Secretaries to serve as his principal advisors. At the time there were sixteen officials of Under-Secretary rank at Headquarters and fifteen stationed elsewhere. Those chosen by Thant to serve as his top advisors were selected on a wide geographical basis and included nationals of Brazil, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Nigeria, The Soviet Union, the United Arab Republic, and the United States. The number chosen recalls the fact that Lie also had eight principal advisors in his "cabinet". However, of Lie's eight, five were nationals of the permanent members of the Security

¹C.V. Narasimhan, "Administrative Changes in the Secretariat," Annual Review of United Nations Affairs 1961-62 (New York: New York University Press, 1963), p. 2.

²Bailey, op. cit., pp. 78-79.

Council. In contrast, only three nationals of permanent members were among those selected by Thant to serve as his principal advisors. A related fact of some significance is Thant's statement, upon announcing the selection of his top advisors, that he was reserving the right to consult them collectively, individually, or not at all.¹

To emphasize the fact that the eight principal advisors are not a "cabinet", Thant holds concurrent and regular Friday morning meetings---similar to those Hammarskjold used to have---with all the Under-Secretaries. One of the eight top advisors reports that Thant has been "particularly eager to dispel the notion that there is a hierarchy of Under-Secretaries, the principal advisers and the not-so-principal advisers."² He reports that the principal advisors have "very few special perquisites" and that the Secretary-General "has been at pains to emphasize that, in departmental affairs, every Under-Secretary is a principal adviser."³

The perennial argument on the proper geographical distribution has been intensified under Thant, particularly by the demands of the Soviet Union to gain "adequate" representation in the Secretariat. Thant has admitted that the Soviets remain well below the number and range of posts in the Secretariat to which they are entitled. Under the present formula,

¹United Nations Doc. SG/1102, 29 December 1961.

²Narasimhan, op. cit., p. 3.

³Ibid., pp. 3-4.

the Soviet Union could have nationals in 140 posts at the professional level outside of language and other categories not under geographical distribution.¹ During 1961, the number of Soviet nationals in the Secretariat was increased by 50%, rising from forty to sixty staff members. Nonetheless, there is still a difference of eighty between the "quota" of 140 and the sixty on the Secretariat staff. Factors explaining the low number of Soviet citizens in the Secretariat include a number of Soviet practices which hamper recruitment. For instance, the Soviet Union has always insisted that the United Nations select candidates for appointment in the Secretariat from lists submitted by Moscow instead of permitting direct recruitment. A second factor working against an increase in the number of Soviet nationals in the Secretariat is the Soviet practice of recalling its citizens after they have served with the United Nations for only a year or two.² An additional fact helping explain

¹Ibid., pp. 5-6.

²Professor Goodrich, an authority on the United Nations and a member of the Committee of Experts on the Organization of the Secretariat, observes that the U.S.S.R.'s demand "that more Soviet nationals be employed is a reasonable one; the difficulty arises when it comes to implementation. By denying the whole conception of international career service, by seeking to place its nationals in what it regards as key policy positions, by denying the possibility of free recruitment, by insisting that all appointments be made from persons proposed and approved by the government for short terms, and by taking the position that its nationals refuse fixed-term career appointments, the Soviet Union makes the task of the Secretary-General in meeting its request for increased participation of its nationals extremely difficult, if not impossible." Leland M. Goodrich, "Geographical Distribution of the Staff of the Secretariat," International Organization, XVI (Summer 1962), p. 481.

the low number of Soviet citizens in the Secretariat is simply that "in the past, the U.S.S.R. was not interested in filling the posts."¹

The Soviet Union is not the only country with a smaller number of nationals in the Secretariat than it should have if a proper geographical distribution of posts is to be achieved. Several countries in Eastern Europe, Asia, and Africa are also under-represented. Under Thant, measures have been taken to answer their demands to have more of their nationals in the Secretariat. In October 1962, the Secretary-General reported that twenty-six Africans had been added to the staff since his period in office began a year earlier. The same report indicated that, "by coincidence", the Eastern European countries had picked up a total of twenty-seven posts at the same time that the Western European and North American total was cut by twenty-seven.² This report served to underscore the fact that in order to reach a proportionate geographical distribution those countries which have been over-represented in the past will have their quotas reduced to permit the appointment of additional nationals from under-represented Member States. Thus compounded, the question of a "proper" geographical distribution is likely to continue to plague the United Nations for some time---not only in terms of Soviet protests but also due to the increasing demands of the new emerging nations.

¹Narasimhan, op. cit., p. 6.

²The New York Times, 26 October 1962, 2:5; 30 October 1962, 10:1.

Since U Thant assumed the top post in the Secretariat, the major departments have been headed by nationals of the following Member States:

Special Political Affairs.....United States¹
 Special Political Affairs...India², U.A.R.³, Yugoslavia⁴
 Political and Security Council.....U.S.S.R.⁵
 Economic and Social Affairs.....France⁶
 Trusteeship.....Yugoslavia⁷, Nigeria⁸
 Public Information.....Brazil⁹
 Conference Services.....Czechoslovakia¹⁰
 Legal Counsel.....Greece¹¹
 Personnel.....United Kingdom¹²
 General Services.....United States¹³
 Controller.....New Zealand¹⁴
 Technical Assistance Administration.....China¹⁵
 UNICEF.....United States¹⁶
 Technical Assistance Board.....United Kingdom¹⁷

¹See Bunche, infra, p.94.

²See Narasimhan, infra, p.115.

³See Loutfi, infra, p.110.

⁴See Protitch, infra, p.121.

⁵See Kiselev, infra, p.109 and Suslov, infra, p.125.

⁶See de Seynes, infra, p.97.

⁷See Protitch, infra, p.121.

⁸See Amachree, infra, p.90.

⁹See Tavares de Sa, infra, p.126.

¹⁰See Nosek, infra, p.116.

¹¹See Stavropoulos, infra, p.124.

¹²See MacFarquhar, infra, p.114.

¹³See Vaughan, infra, p.130.

¹⁴See Turner, infra, p.129.

¹⁵See Hoo, infra, p.103.

¹⁶See Pate, infra, p.118.

¹⁷See Owen, infra, p.117.

Special Fund.....United States,¹ Panama²
 Industrial Development.....U.A.R.³

In all, forty-three officials have been appointed to serve at Headquarters with the rank of Under-Secretary or its equivalent since 1946. All are directly responsible to the Secretary-General, whose role as the chief administrative officer of the United Nations was described above. Each of the three Secretaries-General has organized the top echelon of the Secretariat differently. The number of Under-Secretaries has increased steadily, partly due to the increased demands placed upon the Secretariat but also as a means to secure a more proportionate geographical distribution of the top offices. Each of these Under-Secretaries will be considered individually in the next chapter.

¹See Hoffman, infra, p. 102.

²Post of Associate Managing Director, Special Fund, established in January 1962. See Heurtematte, infra, p. 101.

³Post of Commissioner for Industrial Development established in August 1963. See Abdel-Rahman, infra, p. 89.

C H A P T E R I I I

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON THE TOP FUNCTIONARIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SECRETARIAT, 1946 to 1964

The biographical data presented in this chapter are drawn primarily from the following sources: (1) United Nations publications, including documents and official press releases; (2) international and national biographical directories; (3) foreign embassies and information agencies; (4) books and articles written by and about the officials here considered; and (5) The New York Times. All sources are listed in the Bibliography.

A number of difficulties were encountered in assembling these data. Most United Nations publications make only brief mention of Secretariat officials. Many national biographical directories do not list Secretariat members, perhaps because they are not always nationally prominent, or perhaps out of respect for their international character. Although most foreign embassies replied to the writer's requests for biographical data, only a few provided the information requested. The names of several officials considered in this study were spelled differently in different sources, thus complicating the research. Fortunately, The New York Times proved very helpful, and much of the information presented below was secured through its columns.

The Secretaries-General

- | | National of |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Hammarskjold, Dag Hajlmar Agne Carl | Sweden |
| Served 10 April 1953 to 18 September 1961 | |
| 2. Lie, Trygve Halvdan | Norway |
| Served 2 February 1946 to 9 April 1953 | |
| 3. Thant, U | Burma |
| Served 3 November 1961 - | |

HAMMARSKJOLD, Dag Hjalmar Age Carl Swedish civil servant

Born: 29 July 1905 in Jonkoping, Sweden.

Educated: Upsala University, B.A. in history of French literature, social philosophy and political economy, with honors, 1925; "filosofic licenciat" in economics, 1928; Bachelor of Laws, 1930.
Stockholm University, Ph.D. in economics, 1933.
Assistant Professor in political economy, Stockholm University, 1933-34.

Government
service:

Secretary, National Bank of Sweden, 1935-36;
Permanent Under-Secretary, Ministry of Finance 1936-45;
Chairman of the National Bank's Board, 1941-48;
Adviser to the Cabinet, 1945-47;
Under-Secretary, Foreign Office, 1947-49;
Secretary-General, Foreign Office, 1949-51;
Minister without Portfolio, 1951;
Deputy Foreign Minister, 1951-53.

Delegate to the 1947 Paris Conference when Marshall Plan machinery was established;
to the 1948 Paris Conference of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation;
to UNISCAN, established to promote economic co-operation between the United Kingdom and Scandinavian countries.

UN service: Appointed Secretary-General on 7 April 1953.
Elected to a second five-year term in September 1957.
Died in plane accident in Niola, Rhodesia on 18 September 1961.

LIE, Trygve Halvdan

Norwegian politician

Born: 16 July 1896 in Oslo, Norway.

Educated: Oslo University, law degree, 1919.

Employment: Assistant to the Secretary of Labor Party, 1919-22;
Legal Adviser, Norwegian Trade Union Federation, 1922-1935.

Government service: Minister of Justice, 1935-39;
Minister of Trade and Industries, 1939;
Minister of Supply and Shipping, 1939-40;
Acting Foreign Minister, 1940;
Foreign Minister, 1941-46.

Chairman, delegation to UNCIO, San Francisco, 1945;
Chairman, delegation to First General Assembly, London, 1946.

UN service: Chairman, Security Council Commission, UNCIO;
Elected first Secretary-General of the UN in January 1946, installed on 2 February 1946;
The General Assembly continued Lie in office for a further three years from 1 February 1951.
Resigned in November 1952, welcomed Hammarskjold in April 1953.

Post-UN service: Appointed Governor of Oslo and Akershus, 1953-63;
Minister of the Department of Industries, 1963;
Minister of the Department of Commerce, 1964.

THANT, U

Burmese diplomat

Born: 22 January 1909 in Pantanaw, Burma.

Educated: University College, Rangoon.

Government
service:

Headmaster, National High School, 1931-46, (he succeeded Thakin Nu, later to become U Nu, Premier of Burma);
Secretary, Burma's Education Reorganization Committee under Japanese occupation government, 1942;
Burma's Press Director, 1947;
Director of Broadcasting, 1948;
Secretary, Ministry of Information, 1949;
Secretary for Projects in the Office of the Prime Minister, 1953;
Executive Secretary, Burma's Economic and Social Board, 1955;
Permanent Representative, UN, 1957-61.

Traveled as Adviser to the Prime Minister to missions to Thailand and Indonesia, 1951;
First Colombo Conference, Colombo, Ceylon, 1951;
Second Colomb Conference, Bogor, Indonesia, 1954;
Asian-African Conference, Bandung, 1955;
Third Colombo Conference, New Delhi, 1956;
Asian Socialist Conference, Bombay, 1956;
Belgrade Conference of Non-Aligned Nations, 1961.

UN service: Appointed Acting Secretary-General on 3 November 1961 to complete the unexpired term of Hammarskjöld;
Elected Secretary-General on 30 November 1962, to serve until 3 November 1966.

The Under-Secretaries

Group I

Officials appointed to Headquarters positions
with Under-Secretary rank or its equivalent
between 1946 and 1964

Name	Country	Page
1. Abdel-Rahman, Ibrahim Helmi	U.A.R.	89
2. Amachree, Godfrey Kio Jaja	Nigeria	90
3. Andersen, Hans Christian	Denmark	91
4. Arkadyev, Georgi Petrovich	U.S.S.R.	92
5. Bokhari, Ahmed Shah	Pakistan	93
6. Bunche, Ralph Johnson	U.S.A.	94
7. Cohen, Benjamin	Chile	95
8. Cordier, Andrew Wellington	U.S.A.	96
9. de Seynes, Philippe	France	97
10. Dobrynin, Anatoly Fedorovich	U.S.S.R.	98
11. Georges-Picot, Guillaume	France	99
12. Hamilton, William Aitken Brown	U.K.	100
13. Heurtematte, Roberto Manuel	Panama	101
14. Hoffman, Paul Gray	U.S.A.	102
15. Hoo, Victor Chi-Tsai	China	103
16. Hutson, John B.	U.S.A.	104
17. Jackson, Robert Gillman Allen	Australia	105
18. Katzin, Alfred George	South Africa	106
19. Keenleyside, Hugh Llewellyn	Canada	107

	Name	Country	Page
20.	Kerno, Ivan Stephen	Czechoslovakia	108
21.	Kiselev, Evgeny Dmitrievich	U.S.S.R.	109
22.	Lall, Shamaldharee	India	110
23.	Laugier, Henri	France	111
24.	Loutfi, Omar	U.A.R.	112
25.	McDiarmid, John	U.S.A.	113
26.	MacFarquhar, Sir Alexander	U.K.	114
27.	Narasimhan, Chakravarthi V.	India	115
28.	Nosek, Jiri	Czechoslovakia	116
29.	Owen, Arthur David Kemp	U.K.	117
30.	Pate, Maurice	U.S.A.	118
31.	Pelt, Adrian	The Netherlands	119
32.	Price, Byron	U.S.A.	120
33.	Protitch, Dragoslav	Yugoslavia	121
34.	Robertson, John Archibald Campbell	U.K.	122
35.	Sobolev, Arkady Aleksandrovich	U.S.S.R.	123
36.	Stavropoulos, Constantin Anghelos	Greece	124
37.	Suslov, Vladimir P.	U.S.S.R.	125
38.	Tavares de Sa, Hernane	Brazil	126
39.	Tchernychev, Ilya Semenovich	U.S.S.R.	127
40.	Trevelyan, Sir Humphrey	U.K.	128
41.	Turner, Bruce	New Zealand	129
42.	Vaughan, David B.	U.S.A.	130
43.	Zinchenko, Konstantin Emilianovich	U.S.S.R.	131

Group II

Officials of Under-Secretary rank
at established offices overseas:

1. Gardiner, Robert K. A. (Ghana); Executive Secretary,
Economic Commission for Africa
2. Mayobre, Jose Antonio (Venezuela); Executive Secretary,
Economic Commission for Latin America
3. Nyun, U (Burma); Executive Secretary,
Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East
4. Spinelli, Pier P. (Italy); Under-Secretary,
Director of the European Office of the United Nations
5. Velebit, Vladimir (Yugoslavia); Executive Secretary,
Economic Commission for Europe

Group III

Officials of Under-Secretary rank
in charge of missions, or special
assignments (as of 1 August 1963)

1. Azfar, Muhammed (Pakistan); Special Representative of
the SG, UN Mission in Mogadiscio, Somalia
2. Bull, Odd (Norway); Chief of Staff,
UN Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine
3. Davis, John H. (U.S.); Commissioner-General,
UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees
4. Dorsinville, Max H. (Haiti); Officer-in-Charge,
UN Operations in Congo
5. Graham, Frank P. (U.S.); UN Representative,
India and Pakistan
6. Kaldager, Christian (Norway); Commander, UN Force in Congo
7. Gyani, P. S. (India); Commander, UN Emergency Force
8. Prebisch, Raul (Argentina); Secretary-General,
UN Conference on Trade and Development
9. Schnyder, Felix (Switzerland); UN High Commissioner
for Refugees
10. von Horn, Carl Carlsson (Sweden); Commander,
UN Yemem Observation Mission

Officials on this page not included in the forty-three
analyzed individually in this study.

The following forty-three pages contain biographical composites on each of the Secretariat officials who have been appointed to serve at Headquarters with the rank of Under-Secretary since the United Nations was established in 1946.

ABDEL-RAHMAN, Ibrahim Helmi

(Egyptian educator and administrator)

Commissioner for Industrial Development

Born: 1919 in Egypt

Educated: Cairo University, Faculty of Science, 1938;
London and Edinburgh universities, post-graduate studies;
Cambridge University, Ph.D., 1941
Leiden University.

Employment: Professor, astronomy and astrophysics, Cairo University, 1942-54

Government service:

Secretary-General, First Central Planning and Coordination Committee, 1952-54
Secretary-, Council of Ministers, 1954-59
Director, Egyptian Atomic Commission, 1955;
Head of Technical Staff, National Planning Committee, 1957;
Director, Institute of National Planning, 1960-63

Established the Egyptian Atomic Energy Commission;
Headed U.A.R. delegation to the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna;
Participated in UN Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, Geneva, 1955;
Established the central science council which in 1962 gave rise to the Ministry of Scientific Research in U.A.R.;
Responsible for the preparation of the first five-year development plan (1960-65) now underway in U.A.R;
Headed U.A.R. delegation to UN Conference on New Sources of Energy, Rome, 1961, and to UN Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas, Geneva, 1963.

UN service: Member of UN expert committee on compensatory financing;
Member of UN Special Fund expert team which considered the establishment of Latin American Development Institute in Santiago, Chile.

Appointed to present post in June 1963.

AMACHREE, Godfrey Kio Jaja

(Nigerian attorney)

Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories

Born: 27 February 1918 in Buguma, Nigeria

Educated: Government College, Umuahia
King's College, Lagos
Higher College, Yaba
University College, University of London
Pembroke College, Cambridge University
Gray's Inn, London

Q.C. (Queen's Counsel), LL.B.; Barrister-at-Law

Government
service:

Nigerian Legal Department, 1949-55
Senior Crown Counsel, 1955
Acting Legal Secretary, South Cameroons, 1955
Acting Solicitor-General, Federation of Nigeria,
1957
Solicitor-General and Permanent Secretary,
Federal Ministry of Justice, 1958-62

As Solicitor-General, Amachree was the principal legal adviser to the Government of Nigeria and represented the Crown in all civil litigations. As Permanent Secretary, he was responsible for all administrative matters pertaining to the Ministry.

UN service: Under-Secretary in Charge of UN Civilian Operations in the Congo, from 1962 until appointed to present post in July 1963.

ANDERSEN, Hans Christian

(Danish government budget expert)

Controller, 1955

Born: 25 October 1906 in Frederiksberg, Denmark

Educated: Copenhagen University, LL.B., 1931

Employment: Denmark Insurance Co., 1925-30
Insurance Society of Denmark, 1932-42

Government
service: Legal Adviser, Danish Ministry of Finance,
1932-42
Bureau of Budget and Secretariat for Ministry
of Finance, 1938-42
Chief, Budget and National Debt Department,
1942-46

UN service: Principal Director, Bureau of Finance, 1946-54
Appointed Controller effective 1 January 1955,
resigned 3 February 1955.

Post-UN
positions: With Denmark Insurance Co., 1956, Managing
Director since 1962
Pension and Annuity Institute, Chairman since
1958
Board for the Copenhagen Insurance Society,
Vice-Chairman since 1959.

ARKADYEV, Georgi Petrovich

(Soviet diplomat)

Under-Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs,
1960-62

Born: In 1905

Educated: Economic Institute, Moscow

Employment: Publishing and pedagogical activities, 1919-36

Government
service:

Joined Soviet diplomatic service, 1936
Head, Law Department, People's Commissariat
for Foreign Affairs, 1939-44
Head, Economic Department, 1944-47
Deputy Political Adviser, Soviet Military Ad-
ministration, Germany, 1947-49
Counsellor, Soviet diplomatic mission to East
Germany, 1949-51
Head, Fourth European Department, Foreign Minis-
try, 1951-52
Head, U.S.A. Department, Foreign Ministry,
1952-53
Ambassador to Norway, 1954-56
Deputy Permanent Delegate to UN, 1956-60

UN service: Appointed Under-Secretary on 11 May 1960,
resigned on 1 March 1962

Post-UN
Service:

Head, Department of International Economic
Organizations, Soviet Foreign Ministry,
since 1962.

Remarks: Arkadyev resigned due to the illness of his
wife, but he had been criticized severely
for passing notes to the Soviet delegate
during a Security Council debate.

BOKHARI, Ahmed Shah

(Pakistani diplomat)

Under-Secretary for Public Information, 1955-58

Born: 1 October 1898 in Peshawar, India

Educated: Punjab University, Lahore, M.A.
Cambridge University, B.A. (honors) and M.A.
(with first class honors)
Elected senior scholar of Emmanuel College,
Cambridge

Employment: Professor of English Literature, National
College, Lahore; Principal, 1947-50

Government
service: Director-General, All-India Radio, during war
years, 1939-45
Head, India Goodwill Mission to Afghanistan, 1942
Co-chairman, Commonwealth Broadcasting Conference,
London, 1945
Head, Pakistan Delegation, India Partition
Negotiations, London, 1947
Head, Pakistan Delegation, International High
Frequency Broadcasting Conference, Mexico
City, 1948
Head, Pakistan Delegation, Commonwealth Rela-
tions Conference, Toronto, 1949
Pakistan representative, General Assembly, 1949
Permanent representative, General Assembly, 1950-55

UN service: Served as political adviser to Hammarskjold on
1954 trip to Peking
Appointed to direct all UN information services
in 1955
Became one of Hammarskjold's closest advisers
Died of a heart attack on 5 December 1958.

Remarks: Author of numerous short stories, plays and poems
in Urdu and Persian
Translated into Urdu and produced plays by Shaw
and Shakespeare
Was among those considered for Secretary-General
in 1953
Upon his death an editorial of The New York Times
praised him as a "citizen of the world....
The world today is poorer for the passing of
a man who gave us a better insight into what
good things are possible in a better future."

BUNCHE, Ralph Johnson

(U.S. political scientist)

Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs since 1955.

Born: 7 August 1904 in Detroit, Michigan, U.S.A.

Educated: University of California, Los Angeles, B.A. (cum laude), 1927
Harvard University, M.A., 1928; Ph.D., in government, 1934
Post-doctoral work, Northwestern University, London School of Economics, and University of Capetown, South Africa, 1936-37

Employment: Assistant in Political Science, U.C.L.A., 1925-27
Howard University, instructor, 1928-29; assistant professor, 1929-33; assistant to the President, 1930-31; associate professor. 1933-38; professor, 1938-50; head of Political Science Department, 1929-50

Government Service: Office of Strategic Services, British Empire Section, 1941-44
Deputy Chief, Near East-Africa Section, 1943
Chief, Africa Section, June 1943-January 1944
With Department of State, 1944-47
Assistant Secretary, U.S. delegation, Dumbarton Oaks, 1944
Adviser, U.S. delegation, UNCIO, San Francisco, 1945
Adviser, U.S. delegation, UN Executive Committee, London, 1945
Adviser, U.S. delegation, General Assembly, London, 1946

UN service: Director, Trusteeship Department, 1946-48
Principal Director, Trusteeship Department, 1948-54
Appointed to present post effective 1 January 1955.

Remarks: Has attended numerous international conferences, One of Hammarskjold's closet advisers, Succeeded Count Bernadotte as mediator of the Palestine crisis
Awarded Nobel Peace Prize in 1950
Described as "a superb negotiator with an intimate knowledge of Africa and the Middle East"
In charge of Congo civilian operations, 1963
The grandson of a slave, Bunche collaborated with Myrdal in An American Dilemma, 1944.

COHEN, Benjamin

(Chilean diplomat)

Under-Secretary for Trusteeship, 1955-57

Born: 18 March 1896 in Concepcion, Chile

Educated: University of Chile, Ph.D., 1912
Georgetown University, M.S. (magna cum laude) 1927

Employment: Journalist specializing in international affairs,
Editor of several Chilean dailies, 1911-22
Member of the Faculty, Georgetown University, 1927-32

Government
Service:

Entered diplomatic service as Press Attache, 1922
Secretary, Chilean Embassy, Washington, 1923-27
Charge d'Affaires, Chilean Embassy, Washington, 1932-33
Charge d'Affaires on special mission to the governments of Paraguay and Bolivia, 1933-34
Acting Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Santiago, 1934-36
Minister Resident, Foreign Office, 1936-39
Ambassador to Bolivia, 1939-45
Ambassador to Venezuela, 1945

UN service: Head, Information Section, Executive Committee and Preparatory Commission, London, 1945-46
Chief, Information Planning Section, General Assembly, London, 1946
Assistant Secretary-General, Public Information, 1946-54
Appointed Under-Secretary for Trusteeship effective 1 January 1955, resigned on 6 March 1957

Post-UN
Service:

Resigned in 1957 to become Executive Secretary of the World Federation of UN Associations
Chilean Ambassador to the UN, 1958-60.

Remarks:

Proficient in Spanish, English, French, Italian, Portuguese, and "has notions of Russian and German."
Died of cancer on 12 March 1960.

CORDIER, Andrew Wellington
(U.S. political scientist)

Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs, 1961-62

Born: 3 March 1901 in Canton, Ohio, U.S.A.

Educated: Manchester College, Indiana, B.A., 1922
University of Chicago, M.A., 1923; Ph.D., 1926
Research, Graduate Institute of International
Studies, Geneva, 1930-31
Study and travel, Europe, 1938-39; South
America, 1941

Employment: Teacher, Greentown Hightown High School, Ohio,
1919-21
Chairman, Department of History and Political
Science, Manchester College, 1927-44
Lecturer, social sciences, Indiana University,
1927-44

Government Service: Expert on international security, State Depart-
ment, 1944-46
Technical expert, U.S. delegation to UNCIO, San
Francisco, 1945

UN service: Chief, General Assembly Section, UN Preparatory
Commission, 1945
Assistant to Executive Secretary, Preparatory
Commission
Assistant to President of First General Assembly,
London, 1946
Executive Assistant to the Secretary-General,
1946-61
Appointed Under-Secretary for General Assembly
Affairs in June 1961
Resigned in February 1962

Post-UN Service: Adviser, State Department, 1962--
Dean, School of International Relations, Columbia
University, 1962--.

Remarks: Served as adviser to all Presidents of the General
Assembly, 1946-61
Was the official closest to the Secretary-General
Shared the confidences of both Lie and Hammar-
skjold
Had major responsibility for coordination of UN
programs and activities
Also performed trouble-shooter assignments, went
to Middle East in 1958 and to Congo in 1961
Resigned to facilitate the reorganization of the
staff to give it wider geographic range.

de SEYNES, Philippe

(French economist)

Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs since 1955

Born: 4 January 1910 in Paris, France

Educated: Faculty of Letters and Law, Paris, Licence en droit at lettres, Diplome d'etudes superieures de droit, Diplome de L'Ecole libre des sciences politiques

Government Service: Clerk, Ministry of Finance, 1935-39
Assistant to the Inspection of Finance, 1939-45
Member, French Mission to Germany, later Assistant Secretary-General, Allied Reparations Agency, Brussels, 1945-49
Financial Adviser, French delegation to UN, 1949-54
On staff of Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1954

UN service: Appointed to present post effective 1 January 1955.

DOBRYNIN, Anatoly Fedorovich

(Soviet diplomat)

Under-Secretary for Security Council Affairs, 1958-60

Born: 16 November 1919

Educated: Graduated from a technical college before the outbreak of World War II
Holds an M.S. in history

Government Service: Entered Soviet diplomatic service, 1944
With Soviet Embassy in Washington, 1952-54
As Minister-Counselor, Washington, 1954-55
Counselor with rank of Ambassador, Foreign Ministry, 1955
Member, Soviet delegation to London Conference on Suez Canal, 1956
Adviser to Soviet Delegation, UN, 1956

UN service: Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs, appointed in July 1957
Under-Secretary for Security Council Affairs, appointed in 1958 to serve until 1 June 1963

Post-UN Service: Recalled in February 1960 to the Foreign Ministry
Became head of the American Department, concerned with the entire Western Hemisphere
Counselor, Soviet delegation at Big Four Conference in Paris, 1960
Attended the Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting in Vienna, 1961
Appointed to present post of U.S.S.R. Ambassador to the U.S. on 1 December 1963.

Remarks: Little is known about his early life or education
It is reported that he is a Ukrainian
During the war he served as an engineer at an aircraft plant
Although he is a member of the Communist Party, he has held no high party positions
Accompanied Hammarskjold in 1959 meeting with Khrushchev in the Crimea
He speaks fluent English.

GEORGES-PICOT, Guillaume

(French diplomat)

Assistant Secretary-General for the Department of Social and Economic Affairs, 1951-54

Born: 10 August 1898 at Etretat (Seine-Inf.), France

Educated: University of Paris, Licence en droit

Government Service: Attache, 1924
 Secretary to Embassy, 1925-27
 First Secretary, 1928, French Embassy, Moscow
 Clerk, Central Administration, Paris, 1930-33
 Secretary, French Embassy, Sofia, 1933
 Assistant Consul, Bangkok, 1934
 First Secretary, Peking, 1937-39
 First Secretary, Mexico City, 1940
 Secretary-General, Tunis, 1940
 Counselor, Washington, 1941 (called back by Vichy in 1942)
 Head, Civil Service of French Mission, Washington, 1942
 Sub-manager of the Commissioner's Office, Algeria, 1943
 On special mission to China, 1944
 On special mission to U.S., 1945
 Minister Plenipotentiary, Tirana, 1946
 Ambassador, Venezuela, 1946-48
 Ambassador, Argentina, 1948-51

UN service: Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Department of Social Affairs, appointed September 1951
 Appointed to head concurrently Department of Economic Affairs beginning in 1952
 In Hammarskjold's 1955 reorganization both departments were consolidated and another Frenchman was appointed to head them

Post-UN Service: Ambassador, Mexico, 1954-56
 Permanent Representative, UN, January 1957 to May 1959
 Resigned from Foreign Service
 Became first President of the Union Internationale de Gestion et d'Investissements
 Also President of the Compagnie Industrielle Maritime
 Vice-President of the Societe d'Investissements Metropolitains and of the Societe des Plantations Reunies de Mimot
 He is President of the French Association for the UN, the French Committee for World Struggle Against Hunger, and of the Conseil Supérieur des Français de l'étranger.

HAMILTON, William Aitken Brown

(British civil servant)

Director of Personnel, 1959-62

Born: 3 June 1909 at Aberdeenshire, Scotland

Educated: Aberdeen University, M.A. in classics (first class honors)

Government Service: Administrative Civil Service, Board of Education, 1931-35
Principal, 1936
Joint Secretary, Athlone Committee on Nursing Services, 1937-39
Ministry of Food, 1939-44
Assistant Secretary, 1943
Ministry of Education, 1944-49
Director of Establishments and Under-Secretary, 1946
Director of Establishments and Assistant Under-Secretary of State, 1949

UN service: Appointed Director of Personnel on 6 February 1959
His successor, another Briton, was appointed on 23 April 1962

Post-UN service: Assistant Secretary of State, Commonwealth Relations Office since 1962.

HEURTEMATTE, Roberto Manuel

(Panamanian industrialist)

Associate Managing Director, Special Fund, since 1962

Born: In 1908

Educated: Yale University

**Private
Career:** Commercial, financial, industrial and
livestock activities in Panama,
1931-59

**Government
Service:** Alternate Governor from Panama of Inter-
national Monetary Fund and International
Bank, 1947
Governor of International Bank, 1951-54
Governor of International Monetary Fund,
1951-59
Ambassador to U.S. and Permanent Representative
of Panama to O.A.S., 1951-54
Controller General of Panama, 1954-58

UN service: Commissioner for Technical Assistance, 1959-62
Associate Managing Director, Special Fund, since
1962.

HOFFMAN, Paul Grey

(U.S. industrialist and administrator)

Managing Director, Special Fund, since 1959

Born: 26 April 1891 in Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

Educated: University of Chicago, 1908-09
(Honorary degrees from several universities including U.C.L.A., Columbia, Harvard, and Yale)

Employment: Began as automobile salesman for the Studebaker Corp., in Los Angeles, 1911
Sales manager, 1915
District manager, 1917
Purchased Los Angeles retail branch, 1919
Vice-President, 1925-33
President, 1935-38
Chairman of the Board, 1953
Chairman of the Board, Studebaker-Packard Corp., 1954-56

Government service: Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, 1948-50
Member, U.S. delegation, General Assembly, 1956-57

UN service: Appointed to head Special Fund when it was established by General Assembly in 1959.

Remarks: Has served as President and Trustee of the Ford Foundation
Is Director of several corporations, including New York Life Insurance Co., Time, Inc., United Air Lines, Inc., and Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.

HOO, Victor Chi-Tsai

(Chinese diplomat)

Commissioner for Technical Assistance since 1962

Born: 16 November 1894 in Washington, D.C., where father served in Chinese legation

Educated: Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques, Paris, Laureate, 1915
Faculty of Law, University of Paris, Licence en droit, 1916
Docteur en droit, political and economic sciences, 1918

Government service: Assistant Secretary, Chinese delegation, Paris Peace Conference, 1918-19
Member, permanent delegation to League of Nations, 1920-22
Section Chief, Chinese legation, Berlin, 1923-24
Charge d'Affaires, Berlin, 1924-25
Section Chief and later Assistant Director, Treaty Department, Foreign Ministry, 1926-28
Director, Department of Asiatic Affairs, Foreign Ministry, 1930-31
Director, Permanent Office of delegation to League of Nations, 1932-42
Charge d'Affaires, Switzerland, 1932-33
Minister at Berne, 1933-42
Vice-Minister, Foreign Ministry, 1942-45
Secretary-General, delegation to UNCIO, 1945

UN service: Chairman, Economic and Social Committee, Preparatory Commission, London, 1946
Assistant Secretary-General for Trusteeship, 1946-54
Under-Secretary for Conference Services, 1955-61
Appointed to present post in 1962.

Remarks: Has seniority in UN service, speaks all five official languages. As Chinese delegate, attended numerous international conferences.

HUTSON, John B.

(U.S. agricultural economist)

Assistant Secretary-General for Administrative and Financial Services, 1946-47

Born: In 1890 in Murray, Kentucky, U.S.A.

Educated: Western Kentucky State Teachers College
Bowling Green University
University of Kentucky, B.A. 1917
University of Wisconsin, M.S.
Columbia University, Ph.D., 1930

Employment: Teaching, 1909-1913
Research in economics and tobacco, 1919-30

Government service: Entered government service, with Department of Agriculture, in 1921
Chief, Tobacco Section, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, 1933-36
Assistant Administrator, A.A.A., 1936-40
Adviser, International Sugar Conference, London, 1936
Deputy Commissioner for Agriculture, National Defense Advisory Commission, 1940-41
President, Commodity Credit Corporation, 1941-45
Director of Food Production, War Food Administration, 1943-45
Under-Secretary of Agriculture, July 1945 to March 1946

UN service: Appointed Assistant Secretary-General for Administrative and Financial Services in April 1946
Resigned in March 1947

Post-UN service: President, Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1947 until his death on 5 May 1964.

Remarks: Widely regarded as an expert on international agricultural problems
Participated in a number of agricultural conferences in Europe and South America
Headed U.S. delegation to the third Inter-American Agricultural Conference, Caracas, 1945
As President of Tobacco Associates, an organization representing the interests of tobacco growers from Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida, he traveled throughout the world and was meeting with tobacco industry officials from Western Europe at the time of his death in Brussels.

JACKSON, Sir Robert Gillman Allen

(Australian civil servant)

Assistant Secretary-General for General Coordination, 1948

Born: In 1911

Educated: Privately, and at Mentone Grammar School, Victoria, Australia

Government service: Royal Australian Navy, 1929-37
Transferred to Malta and Royal Navy, 1937-40
Chief Staff Officer to the Governor and Commander in Chief, Malta, 1940
Commander, Defence Committee, and Officer in Charge, Coordinated Supply Scheme, 1941
Director General, Middle East Supply Centre and Principal Assistant, United Kingdom Minister of State, 1942-45
On loan to Allied Forces Headquarters for special duties with Chief Commanding Officer in Greece, 1944-45
Transferred to His Majesty's Treasury, 1945

UN service: In charge of UN Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Operations, Europe, 1945
Senior Deputy Director General, UNRRA, 1945-47
Supervised transfer of UNRRA residual functions to World Health Organization and Food and Agricultural Organization, 1947
Assisted in establishment of International Refugee Organization and International Children's Emergency Fund, 1947
Appointed Assistant Secretary-General for General Coordination in February 1948, served until August 1948.

Post-UN service: His Majesty's Treasury for duties with Lord President of the Council, 1949
Permanent Secretary, Ministry of National Development, Australia, 1950-52
(Married author Barbara Ward on 16 November 1950)
Adviser to Governments of India and Pakistan on Development Plans, 1952
Chairman of Preparatory Commission, Volta River Multi-purpose Project, Gold Coast, 1953-56
Chairman, Development Commission, Ghana, 1956-61
Special International Consultant on economic development to Ghana Government and Special Adviser to UN Special Fund, since 1961.

Remarks: His appointment as Assistant Secretary-General was for a trial period. In August Lie informed him that the new post could not be fitted into the Secretariat's structure.

KATZIN, Alfred George

(South African industrialist)

Acting Head, Public Information, 1959

Born: 1 February 1906 in Capetown, South Africa.

Educated: Diocesan College, Rondebish, Capetown, 1916-24

Employment: Engaged in industrial and commercial activities in South Africa, 1925-39

Government service: Active duty, first in the South African and later in the British Army, in East Africa, Egypt, Middle East, North Africa, Italy, and the Balkans, 1940-45

UN service: Deputy Director-General for finances and administration, European region, UN Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, 1945
Chief, executive office, UNRRA, 1946-47
Special Assistant of the Secretary-General, 1948-49
Coordinator, UNICEF, 1949
Personal Representative of the Secretary-General to the UN Commission, the Unified Command, and the Republic of Korea, Korea, 1950
Director, Bureau of Personnel, 1954
Appointed Acting Head, Public Information, upon Bokhari's death in December 1958, retained that post until appointment of Tavares de Sa in May 1960
Served as Executive Secretary of the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of Less Developed Areas, in 1962

Retired on 1 July 1963, for health reasons.

KEENLEYSIDE, Hugh Llewellyn

(Canadian diplomat)

Director General, Technical Assistance Administration, 1955-58

Born: 7 July 1898 in Toronto, Canada

Educated: University of British Columbia, B.A., 1920
Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts,
M.A., 1921; Ph.D., 1923
University of British Columbia, Doctor of Laws,
1945

Employment: Lecturer in History at various U.S. universities
and at University of British Columbia,
1923-27

**Government
service:**

Served with Canadian Field Artillery and 2nd
Canadian Tank Battalion in First World War
With Canadian diplomatic service, 1928-47:
Third Secretary, Department of External Affairs,
1928
Second Secretary, 1929, and First Secretary,
1929-36, at Canadian Legion, Tokio
Chairman, Board of Review investigating illegal
entry of Orientals into British Columbia,
1938
Secretary, Inter-Department Committee handling
Royal Tour, 1939
Member, Canadian-U.S. Joint Economic Committee,
1940-44
Acting Chairman, Canada-U.S. Permanent Joint
Board of Defence, 1944
Ambassador to Mexico, 1944-45
Member, Canadian delegation, UN, 1946
Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources and
Commissioner of the North-West Territories,
1947-50
Head, Canadian delegation to the first UN
Scientific Conference on Conservation and
Utilization of Resources, Lake Success,
1949
Deputy Minister of Resources and Development,
January to October 1950

UN service: Director, Technical Assistance Administration,
1950-55
Director-General, with rank of Under-Secretary,
TAA, 1955-58
Director, Office of Public Administration, 1959-

KERNO, Ivan Stephen

(Czechoslovakian diplomat)

Assistant Secretary-General in Charge of the Department of Legal Affairs, 1946-52

Born: 26 September 1891 in Myjara, Czechoslovakia

Educated: University of Paris, Doctor Juris, 1919
University of Prague, Doctorate in political science, 1919
University of Paris, degree of Barrister and Judge, 1920

Government service:

Adviser and member, Czechoslovak delegation to Peace Conference, Paris, 1919-20
First Secretary, Czechoslovak Legation, Paris, 1920-21
Czechoslovak Representative, Permanent Court of Justice, The Hague, 1923
Member, Political Section, League of Nations, 1928-39
Member of the Cabinet of the Secretary-General, LN, 1930-33
Minister to the Netherlands, 1934-38
Chief, Political Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Prague, 1938 (when the Germans occupied Czechoslovakia, he escaped with his family and remained in hiding in occupied France for almost five years, where he was active as a member of the Resistance)
Member, Czechoslovak delegation, UNCIO, 1945
Permanent Representative, UN, London, 1946

UN service: Appointed Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Legal Affairs on 4 March 1946
Retired on 26 September 1952, his sixty-first birthday
Named Chairman of the Review Board of the UN, 1952-56

Remarks: Upon his retirement in 1952, Kerno announced he would remain in the United States and would acquire U.S. citizenship
He remained active in legal circles as an expert in international law until his death in New York on 15 April 1961.

KISELEV, Evgeny Dmitrievich

(Soviet diplomat)

Under-Secretary for Security Council Affairs, 1962-63

Born: 28 July 1908 in Solikamsk, U.S.S.R.

Educated: Moscow Institute of National Economy

Employment: Engineer-economist in the mining industry in
the Urals

**Government
service:**

Entered diplomatic service in 1937
 Consul General, Königsberg
 Consul General, New York
 Political adviser with rank of Minister and High
 Commissioner on the Allied Commission in
 Austria, 1945
 Head, Department of Balkan Countries, Soviet
 Foreign Ministry, 1948-49
 Ambassador to Hungary, 1949-54
 Head, Protocol Department, Soviet Foreign
 Ministry, 1954-55
 Ambassador to Egypt, 1955-59
 Head, Near East Department, Soviet Foreign
 Ministry, 1959-62

UN service: Appointed effective 15 March 1962 to succeed
 Arkadyev; died of heart ailment in New York
 on 17 April 1963

Remarks: Kiselev was Soviet Ambassador in Cairo during
 the Suez crisis and conveyed word of support
 to Nasser, including the offer of Soviet
 combat volunteers. The crisis ended, under
 U.S. and U.S.S.R. pressure, before any
 volunteers arrived
 In February 1959, Kiselev signed agreement on
 aid to U.A.R. on construction of Aswan Dam.

LALL, Snamaldharee

(Indian civil servant)

Assistant Secretary-General for Conference and General Services, 1950-54

Born: October 1894 in Bhagalpur, Bihar, India.

Educated: St. Xavier's College, Calcutta
Scottish Church College, Calcutta
Exeter College, Oxford, B.A. (with honors), 1917
I.C.S. examination, England, 1918

Government service: Probationer, I.C.S., England, 1919
Joined service in Provinces of Bihar and Orissa, India, in 1920
Sub-director, district and settlement work, 1920-24
Under-Secretary, Financial Department, Government of Bihar and Orissa, 1924-25
Department of Industries and Labor, Government of India, 1925-28
Secretary and Adviser, Indian delegation, 10th Session, I.L.O., 1926
Deputy Secretary, 1928, and Joint Secretary, Royal Commission on Labor in India, 1929-32
District Magistrate and Collector, Bihar, 1932
Director of Industries, Bihar and Orissa, 1933-34
Secretary, Education and Development Department, 1935-38
Acting High Commander in U.K. for India, 1938-43
Joint Secretary, Department of Labor, Indian Government, 1944
Additional Secretary, 1945
Secretary, Ministry of Labor, 1946-49
Served as Indian representative at various international conferences and on the governing body of the I.L.O., and as its Chairman, 1949-50

UN service: Appointed Assistant Secretary-General in 1950, dropped when Hammarskjold's reorganization plan went into effect 1 January 1955

Post-UN service: Chairman, Air Transport Council, Government of India, 1955---

LAUGIER, Henri

(French scientist)

Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs, 1946-51

Born: 5 August 1888 at Mane, Basses-Alpes, France

Educated: Faculty of Medicine and Science, University of Paris, docteur en medicine et docteur en sciences
Holds high French university diploma: the aggregation de science

Employment: Professor of the Physiology of work, National Conservatory of Arts and Crafts, University of Paris, 1929-38
Director, National Center of Scientific Research, 1938-40
Professor of Physiology, University of Montreal, 1940-43
Rector of the Academy in Algiers, 1943-44
Also taught at Universities of Sao Paulo, Lima, and Mexico City
A founder of the New School for Social Research, New York

Government service: Director, Cultural Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1944-46
Chairman, French delegation to UNESCO Conference, London, 1945

UN service: Appointed first Assistant Secretary-General to head Department of Social Affairs effective 4 March 1946
Resigned on 14 April 1951

Post-UN service: Returned to his Chair as Professor of Physiology at the Sorbonne
Is now listed as "ancien Recteur d'universite".

LOUTFI, Omar

(Egyptian lawyer and diplomat)

Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs, 1962-63

Born: In Cairo, Egypt in 1908

Educated: Faculty of Law, Cairo University

Government
service:

Joined Ministry of Justice as state attorney,
1930

Appointed Judge, 1944

Assistant Counselor, Egyptian State Council
(citizens' court of appeals on actions
against the government), 1946

Legal Counselor, Egypt's delegation, UN,
1949-53

Head, Department of International Organizations
and Legal Affairs, Foreign Ministry, 1953-55

Representative to UN, 1954

Permanent Representative of Egypt to UN, 1955-58

Permanent Representative of U.A.R. to UN,
1958-61

UN service: Legal Adviser, UN Mission to Libya (helped
draft its first constitution), 1950
Appointed Under-Secretary for Special Political
Affairs effective 1 January 1962
Appointed to take over temporarily the Depart-
ment of Security Council Affairs, April
1953
Died of a heart attack at Headquarters on
17 May 1963

Remarks: In 1953, he was one of the Egyptian delegates
who helped negotiate the 1954 British-
Egyptian treaty under which the British
agreed to leave their Suez Canal base
In 1956, he represented his country in the Suez
debate in the Security Council, arising from
the entry of British, French, and Israeli
forces into Egypt after President Nasser
had seized the Canal.
As Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs,
he had principal responsibilities for
developments in the field of disarmament,
where his legal background was of special
value
He was one of the aides who accompanied Thant
to Cuba during the Caribbean crisis of 1962.

McDIARMID, John

(U.S. political scientist)

Acting Director of Personnel, 1957-59

Born: 11 August 1911 in Beckley, W. Va., U.S.A.

Educated: Texas Christian University, M.A. in political science and history, 1932
University of Chicago, Ph.D. in public administration and political science, 1936

Employment: Instructor in Government, Texas Christian University, 1932-33
Instructor in Politics, Princeton University, 1936-38
Assistant Professor of Public Administration, University of Southern California, 1938-42
Associate Professor of Political Science, U.S.C., 1945-46

Government service: Research Assistant, National Resources Board, Washington, 1935
With U.S. Civil Service Commission, 1942-45
Civil Service Representative, War Agencies, 1942-43
Assistant Chief, Examination and Personnel Utilization Division, 1943-45

UN service: Consultant, Bureau of Personnel, 1946
Assistant Chief, Appointments and Staff Relations Division, 1946-49
Chief, Policy Training and Examinations Division, 1949-53
Deputy Director, Personnel, 1954-57
Acting Director of Personnel, from late 1957 to early 1959
Senior Director, Technical Assistance Board, since 1959.

MacFARQUHAR, Alexander

(British civil servant)

Director of Personnel, since 1962.

Born: 6 November 1903 in Scotland

Educated: Aberdeen University, M.A. (first class honors,
classics)
Cambridge University

Government
service: Entered Indian Civil Service in 1926
Deputy Commissioner, Ferozepore, 1930-33
Deputy Commissioner, Amritsar, 1933-36
Settlement Officer, Amritsar, 1936-40
Deputy Secretary to the Government of
India, 1941-42
Deputy Director-General, Directorate-General
of Supply, India, 1943-45
Director-General, Disposal, 1946-47
Commerce and Education Secretary, Government
of Pakistan, 1947-51

UN service: Resident Representative of UN Technical
Assistance Board, Pakistan, 1952-55
Regional Representative of Technical
Assistance Board to Far East, Bangkok,
1955-60
Special Adviser to Secretary-General for
Civilian Affairs in the Congo, 1960-62
Appointed Director of Personnel in 1962.

NARASIMHAN, Chakravarthi V.

(Indian civil servant)

Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs, since 1962

Born: In 1915 in Srirangam, India

Educated: University of Madras
Oxford University

Government
service: Entered I.C.S. in 1936
Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, 1950
Chief, Land Reclamation, Central Tractor
Organization, 1951-53
Member, Economic Affairs Department, Ministry
of Finance, 1953-56
Coordinator of Foreign Assistance, Colombo
Plan, 1955

UN service: Executive Secretary, UN Economic Commission
for Asia and Far East, 1957-58
Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs,
1959-61
Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs
and Chef de Cabinet, since 1962.

NOSEK, Jiri

(Czechoslovakian diplomat)

Under-Secretary for Conference Services, since 1962

Born: In 1911 in Cercany, Czechoslovakia

Educated: Graduate School of Economics and Political
Science, Prague

Government
service: Adviser to Czechoslovak delegation, UN, 1947
Alternate Representative, GA, 1948-49
Acting Permanent Representative, GA, 1950-53
Permanent Representative, with rank of
Ambassador, UN, 1953-54
Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs, Prague,
1955-56
Ambassador to India and Ceylon, 1956-59
Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, Prague,
1959-61

UN service: Appointed Under-Secretary for Conference
Services, effective 18 January 1962

Remarks: Has attended every session of the UN General
Assembly since 1947
Has served as Chairman of three of the Assem-
bly's main Committees: Second, Third, and
Fifth.

OWEN, Arthur David Kemp

(British economist and diplomat)

Executive Chairman, Technical Assistance Administration,
since 1952

Born: 26 November 1904 in Pontypool, South Wales.

Educated: Leeds University

Employment: Assistant Lecturer, Economics, Huddersfield
Technical College, 1926-29
Stevenson Lecturer in Citizenship, Glasgow
University, 1937-40

Government
service:

Secretary, Social Division, Political and
Economic Planning, 1933-36
Co-Director, Pilgrim Trust Unemployment Inquiry,
1936-37
Director, Political and Economic Planning,
1940-41
Personnal Assistant to Sir Stafford Cripps,
Lord Privy Seal, 1942
Member, Cripps Mission to India, 1942
Ministry of Aircraft Production, 1942-43
Officer in Charge of League of Nations Affairs,
Foreign Office Reconstruction Department,
1943-45
Foreign Office Observer, I.L.O. Conference,
Philadelphia, 1944
Member, British Delegation, Dumbarton Oaks
Conference, 1944
Member, British Delegation, UNCIO, 1945
Deputy Executive Secretary, Preparatory
Commission for UN, 1945

UN service: Executive Assistant to the Secretary-General,
from February to April, 1946
Appointed Assistant Secretary-General in charge
of the Department of Economic Affairs in
March 1946
Chairman, Technical Assistance Board, 1949-52
Executive Chairman, Technical Assistance
Administration, since 1952.

PATE, Maurice

(U.S. businessman)

Executive Director, UNICEF, since 1947

Born: 14 October 1894 in Pender, Nebraska, U.S.A.

Educated: Princeton University, B.A., 1915

Employment: Financial and sales work, Standard Oil Co. of
New Jersey, in Poland, 1922-27
Import and banking business, own firm, 1927-35
Investment banker and director, natural gas and
machine tool companies, New York, 1935-39

Government
service:

Assistant Director, American Relief Administra-
tion, Poland, 1919-22
President, Commission for Polish Relief, 1939-41
Director, American Red Cross Relief to Prisoners
of War, 1941-46
Accompanied Herbert Hoover on world-wide food
surveys, 1946

UN service: Appointed Executive Director of the United
Nations International Children's Emergency
Fund in January 1947
His office was given Under-Secretary status in
1955.

PELT, Adrian

(Dutch diplomat)

Assistant Secretary-General for Conference and General Services, 1946-49

Born: 8 May 1892 near Amsterdam, Holland

Educated: Ecole libre des Sciences politiques, Paris, 1916-19

Employment: Journalist, Amsterdam, 1909-15
London correspondent, 1915-16
Paris correspondent, 1916-19
Foreign sub-editor of Dutch newspaper, 1919-20

League of Nations service:

Member, Information Section, LN Secretariat, Geneva, 1920-23
Assigned to the League's High Commission for the financial reconstruction of Austria, 1922-24
Assigned to on-the-spot mission to study Danube navigation, 1925
Assigned to the High Commissioner for the settlement of refugees in Greece, 1926
Represented the Secretary-General at League's Epidemiological Office meeting in Bandung, Java,
Deputy Secretary-General, Lord Lytton's mission to inquire into Mukden incident in Manchuria, 1932
Director, Information Section, 1933-40
Reorganized League's Information Office in Bombay, 1936
Resigned upon Nazi invasion of the Netherlands to work for his own Government

Government services:

Head, Netherlands Information Bureau, London, 1940-45
Member, Netherlands Delegation, UNCIO, 1945

UN service:

Appointed Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Department of Conference and General Services in February 1946
UN Commissioner to Libya, 1950-52
Director, UN European Office, Geneva, 1952-58

Post-UN service:

Secretary-General, World Federation of UN Associations, 1958-63; President, since 1963.

PRICE, Byron

(U.S. journalist)

Assistant Secretary-General for Administrative and Financial Services, 1947-54

Born: 25 March 1891 in Topeka, Indiana, U.S.A.

Educated: Wabash College, B.A., 1912
Harvard University, M.A., 1946

Employment: In newspaper work, Crawfordsville and Indianapolis, 1902-12
Reporter and editor, United Press Association, Chicago, 1912
With Associated Press, 1912-41:
News Editor, Washington Bureau, 1922-27
Chief, Washington Bureau, 1927-37
Executive News Editor, Associated Press, 1937-41
Vice-President, Motion Picture Association, 1945
Chairman of the Board, Motion Picture Producers Association, 1946-47

Government service: U.S. Director of Censorship, 1941-45

UN service: Appointed on 19 February 1947 to succeed Hutson as Assistant Secretary-General for Administrative and Financial Services
Retired on 27 January 1954.

PROTITCH, Dragoslav

(Yugoslav diplomat)

Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs, since 1963

Born: In 1902

Educated: Belgrade University, LL.B.
Brussels Free University, D.Sc.

Government service: Financial attache, Yugoslav Legation, Brussels, 1923-26
Attache, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Belgrade, 1926-28
Secretary to Yugoslav Legation, Vienna, 1928-29
Secretary to Yugoslav Legation, London, 1929-33
First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Belgrade, 1933-35
Director of Cabinet of Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1936-38
Counsellor, Foreign Ministry, Belgrade, 1938-40
Counsellor, Yugoslav Legation, Athens, 1940-41
Counsellor, Yugoslav Legation, Cairo, 1941-42
Counsellor, Yugoslav Legation, London and Charge d'affaires of Yugoslavia to The Netherlands, 1942-46

Also Participated in many international conferences: with Yugoslav Delegation to League of Nations, 1927 and 1928
With Yugoslav Delegation to Conferences of Little Entente and Balkan Entente, in 1933, 34, 36, 37, and 38
As representative of Yugoslavia to Allied Conference of Ministers of Education, 1944-45
And as Yugoslav delegate to UNESCO Conference, 1945

UN service: Director, Administrative and General Division, Department of Security Council Affairs, 1946-55
Was Acting Head of the Department in 1952-53
Under-Secretary for Security Council Affairs, 1955-57
Under-Secretary for Trusteeship, 1957-62
Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs, since 20 June 1963.

ROBERTSON, John Archibald Campbell

(British civil servant)

Director of Personnel, 1954-57

Born: 21 November 1912

Educated: St. John's College, Cambridge (first class honors)

Government service: Administrative class, Home Civil Service, 1935
India Office, 1935-36
Private Secretary to Financial Secretary, 1939-40
Private Secretary to Permanent Secretary, 1943-45
Assistant Secretary, Treasury, 1945-48
Home Civil Service, Commonwealth Fund Fellow, 1949-50
Under-Secretary, Treasury, 1951-54

UN service: Appointed Director of Personnel on 13 December 1954
Resigned in 1957

Post-UN service: Director, Organizations and Methods, Treasury, since 1958.

SOBOLEV, Arkady Aleksandrovich

(Soviet diplomat)

Assistant Secretary-General for Security Council Affairs,
1946-48

Born: In 1903 in St. Petersburg, now Leningrad,
U.S.S.R.

Educated: Electrotechnical Institute, Leningrad, gradu-
ated in 1930

Employment: Research work in connection with the develop-
ment of power plant equipment, 1930-39

Government service: Entered diplomatic service in 1939 as Secre-
tary, Soviet Foreign Ministry
Member, Soviet diplomatic mission, Bulgaria,
1940
Counselor with rank of Minister, Soviet Embassy,
London, 1942-44
Special envoy, Dumbarton Oaks Conference, 1944
Member, Soviet Delegation, Potsdam, 1945
Chief, Political Section, Soviet Military Mis-
sion, Berlin, 1945

UN service: Appointed Assistant Secretary-General for Se-
curity Council Affairs on 17 February 1946
Left for Moscow in January 1949 on leave of
absence because of illness in his family,
Resigned for the same reason on 26 March 1949

Post-UN service: Director, American Department, Soviet Foreign
Ministry, 1949-51
Ambassador to Poland, 1951-53
Director, American Department, Soviet Foreign
Ministry, 1954
Deputy Permanent Representative, UN, 1954
Permanent Representative, UN, 1955-60
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
Foreign Ministry, since 1960.

STAVROPOULOS, Constantin Anghelos

(Greek jurist)

Legal Counsel, with Under-Secretary rank, since 1955

Born: 15 August 1905 in Athens, Greece

Educated: University of Athens, Faculty of Law, diploma
with honors, 1928
London School of Economics

Employment: Private legal practice, 1919-33 and 1936-39

Government
service: Secretary-General and Acting Governor-General
of Epirus, 1933-36
Legal Adviser, Royal Greek Embassy, London,
1941-46
President, Greek Maritime Court in Great Britain,
1942-46
Greek Representative, UN War Crimes Commission,
1943-46
Legal Adviser, Greek Delegation to UN Preparatory
Commission, 1946
Legal Adviser, Greek Delegation, GA, London, 1946

UN service: Legal Counselor, Department of Legal Affairs,
1946-49
Deputy Director, Division of Development and
Codification of International Law, 1949
Senior Legal Adviser, UN Palestine Commission,
1948
Principal Secretary, UN Commission for the Uni-
fication and Rehabilitation of Korea, and
Personel Representative of the Secretary-
General, 1950-51
Principal Director and Acting Head, Department
of Legal Affairs, 1952-55
Appointed Legal Counsel with status equivalent
to Under-Secretary, effective on 1 January
1955.

SUSLOV, Vladimir

(Soviet diplomat)

Under-Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs,
since 1963

Born: In 1923

Educated: Moscow State Institute of Foreign Relations,
graduated in 1948

Government service: First Secretary, Soviet Delegation, UN, 1953-55
Adviser, International Organizations Department,
Soviet Foreign Ministry, 1955-57
Adviser on political questions, Soviet Dele-
gation, UN, 1957-61
Senior Assistant, Minister of Foreign Affairs,
Moscow, 1961-63

UN service: Appointed on 21 May 1963 to succeed Kiselev
who died on 17 April 1963.

TAVARES DE SA, Hernane

(Brazilian educator and journalist)

Under-Secretary for Public Information, since 1960

Born: 7 January 1911 in Natal, state of Rio Grande
de Norte, Brazil

Educated: Colegio Salesiano, Recife
In Italy and the United States
University of Louvain, Belgium, M.D. (with honors)
in 1935

Employment: Professor of Genetics and Biology, University of
Sao Paulo, 1938-43
Surveyed higher education systems in the U.S.,
sponsored by Institute of International
Education, in 1942
Special Advisor, U.S. Office of Coordinator of
Inter-America Affairs (Nelson Rockefeller),
1943-44
Professor, School of Journalism, Catholic Uni-
versity of Rio de Janeiro, 1952-57
Editor-in-Chief, Visao (Brazilian weekly news
magazine), 1957-60.

Joined the Secretariat of the Organization of
American States as Head of the Public Rela-
tions Division in 1948

During 1950 and 1951, he was Special Assistant
to the Secretary-General of the O.A.S.

He has lectured at more than 100 U.S. universi-
ties, represented Brazil at numerous in-
ternational conferences, and served with
the joint U.S.-Brazilian Economic Develop-
ment Commission

UN service: Appointed Under-Secretary for Public Information
on 10 May 1960.

TCHERNYCHEV, Ilya Semenovich

(Soviet diplomat)

Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs, 1955-57

Born: In August 1912, near Taskhent, U.S.S.R.

Educated: Moscow University, degree in History, 1940

Government service: Entered Foreign Service, 1940
 Attache, Soviet Embassy, Berlin, 1940-41
 With Europe and Middle East Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1941-44
 Soviet Embassy, Stockholm, first with rank of Counsellor, then in charge of the Mission as Minister, 1944-47
 Deputy Chief, Tass, 1947-52

UN service: Under-Secretary for Security Council Affairs, 1953-54
 Appointed Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs, effective 1 January 1955
 Resigned in 1957

Post-UN service: Deputy Chief, U.S.S.R. Foreign Cultural Relations Committee, 1957-62
 In February 1962, he was appointed Soviet Ambassador to Brazil to re-establish the diplomatic mission that had been closed when relations were broken in 1947
 On 22 October 1963, while swimming off Barra de Tijuca beach near Rio de Janeiro, he suffered a fatal heart attack.

Remarks: For his first Under-Secretary appointments, Hammarskjold, with whom he had played tennis frequently in Stockholm, selected Tchernychev from a list of three candidates submitted by the Soviet Union.

TREVELYAN, Sir Humphrey

(British civil servant and diplomat)

Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs, 1957-58

Born: 27 November 1905

Educated: Cambridge University

Government service: Entered Indian Civil Service, 1929
 Indian Political Service, 1932-47
 Political agent of the Indian States, Washington, 1944
 Joint Secretary to Government of India in External Affairs Department, 1946
 Retired from Indian Political Service and entered Foreign Service, 1947
 Counsellor at Baghdad, 1948
 Economic and Financial Adviser, U.K. High Commissioner for Germany, 1951-53
 Charge d'Affairs in Peking, 1953-55
 Ambassador to Egypt, 1955-56

UN service: Appointed Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs on 14 December 1957
 Resigned on 27 December 1958

Post-UN service: Ambassador to Iraq, 1958-61
 Deputy Under-Secretary of State, Foreign Office, 1962
 Ambassador to the U.S.S.R., since 1962.

TURNER, Bruce

(New Zealand civil servant)

Controller, with Under-Secretary rank, since 1955

Born: In 1914

Educated: University College in Arts and Commerce, Canterbury, New Zealand

Government service: On staff of the Minister of Finance and Deputy Prime Minister of New Zealand, 1936-41
Secretary, New Zealand Trade and Lend Lease Mission to the U.S., 1941
Staff, New Zealand Legation, Washington, 1942-46
Delegate and Adviser, New Zealand Delegation, UNCIO, 1945

UN service: With Secretariat since 1946
Executive Officer, Department for Administrative and Financial Services, 1952-55
Appointed Controller, effective 1 July 1955, to succeed Andersen, who had resigned earlier that year.

VAUGHAN, David

(U.S. government administrator)

Director, Office of General Services, since 1955

Born: 6 August 1910 in Louisa, Kentucky, U.S.A.

Educated: New York University, 1930-34
American University, 1935-36
Columbus Law School, 1931-38

Employment: With Irving Trust Co., 1928-35

Government service: Assistant Director of Finance, Farm Security Administration, 1935-39
Director of Personnel, Surplus Marketing Administration, 1939-40
Assistant Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration, 1942-44

UN service: Director of Administrative Management, UN Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, 1944-45
Principal Director, Department of Conference and General Services, 1946-49
Acting Head, Conference and General Services, 1949-50
Principal Director, 1950-55
Appointed Director, Office of General Services, with Under-Secretary rank, effective 1 January 1955.

ZINCHENKO, Konstantin Emelianovitch

(Soviet diplomat)

Assistant Secretary-General for Security Council Affairs,
1949-53

Born: In 1909 in Yeisk, Krasnodar Region, Russia

Educated: Mining Academy in Moscow, 1931
Further study of technical sciences, 1931-38

Government service: Entered foreign service in 1940
Counselor, Soviet Embassy, London, 1942-44
Successively: Head, Press Bureau, Soviet
Foreign Ministry
Second European Division and Latin American
Division, Foreign Ministry, 1945-48
First Counselor, Permanent Delegation, UN,
1948-49

UN service: Appointed on 28 April 1949 to fill the vacancy
created by the resignation of Sobolev
Left for Moscow on home leave in June 1952
In December 1952 the U.S. announced it had
notified its Embassy in Moscow not to
permit the return of Zinchenko's personal
assistant, Nikolai Skvortsov, who was
accused of espionage
Zinchenko's home leave was first extended to
a long "sick leave"
Later, several weeks after his name had been
taken off the UN payroll, his resignation
was presented and accepted on 26 May 1953.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This concluding chapter summarizes the biographical data presented in the preceding chapter, outlines the trends such data suggest respecting the top echelon of the Secretariat of the United Nations, and presents a number of general propositions based upon the patterns found.

Although as a pioneer survey this study is perforce largely descriptive in character, a series of theoretical statements are here presented as hypotheses that need further exploration and that could be tested empirically by future students of international administration. These necessarily tentative propositions are based not only on the data collected for this study, but also upon certain political scientists' writings and upon a number of interviews with high-ranking members of the Secretariat.

The Secretaries-General

Since the Secretary-General heads and represents the entire United Nations Secretariat, it is appropriate to begin by considering the three incumbents of that office. All received university educations; two earned law degrees. All three were fluent in the two United Nations "working" languages (English and French). Each had served his country in either the foreign or civil service before achieving the top

United Nations post. Each had previously participated in General Assembly meetings, serving as chairman of his country's delegations. All were elected only after considerable debate and lengthy consideration of other candidates by the Security Council, where each of the Permanent Members has veto power. Thus, the limited data available to date would indicate that the principal characteristics of Secretaries-General include: (1) membership in own national elite; (2) university education and degrees; (3) government or diplomatic experience of relatively non-controversial nature; (4) previous participation in United Nations activities; and (5) the "right" geographical and political affiliation to secure the approval or, at least, avoid the disapproval of the top Security Council Powers.

In addition, if speculation be permitted, one may hypothesize that providing the United Nations continues its activities in an even greater variety of international areas, an important quality for candidacy will be extreme diplomatic skill and capacity for intensive work under pressure. Moreover, a reputation for forcefulness will probably continue to be considered detrimental. Finally, it seems highly probable that future Secretaries-General will continue to come from nations not closely allied with either of the two Super-Powers.

The Under-Secretaries

The officials directly responsible to the Secretary-General are the Under-Secretaries. In 1964, there were

thirty-four such officials, divided into three groups: (I) those at Headquarters; (II) those at established offices overseas; and (III) those in charge of missions or special assignments. The following statements are based primarily upon analysis of data concerning Group I, which has included since 1946 a total of forty-three officials.

Increase in numbers is perhaps the first observable feature at the Under-Secretary level in the Secretariat. In 1946, there were eight Under-Secretaries (they were then known as Assistant Secretaries-General). When Hammarskjöld's major reorganization plan went into effect in 1955, the number of Under-Secretaries almost doubled; fifteen officials were given Under-Secretary rank. By 1964, the number of Under-Secretaries had doubled again to a total of thirty-four. Thus, the present number represents more than four times the original figure of eight.

Although in theory the Secretary-General has a great deal of freedom in appointing members of the Secretariat, political realities and the Charter have imposed restrictions on his appointive power, particularly with regard to the top echelon. One of the elements contributing to the increase in the number of Under-Secretaries has been the proliferation of United Nations activities, with the corresponding increase in Secretariat responsibility, specialization, and involvement. A second element has been the increase in membership of the Organization and the accompanying demands for a broader geographical distribution of Secretariat posts.

The number of nationalities included in the Secretariat has increased steadily, keeping pace with the growth in membership of the Organization. For instance, in 1960 there were eighty-two Member States, and seventy-two nationalities in the Secretariat. Early in 1963, the number of Member States had increased to 111, and the number of nationalities in the Secretariat to ninety-eight.

A breakdown of the forty-three officials by major regions reveals that the geographical distribution has been broadened continuously under each of the three Secretaries-General. During the period under study here, from 1946 to 1964, a total of twenty-one countries have contributed to the Secretariat's top echelon, as indicated in the table below.

TABLE 1

U.N. UNDER-SECRETARIES: DISTRIBUTION BY COUNTRY OF ORIGIN,
1946-64

United States.....8	China.....1
U.S.S.R.....7	Denmark.....1
United Kingdom.....5	Greece.....1
France.....5	The Netherlands....1
Czechoslovakia.....2	New Zealand.....1
India.....2	Nigeria.....1
U.A.R.....2	Panama.....1
Australia.....1	Pakistan.....1
Brazil.....1	South Africa.....1
Canada.....1	Yugoslavia.....1
Chile.....1	Total = 43

Several elements help to explain the fact that the two Super-Powers head the list in Table 1: (1) the Soviet Union's practice of permitting her nationals to hold Secretariat appointments for only about two years, with the resulting

larger turnover; (2) the United States' size, role as host country, and established bureaucratic tradition, enabling her to make a large contribution of officials for administrative posts in several major agencies whose heads have been given Under-Secretary rank; and (3) the obviously dominant positions in world affairs enjoyed by the two Super-Powers.

An analysis of the geographical distribution at the Under-Secretary level at nine-year intervals illustrates the Secretary-Generals' attempts to recruit members for the top echelon on a widening geographical basis, largely in response to the demands and pressure of those nations considering themselves underrepresented. For official purposes, the United Nations divides the world into seven major regions: Africa; Asia and the Far East; Eastern Europe; Western Europe; Latin America; Middle East; and North America and the Caribbean. The seventh region includes Canada, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United States. These seven regions will be used in Table 2 below to illustrate the progress made in achieving a more widespread regional composition at the top echelon of the Secretariat.

The following major findings emerge from Table 2. In 1946, none of the Under-Secretaries came from Africa or the Middle East. The same was true in 1955; however, the number of officials from Asia and the Far East had by then increased from one to three. By 1964, there was at least one Under-Secretary at Headquarters from each of the world's seven major regions.

T A B L E 2a

U.N. UNDER-SECRETARIES: GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION, 1946, 1955, and 1964

Year	Total Number	Africa No. %	Asia and Far East No. %	Eastern Europe No. %	Western Europe No. %	Latin America No. %	Middle East No. %	North America & Caribbean No. %
1946	8	- -	1 12.5	2 25.0	3 37.5	1 12.5	- -	1 12.5
1955	15	- -	3 20.0	2 13.5	4 26.6	1 6.6	- -	5 33.3
1964	18	1 5.5	3 16.6	3 16.6	4 22.2	2 11.1	1 5.5	4 22.2

T A B L E 2b

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION, 1946

Asia & Far East	Eastern Europe	Western Europe	Latin America	North America & Caribbean
CHINA Hoo, Trusteeship Affairs	CZECHOSLOVAKIA Kerno, Legal Dept.	UNITED KINGDOM Owen, Economic Affairs	CHILE Cohen, Public Info.	UNITED STATES Hutson, Administrative Affairs
	U.S.S.R. Sobolev, Security Council	FRANCE Laugier, Social Affairs		
		THE NETHERLANDS Pelt, Conference & General Services		
1	2	3	1	1

T A B L E 2c

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION, 1955

Asia & Far East	Eastern Europe	Western Europe	Latin America	North America & Caribbean
CHINA Hoo, Conference Affairs	YUGOSLAVIA Protitch, Political & Security Council	FRANCE de Seynes, Economic & Social Affairs	CHILE Cohen, Trusteeship Affairs	UNITED STATES Bunche, Special Political Affairs
PAKISTAN Bokhari, Public Info.	U.S.S.R. Tchernychev, Special Political Affairs	GREECE Stavropoulos, Legal Counsel		UNITED STATES Cordier, Exec. Assistant to Sec.-General
NEW ZEALAND Turner, Controller		UNITED KINGDOM Robertson, Dir. Personnel		UNITED STATES Vaughan, Dir., General Services
		UNITED KINGDOM Owen, Exec. Chmn. Tech. Asst Bd.		CANADA Keenleyside, Director-General, Tech. Asstce Adm.
				UNITED STATES Pate, Exec. Dir., UNICEF
3	2	4	1	5

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION, 1964

	Africa	Asia & Far East	Eastern Europe	Western Europe	Latin America	Middle East	North, America & Caribbean
NIGERIA	CHINA	U.S.S.R.	FRANCE	BRAZIL	U.A.R.	U.S.	
Amachree	Hoo, Dir. Gen.,	Suslov,	de Seynes,	Tavares de Sa,	Abdel-Rahman,	Bunche	
Trusteeship	TAA	Political and	Economic &	Public Info.	Industrial	Special	
Affairs		Security Council	Social Affairs		Development	Political	
	INDIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	GREECE	PANAMA		U.S.	140
	Narasimham,	Nosek,	Stavropoulos,	Huertematte		Vaughan,	
	General	Conference	Legal Counsel	Associate Dir.		General	
	Assembly	Services		Special Fund		Services	
	NEW ZEALAND	YUGOSLAVIA	UNITED KINGDOM			U.S.	
	Turner,	Protitch,	McFarquhar,			Pate,	
	Controller	Special	Director,			Exec. Dir.,	
		Political	Personnel			UNICEF	
			UNITED KINGDOM			U.S.	
			Owen, Exec.			Hoffman,	
			Chmn., Technical			Mng. Dir.,	
			Assistance Board			Special	
						Fund	
1	3	3	4	2	1	4	

It seems very likely that the pressure for Under-Secretary positions on the part of the newer nations, or of those not yet represented, will not only continue but increase. As the number of agencies and activities of the United Nations system multiplies, the number of Under-Secretaries will probably increase. Within the Secretariat staff, the proportion of positions held by the Big Powers may be expected to decline as nationals from the emerging nations move up the promotional ladder. Relatedly, it may be anticipated that the experienced Under-Secretaries from such Security Council nations as the United States and China--four of the five now over sixty years old--will not necessarily be replaced by fellow nationals but possibly by nationals from the emerging nations.

A series of tables below summarizes the data presented in Chapter Three. Table 3 lists the Assistant Secretaries-General from 1946 through 1954, indicating their departments and countries of origin. Table 4 lists the Under-Secretaries from 1955 through 1964, indicating their respective departments and countries of origin. Table 4 also lists officials appointed to positions having Under-Secretary rank during 1955-64, indicating their offices, titles, and countries of origin.

T A B L E 3a

UNITED NATIONS SECRETARIAT : TOP LEVEL OFFICERS, 1946-54

SECRETARY-GENERAL	Lie Hammaraskjold - February 1946 to April 1953 - April 1953 to September 1961			
Assistant Secretaries-General in charge of the Departments of:	1946	1947 and 1948	1949	1950 1951 1952 1953 1954
Security Council Affairs	Sobolev (USSR)	Sobolev	Zinchenko ³	Zinchenko Tchernychev ⁵
Economic Affairs	Owen (UK)	Owen	Owen	Owen Georges-Picot ⁶
Social Affairs	Laugier (France)	Laugier	Laugier	Georges-Picot Georges-Picot
Trusteeship ¹	Hoo (China)	Hoo	Hoo	Hoo
Public Information	Cohen (Chile)	Cohen	Cohen	Cohen
Legal Affairs	Kerno (Czechoslovakia)	Kerno	Kerno	Stavropoulos ⁷ (Greece)
Conference and General Services	Pelt (The Netherlands)	Pelt ⁴	Lall (India)	Lall
Administrative and Financial Services	Hutson (US)	Price ² (US)	Price	Price ⁸
General Coordination	(Jackson appointed on 8 January 1948; post abolished on 28 August 1948.)			

UNITED NATIONS SECRETARIAT - TOP-LEVEL OFFICERS, 1946-54

¹Complete official title of this Department is "of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories".

²Hutson resigned on 9 January 1947. Price was appointed on 19 February 1947.

³Sobolev left for the Soviet Union in January 1949 on leave because of illness in his family. He resigned on 28 March 1949 for that reason. Zinchenko was appointed on 28 April 1949.

⁴Pelt was appointed UN Commissioner to Libya on 10 December 1949. Vaughan of the U.S., who had been Director of the Department of Conference and General Services since 1946, was named Acting Assistant Secretary-General in charge of this Department on 17 December 1949. He served in that capacity until Lall's appointment on 13 January 1950.

⁵Zinchenko's resignation was accepted on 26 May 1953. Tchernychev was appointed to complete Zinchenko's unfinished term to expire on 1 February 1954. From 9 July 1952 upon Zinchenko's departure for Moscow on home leave, until the arrival of Tchernychev on 30 June 1953, Protitch of Yugoslavia, a Director in the Department since 1946, was in charge of the Department of Security Council Affairs.

⁶Owen, who had been Chairman of the Technical Assistance Board since 1949 concurrently with his position as Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs, assumed the Executive Chairmanship of the Board on 1 August 1952. On that date, Georges-Picot became head of the Department of Economic Affairs, while continuing to head the Department of Social Affairs.

⁷Kerno retired on 26 September 1952. Stravopoulos, who was appointed Principal Director on 1 December 1952, became Acting Head of the Department of Legal Affairs. He retained that position until 1 January 1955 when he was appointed Legal Counsel with Under-Secretary rank.

⁸The Department of Administrative and Financial Services was abolished in the major reorganization of 1955. Price had retired on 27 January 1954.

T A B L E 4a

UNITED NATIONS SECRETARIAT : TOP-LEVEL OFFICERS, 1955-64

SECRETARY-GENERAL	Hamarskjold - April 1953 to September 1961				
	Thant - November 1961 to present				
Under-Secretaries in charge of the Departments of:	1955 and 1956	1957	1958	1959	1960 and 1961
Political and Security Council	Protitch (Yugoslavia)	Protitch Dobrynin	Dobrynin	Arkadev (USSR)	Kiselev (USSR)
Economic and Social Affairs	de Seynes de Seynes (France)	de Seynes de Seynes	de Seynes de Seynes	de Seynes de Seynes	Suslov (USSR)
Trusteeship	Cohen (Chile)	Cohen	Protitch	Protitch	Protitch
Public Information	Bokhari (Pakistan)	Bokhari	Bokhari	Katzin ³ (South Africa)	Tavares de Sa
Conference Services	Hoo (China)	Hoo	Hoo	Hoo	Nosek (Czechoslovakia)
Without Department ¹	Bunche (US)	Bunche	Bunche	Bunche	Bunche
Without Department ¹	Tchernychev (USSR)	Dobrynin (USSR)	Trevelyan (UK)	Narasimhan (India)	Narasimhan (UAR)
General Assembly ² Affairs	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -

T A B L E 4a--Continued

Secretariat Officers with rank equivalent to Under-Secretary:	1955 1956 1957	1958	1959 1960 1961	1962	1963 1964
Executive Assistant to the SG	Cordier ⁵ (US)	Cordier	Cordier	Narasimhan ⁹ (India)	Narasimhan
Legal Counsel	Stavropoulos (Greece)	Stavropoulos	Stavropoulos	Stavropoulos	Stavropoulos
Controller	Turner ⁶ (New Zealand)	Turner	Turner	Turner	Turner
Director of Personnel	Robertson (UK)	McDiarmid ⁷ (US)	Hamilton (UK)	MacFarquhar (UK)	MacFarquhar
Director, Office of General Services	Vaughan (US)	Vaughan	Vaughan	Vaughan	Vaughan
Director General, TAA	Keenleyside (Canada)	Keenleyside	Heurtematte (Panama)	Hoo (China)	Hoo
Executive Director, UNICEF	Pate (US)	Pate	Pate	Pate	Pate
Executive Chairman, Technical Assistance	Owen (UK)	Owen	Owen	Owen	Owen
Managing Director, UN Special Fund	- - - -	- - - -	Hoffman ⁸ (US)	Hoffman	Hoffman
Associate Managing Dir., UN Special Fund	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	Heurtematte ¹⁰	Heurtematte
Commissioner for Industrial Dev.	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	Abdel-Rahman ¹¹ (UAR)

UNITED NATIONS SECRETARIAT : OFFICERS WITH UNDER-SECRETARY RANK, 1955-64

¹Title changed to Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs in 1963.

²Office established in 1962, includes position of Chef de Cabinet.

³Bokhari died on 5 December 1958; Katzin was Acting Head until appointment of Tavares de Sa on 10 May 1960.

⁴The title of the Director General of the TAA (Technical Assistance Administration) was changed to Commissioner for Technical Assistance when the TAA was placed under the Department of Economic Affairs effective 31 July 1959.

⁵Cordier had been serving in this capacity since 1946; however, it was not until 1955 that his position was officially given Under-Secretary rank.

⁶Andersen of Denmark, who had been Principal Director of the UN Bureau of Finance since 1946, was originally appointed Controller in January 1955, but resigned the following month.

⁷McDiarmid of the U.S. was Acting Director of Personnel from late 1957 to early 1959.

⁸The UN Special Fund was established in 1959 by General Assembly resolution; Hoffman was appointed its first Managing Director.

⁹Narasimhan was appointed by Thant to succeed Cordier who had been appointed Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs, a position he was to hold for only a few months. Narasimhan has been Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs and Chef de Cabinet since 1962.

¹⁰Heurtematte was appointed to the new position of Associate Managing Director, UN Special Fund, on 1 January 1962.

¹¹Abdel-Rahman was appointed to the new position of Commissioner for Industrial Development in June 1963.

The data show that in 1946 the first Secretary-General drew heavily from candidates who had had previous diplomatic experience, and especially on those who had participated in the preparatory work for the United Nations. Of the eight original Assistant Secretaries-General, seven had either been associated with the League of Nations, or had been participants at Dumbarton Oaks or San Francisco, or were in London as delegates. Some qualified in more than one category. The principal experience of the one exception (Hutson) was of an administrative nature. Although he was appointed precisely to head the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, it may be significant that he was the first to resign, remaining in office less than one year.

With regard to the major characteristics of the entire group of forty-three, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. Sex. All forty-three were males. This may be due partly to the lack of qualified available women, but undoubtedly also to the fact that in many areas of the world the rise of women to a status equal with men is still unaccomplished. As the equalization process spreads and as better-prepared women rise to distinguished posts in their own countries, the probability of having a woman Under-Secretary increases. It may be anticipated that, with the support of Article 8 of the Charter, the Secretary-General will sometime appoint a woman of proven capacity to a high Secretariat position.

2. Age. The average age of the Under-Secretaries when appointed was fifty. The youngest were appointed at

thirty-seven (Jackson) and at thirty-nine (Dobrynin), while the oldest were appointed to that rank at sixty-eight (Hoffman) and at sixty-one (Pate). The age average is increased considerably by the several officials older than sixty-five, most of whom are national of Western Europe and of the United States. It may be surmised that the age average will be lowered as officials from the new nations become available and reach Under-Secretary status.

3. Previous experience in public administration. With one single exception, that of a prominent Brazilian educator and journalist who had served at the OAS Secretariat (Tavares de Sa), each of the forty-three Under-Secretaries had had when appointed, either diplomatic or civil service experience, or had served at the UN, either as his own country's representative or as a member of the lower echelons of the Secretariat.

TABLE 5

PREVIOUS PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE OF THE
43 U.N. OFFICIALS WITH UNDER-SECRETARY RANK,
TO 1964

Category	Total Number of Officials	% of 43
National Civil Service	30	69.7
Diplomacy	18	41.8
UN Experience, General Assembly	12	27.8
UN Experience, Secretariat	12	27.8

thirty-seven (Jackson) and at thirty-nine (Dobrynin), while the oldest were appointed to that rank at sixty-eight (Hoffman) and at sixty-one (Pate). The age average is increased considerably by the several officials older than sixty-five, most of whom are national of Western Europe and of the United States. It may be surmised that the age average will be lowered as officials from the new nations become available and reach Under-Secretary status.

3. Previous experience in public administration. With one single exception, that of a prominent Brazilian educator and journalist who had served at the OAS Secretariat (Tavares de Sa), each of the forty-three Under-Secretaries had had when appointed, either diplomatic or civil service experience, or had served at the UN, either as his own country's representative or as a member of the lower echelons of the Secretariat.

TABLE 5

PREVIOUS PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE OF THE
43 U.N. OFFICIALS WITH UNDER-SECRETARY RANK,
TO 1964

Category	Total Number of Officials	% of 43
National Civil Service	30	69.7
Diplomacy	18	41.8
UN Experience, General Assembly	12	27.8
UN Experience, Secretariat	12	27.8

Table 5 adds up to more than forty-three and more than 100 % because some officials qualify in more than one category. In addition to the twelve listed as having had experience in the General Assembly, four served as representatives there after they had completed their Secretariat tenure. The predominance of officials with civil service experience may be explained partly through the broad nature of this category. A breakdown by individuals is presented in Table 6.

4. Education. Of the forty-three, apparently only two (Hoffman and Jackson) did not complete higher educational programs. An impressive 95.3% of the Under-Secretaries earned university degrees. Furthermore, the available data indicate that at least ten, or 32.2%, earned doctorates; that at least nine, or 20.9%, hold law degrees; and that at least nine, or 20.9%, earned their degrees with honors. Many of them have also received honorary degrees, although these have not been tabulated here. A breakdown, by individuals, of educational institutions attended is presented in Table 7.

On the basis of this evidence, it seems reasonable to suppose that university education will continue to be considered essential for Under-Secretaries. As the number of such officials from the newer nations increases, so will the number and variety of educational institutions represented. Of potentially great significance is the probability that officials from the emerging nations will often have been educated outside their own countries. If the theory that cross-cultural education and international travel foster an international outlook be correct, future Under-Secretaries could well have an even broader **international outlook than those of the present generation.**

T A B L E 6

PREVIOUS PUBLIC-ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE OF THE 43 U.N.
OFFICIALS WITH UNDERSECRETARY RANK, TO 1964

Name	Diplomacy	United Nations	Other Government Service
1. Abdel-Rahman			X
2. Amachree		Secretariat	X
3. Andersen		Secretariat	X
4. Arkadyev	X	GA (after)	
5. Bokhari		GA	X
6. Bunche		UNCIO, Sec.	X
7. Cohen	X	GA (after)	
8. Cordier		UNCIO, Sec.	X
9. de Seynes	X	GA	X
10. Dobrynin	X	GA	
11. Georges-Picot	X	GA (after)	
12. Hamilton			X
13. Heurtematte	X		X
14. Hoffman		GA	X
15. Hoo	X	UNCIO, GA	
16. Hutson			X
17. Jackson			X
18. Katzin		Secretariat	X
19. Keenleyside	X	GA	X
20. Kerno	X	UNCIO, GA	
21. Kiselev	X		
22. Lall			X
23. Laugier			X
24. Loutfi		GA	X
25. McDiarmid		Secretariat	X
26. MacFarquhar		Secretariat	X
27. Narasimhan		Secretariat	X
28. Nosek	X	GA	
29. Owen	X	UNCIO	X
30. Pate			X
31. Pelt		UNCIO	X
32. Price			X
33. Protitch	X	Secretariat	
34. Robertson			X
35. Sobolev	X	GA (after)	
36. Stavropoulos		GA, Secretariat	X
37. Suslov	X	GA	
38. Tavares de Sa	-	- - - - -	-
39. Tchernychev	X		X
40. Trevelyan	X		X
41. Turner		UNCIO, Sec.	X
42. Vaughan		Secretariat	X
43. Zinchenko	X	GA	

T A B L E 7

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ATTENDED BY THE 43 U.N.
OFFICIALS WITH UNDER-SECRETARY RANK, TO 1964
(Degrees earned indicated if available)

1. Abdel-Rahman	Cairo U.; Cambridge (Ph.D.); Leiden U.
2. Amachree	King's C., Lagos; Higher C., Yaba; London U.; Cambridge U.; (LL.B.)
3. Andersen	Copenhagen U. (LL.B.)
4. Arkadyev	Moscow Economic Institute
5. Bokhari	Punjab U., Lahore (M.A.); Cambridge U. (B.A., honors; M.A., first class honors)
6. Bunche	UCLA (B.A., <u>cum laude</u>); Harvard U. (M.A., Ph.D.)
7. Cohen	U. of Chile (Ph.D.); Georgetown U. (M.S., <u>magna cum laude</u>)
8. Cordier	Manchester C., Indiana (B.A.), U. of Chicago M.A., Ph.D.)
9. de Seynes	U. of Paris (Licencie en droit, diplome d'etudes superieures en droit)
10. Dobrynin	A technological college (M.A., history)
11. Georges-Picot	U. of Paris (Licencie en droit)
12. Hamilton	Aberdeen U. (M.A., first class honors)
13. Heurtemattee	Yale U.
14. Hoffman	U. of Chicago (No earned degree)
15. Hoo	U. of Paris (Licencie en droit, Docteur en droit)
16. Hutson	U. of Kentucky (B.A.); U. of Wisconsin (M.A.); Columbia U. (Ph.D.)
17. Jackson	Privately educated
18. Katzin	Diocesan C., Capetown
19. Keenleyside	U. of British Columbia (B.A.); Clark U., Mass. (M.A., Ph.D.)
20. Kerno	U. of Paris; U. of Prague (Ph.D.)

T A B L E 7-Continued

21. Kiselev	Moscow Institute of National Economy
22. Lall	St. Xavier's C., Calcutta; Oxford (B.A., with honors)
23. Laugier	U. of Paris (Docteur en medicine et docteur en sciences)
24. Loutfi	Cairo U. (LL.B.)
25. McDiarmid	Texas Christian U. (M.A.); U. of Chicago (PhD.)
26. MacFarquhar	Aberdeen U. (M.A., first class honors); Cambridge U.
27. Narasimhan	U. of Madras; Oxford U.
28. Nosek	Graduate School of Political Science, Prague
29. Owen	Leeds U.
30. Pate	Princeton U. (B.A.)
31. Pelt	Ecole libre des sciences politiques, Paris
32. Price	Wabash C. (B.A.); Harvard (M.A.)
33. Protitch	Belgrade U. (LL.B.); Brussels U. (D.Sc.)
34. Robertson	Cambridge U. (B.A., first class honors)
35. Sobolev	Electrotechnical Institute, Leningrad
36. Stavropoulos	Athens U. (Law diploma, with honors); London School of Economics
37. Suslov	Moscow State Institute of Foreign Relations
38. Tavares de Sa	Colegio Salesiano, Recife; U. of Louvain, Belgium (M.D., with honors)
39. Tchernychev	Moscow U.
40. Trevelyan	Cambridge U.
41. Turner	University C., Canterbury, New Zealand
42. Vaughan	NYU, American U., Columbus Law School
43. Zinchenko	Mining Academy of Moscow

5. Principal previous occupations. While the varied professional interests and activities of the Under-Secretaries make it difficult to classify concisely their principal occupations before joining the Secretariat, it is possible to classify them loosely according to four major categories. In Table 8 the forty-three officials are distributed according to the following principal occupations: (1) diplomats; (2) civil servants; (3) educators; and (4) industrialists. The table lists the number of officials contributed to each major professional category by major regions or nations.

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF U.N. OFFICIALS OF UNDER-SECRETARY RANK, TO 1964,
BY REGIONAL ORIGINS AND PRINCIPAL OCCUPATIONS

	Commonwealth	United States	U.S.S.R.	Western Europe	Eastern Europe	Latin America	U.A.R.	China	Totals	Percentage
Diplomats	5	-	7	2	3	1	1	1	20	46.4
Civil Servants	7	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	13	30.3
Educators	-	3	-	1	-	1	1	-	6	13.9
Industrialists	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	4	9.4
Totals	13	8	7	6	3	3	2	1	43	100.0

T A B L E 9

U.N. OFFICIALS OF UNDER-SECRETARY RANK, TO 1964, BY PRINCIPAL
OCCUPATION AND LAST OFFICE PREVIOUS TO APPOINTMENT

Name	PO*	Position held immediately previous to Under-Secretary appointment
1. Abdel-Rahman	E	Director, National Planning, U.A.R.
2. Amachree	CS	Officer i/c UN Operations, Congo
3. Andersen	CS	Director, Finance Bureau, UN
4. Arkadyev	D	Soviet delegate, UN
5. Bokhari	D	Pakistani delegate, UN
6. Bunche	E	Adviser, U.S., London, 1946
7. Cohen	D	Head, Information Section, PC, 1946
8. Cordier	E	Head GA Section, PC, 1946
9. de Seynes	CS	Adviser, French delegation, UN
10. Dobrynin	D	Adviser, Soviet delegation, UN
11. Georges-Picot	D	French Ambassador, Argentina
12. Hamilton	CS	Asst. Under-Sec. of State, U.K.
13. Heurtematte	I	Controller General, Panama
14. Hoffman	I	Member, U.S. delegation, UN
15. Hoo	D	Head, ECCSOC Section, PC, 1946
16. Hutson	CS	Under-Secretary, Agriculture, U.S.
17. Jackson	CS	Director General, UNRRA
18. Katzin	I	Director, Personnel, UN
19. Keenleyside	D	Director, TAA, UN
20. Kerno	D	Czechoslovakian delegate, London, 1946
21. Kiselev	D	Head, Near East, USSR Foreign Ministry
22. Lall	CS	Secretary, Ministry of Labor, India
23. Laugier	E	Director, Cultural Relations, France
24. Loutfi	D	Head, U.A.R. delegation, GA
25. McDiarmid	E	Deputy Director, Personnel, UN
26. MacFarquhar	CS	Adviser to S-G in Congo, UN
27. Narasimhan	CS	Executive Secretary, ECAFE
28. Nosek	D	Deputy Foreign Minister, Yugoslavia
29. Owen	CS	Exec. Asst. to Secretary-General, UN
30. Pate	I	Director, Red Cross Relief
31. Pelt	D	Dutch delegation, GA, 1946
32. Price	CS	Chairman, Motion Picture Association
33. Protitch	D	Director, Security Council Dept., UN
34. Robertson	CS	Under-Secretary, Treasury, U.K.
35. Sobolev	D	Soviet Military Mission, Berlin
36. Stravopoulos	CS	Director, Legal Affairs Dept., UN
37. Suslov	D	Assistant, Minister Foreign Affairs
38. Tavares de Sa	E	Editor-in-Chief, Visao
39. Tchernychev	D	Deputy Chief, Tass
40. Trevelyan	D	British Ambassador, Egypt
41. Turner	CS	Exec. Officer, Administrative Services
42. Vaughan	CS	Director, Conference & General Services
43. Zinchenko	D	Counselor, USSR delegation, UN

*Principal Occupation: E-Educator, CS-Civil Servant,
D-Diplomat, I-Industrialist.

Tables 8 and 9 show that of the forty-three Under-Secretaries thirty-three, or 76.7%, had careers in government service---either as diplomats or as civil servants. Each of the ten officials from the Soviet "bloc" (seven from the Soviet Union and three from Eastern Europe) who has been appointed Under-Secretary has been a member of the Foreign Service. While the Soviet "bloc" thus scored 100% in the category of diplomats, the United States' nationals thus far appointed Under-Secretaries have included not a single member of the Foreign Service. One theory of international administration holds that members of a Foreign Service, obliged by their occupation to appear very nationalistic in outlook, encounter additional difficulties in serving as international civil servants.

It seems likely that for the immediate future, most of the new Under-Secretaries will be drawn from the four major categories now prevalent. The number of civil servants---particularly of those experiencing service in international or quasi-international agencies---probably will grow. For the most part, of course, the newer nations do not have established Foreign Services from which to draw potential Secretariat members. Therefore, their candidates will most likely come from among other elements of their educated elites, such as the intelligentsia, those who have participated in the world-wide activities of the United Nations agencies, and low-ranking members of their delegations to the General Assembly. Since high-ranking members of delegations to the Assembly already enjoy great prestige and high status---not to mention

considerable influence in government and United Nations policy---they may not be interested in Secretariat positions, unless their natural inclination be toward the international civil service.

6. Language skills. Each of the Under-Secretaries was fluent in at least two of the United Nations' five official languages. One (Hoo) was fluent in all five and another (Cohen) was proficient in Spanish, English, French, Italian, and Portuguese.

Future Under-Secretaries may be expected to have the ability to speak, write, and understand at least the two "working" languages and one of the other three official languages. It is even possible that a candidate otherwise qualified may fail to be appointed largely for lack of language ability.

7. Reasons for leaving office. Twenty-five of the forty-three Under-Secretaries have left office during the period under study here. Most of them resigned, though three were transferred within the United Nations system and two were dropped when reorganization plans were put into effect.

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF U.N. OFFICIALS OF UNDER-SECRETARY RANK,
TO 1964, BY REASONS FOR LEAVING OFFICE

Total Number	Resigned No.	%	Transferred No.	%	Dropped No.	%	Retired No.	%	Died No.	%
25	14	56.0	3	12.0	2	8.0	3	12.0	3	12.0

Table 10 indicates that three Under-Secretaries died in office. Three others retired. The fourteen who resigned constitute 56.0% of the twenty-five who have left office since 1946. The table below indicates the types of activity which these fourteen entered upon departure from the Secretariat.

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF U.N. OFFICIALS OF UNDER-SECRETARY RANK, TO 1964,
BY POST-SECRETARIAT OCCUPATION

Total Number	Foreign Service		Civil Service		Private Business		UN-related Activities		Education	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
14	7	50.0	2	14.3	2	14.3	1	7.1	2	14.3

8. Length of tenure of office. Sixteen (64.0%) of the twenty-five who have left office served for periods between one and three years. While one (Andersen) served for only one month, another (Cohen) held the rank of Under-Secretary for more than ten years. The longest tenure is held by one of the incumbents (Hoo), who has held Under-Secretary status since he was originally appointed in 1946.

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF U.N. OFFICIALS OF UNDER-SECRETARY RANK, TO 1964,
ACCORDING TO PERIOD IN OFFICE

Total Number	Less than one year		1-3 years		3-5 years		More than five years	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
25	2	8.0	16	64.0	3	12.0	4	16.0

As indicated in Table 13, the five Soviet nationals who were Under-Secretaries and resigned returned to the Soviet Foreign Office. Of the two United States nationals who resigned, one entered private business and the other returned to educational activities.

TABLE 13

U.N. OFFICIALS OF UNDER-SECRETARY RANK, TO 1964: LENGTH OF TENURE OF OFFICE AND REASON FOR LEAVING

Name	Yrs. ¹	R ²	Next Position Held
Andersen	1 mo.	R	With Denmark Insurance Co.
Arkadyev	2	R	Counselor, Soviet F.O.
Bokhari	3		Died in Office
Cohen	10	R	Exec. Sec., World Fed. UN Assns.
Cordier	6	R	Dean, Columbia School Intl. Affrs.
Dobrynin	3	R	Head, American Dept., Soviet F.O.
Georges-Picot	3	R	French Ambassador to Mexico
Hamilton	3	R	British Asst. Secretary of State
Hutson	1	R	Pres., Tobacco Associates Inc.
Jackson	6 mo.	D	With His Majesty's Treasury
Katzin	1		Retired
Keenleyside	3	T	Dir., UN Office of Public Admin.
Kerno	6		Retired
Kiselev	1		Died in office
Lall	4	D	Chmn., India Air Transport Council
Laugier	5	R	Professor of Physiology, Paris
Loutfi	1		Died in office
McDiarmid	1	R	Sr. Dir., Technical Assistance Bd.
Pelt	3	T	UN Commissioner to Libya
Price	6		Retired
Robertson	3	R	Dir., Organizations, H.M. Treasury
Sobolev	3	R	Head, American Dept., Soviet F.O.
Tchernychev	4	R	Chief, F.O. Cultural Relations
Trevelyan	1	R	H.M. Ambassador to Iraq
Zinchenko	3	R	Soviet F.O.

¹Approximate figures given.

²The reasons for leaving office are: R-Resigned; D-Dismissed; and T-Transferred, besides Retirement and Death in Office.

9. Summary. The data show that higher education has been a major requirement to achieve a top position in the Secretariat. Experience at a high level in diplomacy, public administration and other forms of government service was also found to have been valuable. Previous participation in United Nations activities also has been frequent among Under-Secretaries. Knowledge of official languages is, and will continue to be, essential.

With the growing realization that global responsibilities are best discharged by officials with global outlooks and interests, it seems likely that, in addition to the characteristics already listed, emphasis will be placed upon such hard-to-measure characteristics as cross-cultural educational experience, international travel, a broad awareness of world affairs, and perhaps most important of all, the possession of an international outlook and of a responsible loyalty to the ideals of the United Nations.

To conclude with a final hypothetical formulation: If present trends continue, the Secretariat's top levels will be selected mainly from those with diplomatic and international experience, and are likely to come in increasing proportions from the emerging nations. Furthermore, it may be surmised from the data collected for this study that were a world political elite ever to be formed, many of the administrators, at least, within its membership might be drawn from among those who had had high-level experience within the United Nations.

The officials here studied and their successors would certainly seem, in view of the contacts and the experiences inherent in their offices, to be good prospects for membership in such a supra-national elite.

S E L E C T E D B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Reference

- American Men of Science: The Social and Behavioral Sciences.
10th ed. Tempe, Arizona: The Jacques Cattell Press,
Inc., 1962.
- The Asia Who's Who. 3rd ed. Hong Kong: Pan-Asia Newspaper
Alliance, [1960].
- Biographic Directory of the U.S.S.R. New York: Scarecrow
Press, Inc., 1958.
- The Canadian Who's Who. Vol. IX. Toronto: Trans-Canada
Press, 1963.
- Current Biography. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company,
[1946-1964].
- The International Who's Who. 28th ed. London: Europa
Publications Ltd., 1964.
- The New York Times. 1946-1964. New York: The New York
Times Co.
- The Times of India (Directory and Yearbook including Who's
Who, 1963-64). London: Bennet, Coleman & Co, Ltd.,
[1963].
- Who's Who. London: Adam and Charles Black, [several volumes
consulted].
- Who's Who in America. Chicago, Ill.: The A. N. Marquis
Company, [several volumes consulted].
- Who's Who in Australia. Melbourne: Colorgravure Publications,
1955.
- Who's Who in Canada. Toronto: International Press Limited,
1962.

Who's Who in France. 6^e Edition. Paris: Editions Jacques Lafitte, 1963.

Who's Who in Latin America. Seven volumes. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1948.

Who's Who in Modern China. Hong Kong: Ye Olde Printerie, Ltd., 1954.

Who's Who in the Netherlands. New York: The Intercontinental Book and Publishing Co. Ltd., 1963.

Who's Who in New Zealand. Wellington: A. H. & A. W. Reed, 1961.

Who's Who in U.A.R. and the Near East. Cairo: J. E. Blattner, 1959.

Who's Who in the U.S.S.R. Montreal: Intercontinental Book and Publishing Co. Inc., 1962.

Who Was Who. Vol. V (1951-1960). London: Adam and Charles Black, 1961.

Who's Who in the United Nations. Yonkers-on-Hudson, N.Y.: Christian E. Burckel & Associates, 1951.

Who Was Who in America. Vol. III (1951-1960). Chicago: The A. N. Marquis Co., 1963.

World Biography. 5th ed. Bethpage, N.Y.: Institute for Research in Biography, Inc., 1954.

Yearbook of the United Nations. 1946-1963. New York: Columbia University Press (in cooperation with the United Nations).

Books

Bailey, Sidney. The Secretariat of the United Nations. New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1962.

Bowett, D. W. The Law of International Institutions. New York: Praeger, 1963.

Cecil, Viscount (Lord Robert Cecil). A Great Experiment. New York: Oxford University Press, 1941.

Choate, Joseph H. The Two Hague Conferences. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1913.

- Claude, Inis L., Jr. Swords Into Plowshares: The Problems and Progress of International Organization. 2d ed., rev. New York: Random House, 1963.
- Cohen, Benjamin V. The United Nations: Constitutional Developments, Growth and Possibilities. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Davis, Harriet Eager (ed.). Pioneers in World Order: An American Appraisal of the League of Nations. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944.
- Dehio, Ludwig. The Precarious Balance: Four Centuries of the European Power Struggle. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Duggan, Stephen Pierce (ed.). The League of Nations: The Principle and the Practice. Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1919.
- Dunn, Frederick Sherwood. Peaceful Change: A Study of International Procedures. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1937.
- Eagleton, Clyde. International Government. 3rd ed. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1957.
- Eichelberg, Clark Mell. United Nations: The First Fifteen Years. New York: Harper, 1960.
- Foote, Wilder (ed.). Servant of Peace: A Selection of the Speeches and Statements of Dag Hammarskjöld. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Goodrich, Leland M. and Hambrow, Edvard. Charter of the United Nations: Commentary and Documents. Revised ed. Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1949.
- Hartmann, Frederick H. (ed.). Basic Documents of International Relations. New York: MacGraw Hill Book Co., 1951.
- Hemleben, Sylvester John. Plans for World Peace through Six Centuries. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1943.
- Hill, Norman L. International Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1931.
- _____. International Organization. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.
- _____. The Public International Conference: Its Function, Organization and Procedure. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1929.

- Holls, Frederick W. The Peace Conference at The Hague: and Its Bearings on International Law and Policy. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1900.
- Hull, William I. The Two Hague Conferences and Their Contribution to International Law. Boston: Ginn and Co.,
- Jenks, C. Wilfred. The Proper Law of International Organizations. Dobbs Ferry, N.J.: Oceana Publications, 1962.
- Kelsen, Hans. The Law of the United Nations: A Critical Analysis of Its Fundamental Problems. London: Stevens and Son, 1951.
- Langrod, Georges. The International Civil Service: Its Origins, Its Nature, Its Evolution. Leyden: A. W. Sythoff, 1963.
- Lash, Joseph P. Dag Hammarskjold: Custodian of the Brush-fire Peace. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1961.
- Lie, Trygve. In the Cause of Peace. New York, Macmillan, 1954.
- Loveday, A. Reflections on International Administration. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Malik, Charles. Man in the Struggle for Peace. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Mangone, Gerard J. A Short History of International Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- Matthews, Donald R. The Social Background of Political Decision-Makers. New York: Random House, 1954.
- Miller, Richard I. Dag Hammarskjold and Crisis Diplomacy. New York: Oceana Publications, 1961.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace. 3rd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
- Myers, Dennis P. Handbook of the League of Nations. Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1935.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951.
- Ranshofen-Wertheimer, Egon F. The International Secretariat: A Great Experiment in International Administration. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1945.

- Rappard, William E. The Geneva Experiment. London: Oxford University Press, 1931.
- Robson, William A. (ed.). The Civil Service in Britain and France. London: The Hogarth Press, 1956.
- Royal Institute of International Affairs. The International Secretariat of the Future. London: Oxford University Press, 1944.
- Rubinstein, Alvin Z. The Soviets in International Organizations: Changing Policy Toward Developing Countries, 1953-1963. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- Sayre, Wallace S. The United Nations Secretariat. New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1950.
- Schwebel, Stephen M. The Secretary-General of the United Nations: His Political Powers and Practice. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Scott, James Brown (ed.). Texts of the Peace Conference at The Hague, 1899 and 1907. Boston: Guinn & Co., 1908.
- _____. The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907. Two volumes. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1909.
- Sly, John Fairfield. The Genesis of the Universal Postal Union: A Study of the Beginnings of International Organization. New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1927.
- Walters, F. P. A History of the League of Nations. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Webster, C.K. The League of Nations in Theory and Practice. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1933.
- Young, Tien-Cheng. International Civil Service: Principles and Problems. Brussels: International Institute of Administrative Sciences, 1958.
- York, Elizabeth. Leagues of Nations: Ancient, Medieval and Modern. London: Swarthmore Press, 1928.
- Zimmern, Sir Alfred. The League of Nations and the Rule of Law. 2d ed., revised. London: Macmillan and Co., 1939.

Articles

- Aghnides, Thanasis. "Standards of Conduct of the International Civil Servant," Revue internationale des sciences administratives, XIX, No. 1 (1953), 179-187.
- Bjorklund, Sven. "Training for International Civil Service," Columbia Journal of International Affairs, II, No. 2 (1948), 14-23.
- Booth, David A. "The United Nations, the United States, and the International Civil Service," Revue internationale des sciences administratives, XXI, No. 4 (1955), 703-740.
- Cohen, Maxwell. "The United Nations Secretariat: Some Constitutional and Administrative Developments," American Journal of International Law, II, No. 3 (1955), 295-319.
- Cordier, Andrew W. "The Role of the Secretary-General," in Annual Review of United Nations Affairs (New York: New York University Press, 1961), 1-14.
- Crocker, Walter R. "Some Notes on the United Nations Secretariat," International Organization, IV, No. 4 (1950), 598-613.
- Dallin, Alexander. "The Soviet View of the United Nations," International Organization, XVI, No. 1 (1962), 20-31.
- Davies, J.G.W. "The Work of the Secretariat," in Annual Review of United Nations Affairs (New York: New York University Press, 1962), 135-156.
- Drummond, Sir Eric. "The Secretariat of the League of Nations," Public Administration, IX, No. 2 (1931), 228-235.
- Evans, Archibald A. "Characteristics of an International Organization," Public Administration, XXIII, No. 1 (1945), 31-38.
- Goodrich, Leland M. "From League of Nations to United Nations," International Organization, I, No. 1 (1947), 3-21.
- _____. "Geographical Distribution of the Staff of the United Nations Secretariat," International Organization, XVI, No. 3 (1962), 465-482.
- _____. "The Political Role of the Secretary-General," International Organization, XVI, No. 4 (1962), 720-735.

- Hamilton, T. J. "The United Nations and Trygve Lie," Foreign Affairs, XXIX, No. 1 (1950), 67-77.
- Hoffmann, Stanley. "The Role of International Organization: Limits and Possibilities," International Organization, X, No. 3 (1956), 357-372.
- Hogg, R. D. "The Secretariat," in Annual Review of United Nations Affairs (New York: New York University Press, 1953), 120-137.
- Honing, Frederick. "The International Civil Service: Basic Problems and Contemporary Difficulties," International Affairs (London), XXX, No. 2 (1954), 175-185.
- Howe, John M. "The Geographical Composition of International Secretariats," Columbia Journal of International Affairs, II, No. 2 (1948), 46-56.
- Howell, W. and Fowler, D. "Personnel Programs of International Organizations," Public Personnel Review, XXVII, No. 4 (1956), 281-287.
- Jackson, Elmore. "The Developing Role of the Secretary-General," International Organization, XI, No. 3 (1957), 431-445.
- Jenks, C. Wilfred. "Constitutional Problems of International Organizations," The British Yearbook of International Law, XXII (1945), 11-72.
- _____. "Coordination in International Organization: An Introductory Survey," The British Yearbook of International Law, XVIII (1951), 29-89.
- _____. "Some Problems of an International Civil Service," Public Administration Review, III, No. 2 (1943), 93-105.
- _____. "University Preparation for International Administration," Columbia Journal of International Affairs, XXIII, No. 5 (1948), 5-13.
- Jessup, Philip C. "The International Civil Servant and His Loyalties," Journal of International Affairs, IX, No. 2 (1955), 55-61.
- Kaplan, Robert. "Some Problems in the Administration of the International Secretariat," Columbia Journal of International Affairs, II, No. 2 (1948), 35-45.
- Korovin, Y. "Ways of Reorganizing the U.N. Executive Organs," International Affairs (Moscow), VI, No. 12 (1960), 7-9.

- Kunz, Joseph L. "The Legal Position of the Secretary-General of the United Nations," American Journal of International Law, XL, No. 4 (1946), 786-799.
- Lash, Joseph P. "Dag Hammarskjold's Conception of his Office," International Organization, XVI, No. 3 (1962), 542-566.
- Lengyel, Peter. "Some Trends in the International Civil Service," International Organization, XIII, No. 4 (1959) 520-537.
- Loveday, A. "Staff Salaries in the United Nations Family," International Organization, XI, No. 4 (1957), 635-648.
- Masland, John W. "The Secretariat of the United Nations," Public Administration Review, V, No. 4 (1945), 364-372.
- Molitor, Andre. "Public Administration towards the Future," International Review of Administrative Sciences, XXVII, No. 4 (1961), 381-383.
- Moore, Bernard. "The Secretariat: Role and Functions," in Annual Review of United Nations Affairs (New York: New York University Press, 1949), 21-31.
- Narasimhan, C. V. "Administrative Changes in the Secretariat," in Annual Review of United Nations Affairs (New York: New York University Press, 1962), 1-10.
- Niemeyer, Gerhart. "The Balance-Sheet of the League Experiment," International Organization, VI, No. 4 (1952) 537-558.
- Pelt, Adrian. "Organizing U.N.," Public Administrative Review, VI (1946), 115-129.
- _____. "Peculiar Characteristics of an International Administration," Public Administration Review, VI, No. 2 (1946), 108-114.
- Perry, Clive. "The Secretariat of the United Nations," World Affairs (London), IV, No. 3 (1950), 350-364.
- Phelan, E. J. "The New International Civil Service," Foreign Affairs, XI, No. 2 (1933), 307-314.
- Price, Byron. "Administration: The Secretariat," in Annual Review of United Nations Affairs (New York: New York University Press, 1951), 104-117.

Ranshofen-Wertheimer, Egon F. "International Administration: Lessons from the Experience of the League of Nations," American Political Science Review, XXXVII (1943), 872-890.

_____. "The International Civil Service of the Future," International Conciliation, No. 413 (February 1946), 60-100.

_____. "The Position of the Executive and Administrative Heads of the U.N. International Organizations," American Journal of International Law, XXXIX, No. 2 (1945), 323-330.

Schwebel, Stephen M. "The International Character of the Secretariat of the United Nations," British Yearbook of International Law, XXX (1953), 71-115.

_____. "The Origins and Development of Article 99 of the Charter: The Powers of the Secretary-General," British Yearbook of International Law, XXVIII (1951), 371-392.

Scott, Frank R. "The World's Civil Service," International Conciliation, No. 496 (1954), 259-320.

Sharp, Walter R. "The Study of International Administration: Retrospect and Prospect," World Politics, XI, No. 1 (1958), 103-117.

_____. "Trends in United Nations Administration," International Organization, XV, No. 3 (1961), 393-407.

Swift, Richard N. "Personnel Problems and the United Nations Secretariat," International Organization, XI, No. 2 (1957), 228-247.

Tead, Orway. "The Importance of Administration in International Action," International Conciliation, No. 407 (1955), 7-40.

Turner, Bruce. "The Secretariat," in Annual Review of United Nations Affairs (New York: New York University Press, 1950), 159-177.

Wilson, Joseph V. "Problems of an International Secretariat," International Affairs (London), XX, No. 4 (1944) 542-554.

ROOM USE ONLY

ROOM USE ONLY



MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03196 4046