

I have accepted the invitation of this Board to appear at this hearing in the spirit of courtesy to an official organ of a Member State of the World Health Organization, on whose staff I am employed, and in order that I may clarify further the views expressed in my letter of 17 February 1954 to the Chairman of the Board. As was indicated in the letter inviting me to appear at this hearing, I was addressed in my capacity as an international civil servant, and I am appearing here in that same capacity. Therefore, I hope that it will be understood that any statements I may make are necessarily limited by the proper and normal restrictions imposed by that status of international civil servant.

In the final paragraph of my letter of 17 February 1954 to the Chairman of this Board, I assured him that I have never departed in letter or in spirit from the obligations of the Oath of Office to which I swore when I assumed my post in the World Health Organization in January 1947. That Oath obligates me to perform my duties and to regulate my conduct with the interests of the World Health Organization only in view. This I have done scrupulously and faithfully during the entire period of my employment.

A corollary to this obligation, as I have always understood it, is that an international civil servant subscribing to this Oath shall not take any action at any time which is against the interests of the duly constituted government of any Member State of the World Health Organization, or which is in violation of the laws of the country in which he is stationed. Thus, I feel that it follows from my strict observance of my Oath of Office that I have never in any way committed any improper act, or acted against the interests of any Member State of the World Health Organization.

I cannot but be aware that under Executive Order 10422, as amended, a full field investigation of me has been carried out by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the United States Government. I am absolutely certain that the findings of that investigation cannot fail to corroborate my statement that I have at all times strictly respected my obligations to all Member States of the World Health Organization, and that I have never committed any action whatsoever capable of any reasonable interpretation other than that I am and have been at all times a completely loyal and faithful international civil servant, in respect to my Organization and to all its Member States.

I note that the standard established by the Executive Order is "whether or not on all the evidence there is a reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of the person involved to the Government of the United States". I submit that the results of the field investigation in my case, together with the assertions in my letter of 17 February 1954 regarding my Oath of Office, demonstrate unequivocally that there can be no reasonable doubt whatsoever as to my loyalty to my Organization or to any Member State thereof.

I have been guided at all times by entirely proper motives and especially by respect for the principle of the independence of the international secretariat of the World Health Organization. This principle is enunciated not only in the Oath of Office to which I have

referred but also in Article 37 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization. In ratifying this Constitution, all Member States have also undertaken to respect the independence of the secretariat and subsequently, at the First World Health Assembly, further reaffirmed this principle by defeating a proposal by the delegate of Bulgaria that the Director-General and all members of the staff should be approved by their respective governments. Obviously, then, this principle is not merely unilaterally recognized but guaranteed by all parties concerned; and I should be most regretful if any implications are drawn to the contrary, or if I am placed in the position of appearing to base my attitude upon an ambiguous or disputable principle when in actual fact the principle involved is very precisely articulated and has been very specifically recognized by all parties.

This principle is recognized not only in the forms which I have already mentioned but in the terminology of the Executive Order, as amended, which provides for the transmittal to the executive heads of public international organizations of an advisory opinion regarding staff members of United States nationality, as to their loyalty to the United States of America. I am not aware that my loyalty or my suitability for employment by the World Health Organization has ever been questioned by my Director-General; but a Member State has volunteered to forward to him an advisory opinion and has made me the subject of a full field investigation by the FBI. I am certain that the results of this investigation fully confirm my complete loyalty to my Organization and to the Member State of which I am a citizen as well as all the other Member States.

Thus, I do not consider it incumbent upon me to undertake, in effect, additional vows of loyalty, nor to protest my innocence of any wrongdoing, nor to prove my suitability for employment on the staff of the World Health Organization, in the absence of any consequential evidence or charges suggesting any culpability on my part. I note that the Regulations of this Board stipulate that "strict legal rules of evidence shall not be applied at the hearings" but I cannot conceive that this provision is intended in any degree to weaken or nullify the basic concept of Anglo-Saxon law, that a person is considered innocent until proven guilty, and that the burden of proof is on the accuser -- especially as this solemn concept is part of the very foundation on which the United Nations Charter rests.

The best possible demonstration of my good character and my suitability for my present employment is my long record of service in my Organization, where I am proud to have made some contribution to the objective of the attainment of all people of the highest possible level of health. I am proud also that my Organization has recognized my efforts and my fidelity by offering me promotions three times in succession, and by requesting me on one occasion to remain on the staff rather than to accept another position which had been offered to me. I can assure this Board that such recognition -- indeed, that continued employment on the staff -- would have been impossible had I departed at any time from scrupulous and honourable conduct in respect of my Organization or any of its Member States.

At the same time, I have been accorded, as have all members of the staff of the World Health Organization, respect and privacy with regard to my personal life. After the most serious thought, I am unable to see any justification for enquiries by anybody of authority into my private life or my private relationships with other persons, when these relationships have been completely non-political and in no way conspiratorial for any purpose, as must be reflected in the results of the full field investigation conducted in my case. I have not been informed of any evidence or any charges which can possibly be interpreted as casting doubt upon my character, activities, or loyalty. I do not conceive that there can possibly be such evidence or charges, since I have never supported or committed any action whatsoever in contravention of law and order or in violation of the Constitutions to which I am subject or incompatible with the United Nations Charter and Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

I have the most solemn personal dedication to principle of justice and of human freedom and dignity, as enunciated in these founding documents, including my own freedom and dignity. It is this dedication to principle which has been the basis of all my actions and of this statement. The Board will be aware, I hope, of the consistency of my position at all stages of this matter, and could hardly expect me to abandon principle at this time.

My views on these matters have never been the subject of concealment; I have, in fact, voluntarily and freely expressed myself to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to other officials of this Member State with whom I have been in conversation. However, my expression of views has been voluntary, and I should feel a distinct obligation to resist any compulsion in this respect, especially if it is compulsion for its own sake. I very much hope that the object of this enquiry is not to compel my submission for its own sake, or my surrender of principle for any reason whatsoever. That would be a most grave situation, and it would clearly be my duty as an international civil servant to resist such an invasion of my rights in spite of any resultant personal jeopardy.

Finally, Sir, I believe that this detailed statement, together with the information already available concerning me, give a very clear picture indeed, and one which should not require the addition of any further details. I do not, of course, have any authority to respond to questions put to me in my capacity as an international civil servant regarding my professional duties or associations, or my political views or affiliations. Such responses are clearly prohibited by the regulations which govern the conduct of the staff of the World Health Organization, and I should place myself in jeopardy with respect to my continuing eligibility for employment if, out of a desire to co-operate with this Board, I made such responses.