

## --between the lines—

### EP. 03: Global Citizen from Gulmi - Kul Chandra Gautam

Welcome to *Between the Lines*, a monthly podcast that explores books for a better world, brought to you by the Institute of Development Studies. In this month's episode, Kul Chandra Gautam discusses his book, *Global Citizen from Gulmi*. As a former Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF and Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations Kul has led a distinguished career as a diplomat and development professional. Here he recounts his journey from a remote village in Nepal, lacking schools, roads and electricity, to the highest ranks. His story is a passionate jaunt, spanning interesting times, places and people. Listen out for the bonus clip at the end for his words of encouragement and advice. Interviewing Kul is Honorary IDS Professor and former Director, Sir Richard Jolly.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Kul, you've had the most remarkable early life of anyone ever I've ever known, growing up in Nepal, three days' walk from Kathmandu, but you were discovered and sent to India for training as a monk. But that was only the beginning. Kul, please continue the story, at least briefly.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Well, first maybe a small correction: three days' walk was from my village to the first school I went to. Actually Kathmandu is much further away. Altogether to Kathmandu was *nine* days. But you know, in those days in Nepal, my village was not considered a remote area, because a remote area in Nepal, in those days, was defined as needing 14 days' walk.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: From your village you first went as a monk to India.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: To be trained as a priest, a-ha, a-ha, yeah.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: And how long were you there before someone spotted you and you went back to the secondary school?

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: I was in India for about two years. And then when I went back home to my village, at that time things were changing in the world. I had a step-uncle who was visiting our village. And he told my father, 'This nephew,' – he used to call me nephew – 'of mine. He's very smart. You're trying to make him a priest, a monk, a pundit? That's a waste of time. The world is changing. Do you know, India has become independent? Democracy has come to Nepal. We had a first elected government in 1959, multi-party democracy, and the prime minister at that time was introducing a whole new education effort, introducing English – English meaning, like, in the Colonial times – to produce clerics, clerics right?' He said, 'This young man, you should send him and teach him English. Forget about Sanskrit language

and Hindu philosophy and theology.' And my father didn't know what to do. So he asked me, 'What do you think about what this uncle of yours says?' I said, 'Well, you guys, you are the adults, you have to decide if this is good for me. I'm game.' So my father agreed to send me to modern education as it were, English education. But where? There were no schools near my village, that's why I had gone to India. So at that time, initially, he said, 'I will take him with me to Kathmandu.' So I went to Kathmandu, that's when it took the nine days' travel time. And I was in Kathmandu enrolled in a primary school, because I knew Nepali, I knew Sanskrit, I did not know a word of English. None at all. And they had already started teaching in primary school, English. So that was the hardest for me. But within a few months I mastered English enough. So from third grade I got a double promotion to the fifth grade, but Kathmandu weather did not suit me. I was very sickly, not feeling very well. It was too cold, the Kathmandu Valley, I was a mountain boy. So I then decided, with my parents, that the place that would be better for me is that school three days' walk from my home. So that's where I went and enrolled myself. This was in 1962, in a school that was three days' walk from my home.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Is that the school where there was a Peace Corps teacher?

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Yes indeed.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: And he spotted your talents. Tell us how you got the scholarship and then weren't allowed to take it up?

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Well, for the last year of my high school, the 10th grade, I moved to Kathmandu. And my Peace Corps teacher Ian Thomson had finished his Peace Corps assignment and was working for USAID in Kathmandu. So I contacted him and he remembered, and he had already encouraged, 'Oh you are bright, you will be able to get a good education.' He said, 'You're finishing high school, you should apply for a college in America.' I said, 'What college? How do I do that?', I had no idea. So there happened to be in that town, three days' walk another group of Peace Corps volunteers that had come afterwards, who . . . one of them happened to be a Dartmouth graduate. And he said, this Peace Corps guy, my teacher, said, 'Talk to him, he will tell you how you can get admission in various universities.' So I go to him and he said, 'Well, the only university I know is the place I went to, Dartmouth. It's very difficult to get admission, but if you get admission it is not so difficult to get scholarship.' So, I applied there, sent in all of my papers and the recommendations from the Peace Corps volunteers. And lo and behold I got a full scholarship, admission with a full scholarship. Having been admitted to Dartmouth, which is an Ivy League college, getting a US visa would have been no problem. But before you get a visa you need to get a passport. So, to get a passport I went first to the Foreign Ministry, that's where the passports are issued. The Foreign Ministry people say, 'Excuse me, you're going to study? If you're going to study, you need to get permission from the Ministry of Education, before you come to the Foreign Ministry. So I go to the Ministry of Education and the officer in charge said, 'How did you get this scholarship? You never informed us. You did not

get a scholarship through the government. The normal process is a foreign university or foreign country give grant scholarships, a certain number of scholarships, to His Majesty's Government of Nepal. And His Majesty's Government selects people from among qualified people. You didn't do any of this, you went to straight ahead. There is no such provision. We cannot grant . . . we cannot accept, recognise this scholarship.' So then I had to appeal to a higher level, his boss denied, the Secretary of Education denied, it goes to the Minister. And it went all the way up to the Cabinet: 'This guy has not applied for prior approval, not agreed to. This was the policy recommended by the Cabinet and approved by His Majesty, only His Majesty can change it.' So they send my case to the palace and the word comes from the palace, after many, many months of waiting, 'Do according to the rules' – which meant I would not get a passport. So I was rejected to get a passport by the King. Normally there is no higher authority than the King. When the King says 'No,' it's finished. But I was kind of determined, I felt a deep injustice that, wow, I hadn't done anything wrong. I was qualified. So I . . . in this whole chain of people who looked at my application, there was one guy who was sympathetic, a Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Education who had a similar background to mine, who had also come from the mountains, from an ordinary family, who had made it in Nepal, he had studied in India and he said, 'Look, young man, by denying you this scholarship, who benefits? Nobody. You don't benefit, but Nepal does not benefit. You should benefit.' So he cited a rule. Apparently the King once had given a speech in which he had said the policy of His Majesty's Government is to encourage bright students from the remote areas who are from poor backgrounds. 'That's the policy. You qualify according to that policy. But you don't qualify according to the procedure that requires prior approval. So,' he said, 'start all over again. Tell Dartmouth College that you have been denied. Can you reapply?' So I reapplied a year later and when I went to seek permission, the Section Officer in charge of scholarship again denied, saying, 'How can we agree to give you a passport when the King has denied?' Then I go to the Joint Secretary, who was the man who said, 'According to the policy he is seeking prior approval. He has not gotten the scholarship yet, and the policy allows him,' and he granted me the authority to get the passport.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Wow, what a . . .

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: It took almost two years. *[laughs]*

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: What a story. You spent four years at Dartmouth. You then went to Woodrow Wilson School in Princeton and you joined Unicef. Tell us . . . and you worked in Cambodia. Tell us briefly about that and how your career in UNICEF developed.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Yeah, when I was . . . before I went to Princeton, when I was at Dartmouth, that was in the late 60s, early 70s, at the height of the Vietnam War. So the most important news, the headline news every day was what is happening in Vietnam. There was a strong anti-war movement and I became quite involved in the anti-war movement. And in the course of the anti-war movement I became so fascinated, Richard, with

Vietnam. Who are these people these Vietnamese, who could take on the world's mightiest superpower and beat them? The first ever defeat of the US.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Well, they didn't know they were being beaten yet, quite.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: They were at that time in a checkmate as it were.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Checkmate. And then US papers, newspapers, suggesting that it was hard and difficult but the US was winning.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Winning. So I had become so interested. I wanted to know about who could bog down the Americans, the mightiest power in the world, a peasant country. So I became so interested. I want to learn more about Vietnam and the Vietnamese and Ho Chi Minh and the whole movement. So and I . . . on day I wanted to go to Vietnam. I wanted to see these people who could take on the world's mightiest power. So I prepare myself. I took a number of courses on Indo-China politics and history, I knew Vietnam was a French colony and at that time their foreign language was not English. Now it is English. It was French. So I said, 'If I want to go to Vietnam I better learn French.' So I took French courses, so . . . was active. And then when I finished Dartmouth and I was at Princeton, 1973, February, Paris peace talks were going on. Henry Kissinger on the US side and Lê Đức Thọ from the Vietnamese side. They were the negotiators and Lê Đức Thọ was a senior party man but not very highly educated, did not speak any French, so his deputy was a lady named Madame Nguyễn Thị Bình.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: I remember.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: She is an amazingly inspiring figure who took on Henry Kissinger and, you know, could debate with him. So I used to watch the news and when the news came one day that finally the Paris Peace Agreement is being signed. The war is going to end. So, I was following that news, very excited and I saw that immediately after the Paris Peace Agreement Kurt Waldheim had become the Secretary-General, succeeding U Thant, in January.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Secretary-General of the UN.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Of the UN. He said, 'My predecessor, U Thant, tried so hard to bring peace to Vietnam, to end the war. And the UN failed. We did not succeed. But now, bilaterally, they are coming to an agreement and the peace is going to come, the UN should start a massive post-conflict reconstruction and development. I was reading all of this in newspapers. And then I recall the very first person after Kurt Waldheim's appeal, who responded, was Harry Labouisse, the head of UNICEF. The head of UNICEF said, 'You know, women and children are the ones who have suffered most in this war. We are going to launch a massive program all over Indo-China, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos everywhere. And we'll start soon.'

When I read that, I was in the second year of my graduate school at Princeton. I had not finished my university yet. I said, 'Ah-ha, if UNICEF is starting a big program, maybe I will have a chance.' I wanted to go to Vietnam anyway. So I sent the inquiry to New York, to the UNICEF office. I didn't know if they were going to respond but I was called for an interview, went to New York, had an interview with a guy named Martin Sandberg, who at that time was the chief of the Indo-China Peninsula Group that had been recently set up. We had breakfast, we talked, and at the end of the interview he said, 'Young man, you are exactly the kind of person we are looking for. You have done good universities – Princeton and Dartmouth – studied international relations and development economics, speak French, are interested in Indo-China and you are from a neutral and non-aligned country, Nepal. You have a perfect profile. We hire you.' Right on this one.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Wonderful.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: I said, 'Excuse me?' 'Where do you want to go?' he said, and I . . . 'Excuse me, I have still three more months to finish my university.' 'Don't worry. Take your time. Finish your university. But where do you want to go? Because we are starting operations everywhere – Hanoi, Vientiane, Phnom Penh, Saigon.' And I said, 'My preference are very simple. They go from north to south, Hanoi, Vientiane, Phnom Penh, Saigon, in that order.' He said, 'You'll get your first choice, you'll go to Hanoi.' [*laughs*] But in the end, Richard, I did not go to Hanoi. I ended up in Cambodia. And the reason was when UNICEF started the operation in Indo-China, the Vietnamese said, 'You are UNICEF, you're welcome to start operations and to help children in our country. But you should only deal with us, the North Vietnamese government, not with the South Vietnamese government,' which they said was a puppet of the Americans. But UNICEF had this principle, you remember from Maurice Pate that UNICEF will help children *everywhere* in need, regardless of politics. That, yes, we will help North Vietnam but we must also be allowed to help children in South Vietnam, which are under the control of the Saigon government. So that was a sticking point they could not agree. So UNICEF . . . the Vietnamese thought that UNICEF was just bargaining. But for UNICEF it was a matter of principle.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Deep principle.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Deep principle. So I was contacted by Martin Sandberg saying, 'Sorry, we are not able to open an office in Hanoi right now. And your second preference was Vientiane where we have just appointed a new Rep, Fritz Lherisson, and there is nobody in Cambodia. And Cambodia was the most heavily bombarded at that time, before the final peace agreement came into being. 'Would you like to go there?' And I said, I was young, I was not married. I would venture to say, 'Why not. I'll go to Cambodia, the most dangerous place where nobody wanted to go.' So I went to Cambodia Phnom Penh. I was the first resident UNICEF officer in Phnom Penh. We did not have an office then.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: And with one month of UNICEF experience?

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Right! Yeah, yeah.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Wonderful. So that's how . . . I thought I would be in Cambodia and with UNICEF for maybe one or two years and then I'd go back to Nepal. But I enjoyed the work so much. I mean, it was very difficult, Cambodia had the heaviest bombing, because the war, although the peace treaty was signed in February 1973, the war did not end until 1975.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Yes.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: And the heaviest bombing was in Phnom Penh, people were being evacuated. So it was very traumatic, just before the Khmer Rouge came. And when the Khmer Rouge came, we were all kicked out. Everybody was kicked out. No exceptions. UNICEF, Russians, Chinese everybody was kicked out. So I never made it to Vietnam for UNICEF. But later on, of course, when I was Regional Director [*words unclear*] I went to Vietnam many times.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Many times, yes. Let me jump over the places you worked as Country Rep or as a Regional Director in UNICEF and then in the 1980s you came to New York, you were brought to New York, particularly by Jim Grant, and played a major role in the run-up to the World Summit for Children. I think you have to tell us about that, because that was the first time that any world summit had been held by the UN on any subject. But it wasn't just a meeting, and show and tell, and heads of state being photographed – Jim Grant had some very specific objectives and he particularly asked you personally to make sure they were brought into the agreement that emerged from the summit?

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Yes indeed. Before we come to 1989-90 when this summit was held, Jim Grant's leadership, of course, Jim Grant had started this massive child survival revolution whereby millions of children were being immunised, whereas immunisation rates had been very low, child mortality rates had been very high and Jim Grant had figured that . . . why are 40,000 children dying every day?

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Every day.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: At that time. Why are so many children dying? It is not because they lack sophisticated hospitals or a highly-trained doctor. Nothing like that. It was the simplest of things that cost very little: immunisation that could be had for a dollar or two dollars, that did not require very sophisticated hospitals; oral rehydration therapy. And he was able to show, UNICEF was able to show that you could actually reach a lot of children, save many lives. And if you could do that with a little bit of organisation, mobilising itself, how much more could be done, if we had the world leaders truly committed? You know, you could have universal immunisation, you could drastically reduce mortality and morbidity and malnutrition. And he was an ambitious man, he said, 'Look, I want . . . we have now shown what is possible, now let us mobilise the world leaders to

really make a dramatic change in child survival and development.' So he called for a Summit for Children. And many people kind of laughed. 'How can you have a Summit for Children? Leaders don't get together to talk about children. When leaders meet together they talk about more serious issues like war and peace, trade and economy, not about little children and their health. That's not possible.' But Jim Grant was one of those people who said, 'Guess what. If we got the world's leaders to talk about war and peace and economy and trade, they would never agree with each other. The one issue that they can agree on is children. Everybody can agree on. And we are not asking for, you know, trillions of dollars. We're asking for something very sensible that every country can afford.' And actually, he managed to persuade, initially, a couple of leaders who volunteered to be the people who would convene the summit, six leaders in fact, and convince the Secretary-General of the UN, Pérez de Cuéllar was the Secretary-General. So the first Summit for Children was called. And it became a grand success. We had 71 heads of state and heads of government who came, committed to child survival, child rights, child protection issues. And the first ever goals, quantitative goals, achievable goals, ambitious goals, were set in 1990 for the year 2000. And in the UN there were many other goals, as you like to say, Richard, goals are ever set and never met in the UN. But Jim Grant was determined that we would set ambitious goals, but doable goals, practical goals that could be achieved without huge investment. And, indeed, the Summit for Children was not only the largest summit, I think it was the most successful summit in terms of its follow-up afterwards. So I had the good privilege to work with you and Jim and others in setting and outlining what would be those goals, and those goals have turned out to be so important that later on they became the backbones of the Millennium Goals. And you might say today's Sustainable Development Goals the origin goes all the way back to those goals.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: And you were very strategic, and after Jim Grant had died and other people had come in as executive directors of UNICEF, you were very strategic in monitoring the goals and then getting another world meeting, which was going to be in 2001. Well perhaps you could tell us about the dates and why not, if the goals were for 2000, why not have a meeting in 2000?

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Yes indeed. Well, Jim Grant died in 1995. And there was some worry that the momentum that he had created under his leadership would slacken. And, indeed, it slowed down a little bit when there was a change of guard. But enough buy-in by countries had been secured that even if UNICEF headquarters was not as committed, as dynamic, as under Jim Grant and yourself, Richard, the momentum continued. So good progress was made. So, we wanted to organise a 10 Year Anniversary Summit, the second summit on children, in the year 2000. And actually, by that time, I had finished my assignment as Program Director in New York, was in Bangkok as the Regional Director for Asia-Pacific. And Carol Bellamy called me back to organise this second summit and to set these ambitious goals. And all preparations were ready, everything was ready. It was going to be held in September 2001. That's when 9/11 happened. That was the last day of our final signing-off of the Declaration and Plan of Action. And when

9/11 happened, of course, course the whole world changed. Even the UN General Assembly had to be postponed, many leaders could not come. So that's why our summit, the Second Summit for Children was postponed to 2002, a year later, because of 9/11. But by that time, Millennium Summit had taken place in the year 2000. And as leaders of the world . . . that was much bigger than the Summit for Children. And its agenda was broader than just children. But when they were trying to identify what kind of goals should we have – Kofi Annan was the Secretary-General – and they said, 'Look, UNICEF has a good experience, because they organised the first summit.' There were many other summits in the 1990s. You remember the Earth Summit and the Copenhagen Summit and the Cairo Summit, all kinds of summits. But of all the summits the one that was the most systematically monitored, and significant results were achieved, was the Summit for Children. So they said, 'Let's go with the winners, these goals: reducing infant mortality, maternal mortality, illiteracy, the child-related goals, are the most doable,' and therefore those goals became really the backbones of the Summit for Children. Kofi Annan had been impressed with what Jim Grant and UNICEF had done, so that is the background. could begin. Not many people know that the Summit for Children had so much influence on the MDGs. But that is a fact.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: So let's now move to Kul Gautam as a UNICEF Country Rep or a UNICEF Regional Director. And what you learned, Kul, about how to get things done at country level. A lot of people think the UN, and UNICEF too, does things itself. And in fact it's much more mobilising action, in this case for children. But tell us some of your experiences?

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Well, I would say that UNICEF's working modality is not uniform. When there is a major emergency or humanitarian crisis. Indeed, in some countries that don't have good infrastructure UNICEF itself might be heavily involved in implementation, with its own staff and volunteers. But that is an exception, that's not the norm. In normal development settings what UNICEF does is actually to train and empower your counterparts from the governments and sometimes from the NGO community who are everywhere so that they can deliver these services for their own children better and more effectively. And I think one of the reasons why UNICEF is much appreciated by many countries even compared to other UN agencies. It's the following: most UN agencies are in the business of technical assistance. What they provide are experts and advisers. Some countries like that, some don't. Some need that, others don't. Sometimes many advisers are not very appropriate advisers and not very qualified or appropriate for that topic. UNICEF, whereas, had a combination. UNICEF provides some expertise where needed, but often UNICEF would call on UNESCO for education or WHO for health, but UNICEF itself would provide supplies and equipment. Many countries value and love supplies and equipment and training grants that most other agencies cannot provide. So UNICEF responds to the *needs* of the country. If they need expertise we might provide expertise. But many of them say . . . particularly now middle income countries, 'We have got our own expertise, what we need from UNICEF is things that we don't have. Can you facilitate in our training, can



you facilitate in our capacity building, supplied equipment? So I think UNICEF tends to be very responsive to the needs of the country and UNICEF was also unique in that UNICEF hired a lot of *national* professionals. National Officers. UNICEF had more national professionals than any other organisation. So, the national professionals, they speak the local language, they know the government authority, they know the culture. So it was much easier for us to work at the country level. And I think the strength of UNICEF relied on this decentralisation, using national authorities, national counterparts and providing support that the government wanted, not saying, 'Well we only provide technical assistance, you have to go somewhere else to get finance or training or equipment supplied. So it came as a nice package that countries much appreciated.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: One of the stories I like very much in your book, you were the representative for a while in Haiti. Tell us what happened when you met Baby Doc.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Yeah, well Jim Grant was one of those leaders who said, 'For the well-being of children, we'll work with anybody – democrat, dictator or whatever, because our job is to help children.' And that, 'Even dictators can be persuaded to do good things.' And they were, you know, many, many authoritarian leaders, we worked with, Baby Doc Duvalier or you know, in Sudan and elsewhere, in Nigeria where there was, you know, Idi Amin, and all kinds of nasty characters. I think they were persuaded to do good things. But there's a limit to how far you can go. Obviously, I remember, I think, consulting with you at one point, one of the things I was really scared [of], was that Jim Grant was always looking for opportunities to mobilise whoever you could mobilise. In Haiti, the widest network was that of Tonton Macoute. These killers, you know, these volunteers as it were, they were serving the Duvalier regime. And in many communities, if you wanted to get anything done, you had work with the Tonton Macoutes. And while practically, at the local level, people worked with them, we did not want to be identified with the Tonton Macoutes. But anyway, Jim Grant, he persuaded Baby Doc Duvalier . . . Baby Doc Duvalier was not a very smart person. His wife was very smart, very clever, very cunning – and actually she was running her own hospital for children and there was a lot of pressure for us to divert a lot of assistance to that hospital. And I had the delicate task of being on good terms with the First Lady but not channelling our support to her hospital, because that would have been utilised for their own political purposes. So there were all kinds of tricky things that we had to navigate, but we did it, and even in Haiti – Haiti was considered kind of the most hopeless case. *Everybody* had tried to help Haiti. The Canadians tried to help Haiti. They gave up. The French tried to help Haiti. They gave up. USAID tried to help. And that's why it's the poorest country that was closest to New York in the western hemisphere. UNICEF did not have an office there, because it was considered hopeless. So we had an office in Jamaica that ran for the Caribbean, including Haiti. Whereas Haiti was the poor— it deserved the highest attention. None of the previous executive directors or regional directors thought . . . 'If Canadians cannot do it, Americans cannot – what can UNICEF do?' So they had given up. But Jim Grant was, 'No, no. You *never* give up.' He said, 'We

must be able to do something in Haiti.' So he actually appointed me as the first representative in Haiti, brought me straight from Laos, and we identified carefully that, 'Look, Haiti will not be a normal program – with this kind of dictator, you know, everybody was hopeless. But let's identify one of two things that we can do.' So we identified oral rehydration therapy, against diarrhoea. That was the number one killer. And we did that one program in a massive way, involving church groups, NGOs and the government, but not only relying on the government, because relying on the government alone would not have gotten us anywhere. But in the end we made pretty good impact.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: And when you met Duvalier you had to shake hands, because that was minimum . . .

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Yeah.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: . . . the necessary protocol. But I seem to recall your book saying you chose the next opportunity to go to the toilet . . .

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: And wash my hands! *[laughs]*

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: And wash your hands.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Yes indeed. Yeah.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: You said, and you said even more clearly in your book, when you were at Dartmouth you were very much on the left in the UN World. We are very careful not to declare our political alliances, particularly any that might be linked to our home country. But then when you've retired from UNICEF you did go back to Nepal. Tell us of your experience there and where do you come out to it now, are you a capitalist, are you a socialist, are you a . . . a crypto-something?

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: *[laughs]* If I had to describe myself in one or two words, I would say I am now a principled pragmatist, certainly very sympathetic to issues of social justice and equity, but not in a Marxist-Leninist ideological . . . from that perspective. Because while the idealism that is inherent in some of Marx's ideas, I think we can subscribe to the idealism, but in practice what has happened all over the world is a lot of oppression, a lot of uniformity, and ideology being used as a cover-up for many corrupt practices. So I would hesitate to consider myself in any ideological term as a capitalist or a socialist or whatnot. Naturally, the sentiments are more towards socialist, in the sense of seeking greater equity and greater justice. But not by following a Leninist, or any, script, but in a more pragmatic manner, because ultimately what you find is that countries that have succeeded to achieve great progress, rapid progress, say, in East Asia, the Asian Miracle or elsewhere, there are a few features that are common, besides progressive policies. They have good governance. Following the rule of law so that everybody has to follow the same rules, not that some have one set of rules and another have another set of rules. Accountability and transparency in what you do. Those, to me, are

more important principles than capitalism, socialism et cetera. So when it all boils down to [it], what am I? I would say I think today I have become a, as I say, a principled pragmatist.

SIR RICHARD JOLLY: Well Kul. Thank you very much.

KUL CHANDRA GAUTAM: Thank you. Thank you Richard. To the students of IDS, I would say be persistent, don't give up. I think part of my own life's experience, even when the King rejected I did not give up. So there is hope. And I would say, in terms of the UNICEF experience, you recall, Richard, in a book that you and I wrote together on Jim Grant, there were these Ten Commandments from Jim Grant, that if you are . . . I think if you are in development you should try to follow some of those commandments. Now, what were those? That you have to set ambitious goals, visionary goals, but make sure they are doable, because you can have pie-in-the-sky kind of goals, many goals, but translate them into practical, implementable things. Then you try to mobilise, the normal systems sometimes don't produce the results. Be prepared to take risks. Be prepared to go to nonconventional partners. So, in immunisation programs, we did not rely on health officers only, when immunisations were done in a big way in Colombia, you mobilised the police force, you mobilised the army, you mobilised the Catholic Church. So be prepared to do nonconventional things, you know, reach out to others. And then, I would say, monitor carefully, because . . . monitor and have a system whereby you check your progress, identify weaknesses, tackle the areas where you are not making progress. And then finally I would say, no organisation, IDS or anybody else can do it alone. We need partnership with others. So try to mobilise other partners for your purposes. And I would say among the partners you seek, never forget the United Nations. UN is a reliable development partner, because UN is one of those organisations that has no other self-interest. If the UN is trying to help. It is trying to help because the cause is worthy of helping, not because it fits your ideology or politics or whatnot. So I think if you do that and mobilise, be prepared to use modern technology – nowadays there are technologies that did not exist at that time – that tremendous progress can be made. And I would say that institutions like IDS have already had a huge influence in that many, many development planners in the world were trained here and many more can come and share their experiences. And I think it's a tremendous opportunity for IDS students to change the world.