



Chron Rep: CF/NYH/0SEB/HST/1995-052

File Sub: CF/HST/INT/URQ-001/M

CF/RAI/USAA/OB01/HS/1995-0052

2 March 1985 1520Q

Interview with Mr. B. Urquhart

Conducted By Mr. S. Moe in New York

on 1 February 1985

Table of Contents

(1)

	Page
Introduction	1
Background of Urquhart	1
Framework for interview	1
UNICEF in UN structure	1
Perspective and management	1
What UN can and cannot do	2
Evolution of concern for development after decolonization	2
UNICEF in this framework	2
UNICEF - evolution - like UN	3
First to save world from future effects of world war II and avoid future wars	3
Decolonization - led by United States	3
Changed UN and UNICEF roles - to development and social justice	4
Political problems for UN but UNICEF's non-political role enabled it to do good things eg. Bangladesh, Ethiopia, etc.	5
Importance of original mandate	5
UN has spared UNICEF political problems	6

Challenge to generalize UNICEF's success into plan for future	6
eg. Africa today - Continental problems	
Need to see and act on long - term not short - term basis	7
Need for political solution therefore effective disarmament	7
not other way about - system for international peace and security	7
UNICEF - remarkable way of hanging on to basics - long - term people projects - plus break-throughs like oral rehydration	8
Need to see UN as a whole - comprehension system - not dumping ground for insolvable problems	8
UNICEF has helped in this - jewel in UN crown - partly due to good leadership - Pate, Labouisse	9
Emergencies - UNICEF should always have a role	9
Nigeria, Bangladesh, Kampuchea - useful role in all.	10
Political implication of helping children	11
Practical aid - gets over some societal problems	12

Changes in thinking about development, credit to West for even thinking of idea of development	14
Reluctance of LDC's to help themselves	15
Need for real global communal effort	16
Some evidence of change in LDC's	16
Need for perspective to see evidence of progress gets over "quick fix" blindness	17
UNICEF has greatly helped in promoting self-help idea	17
Field orientation	17
UNICEF in relation to UNDP and UN system organizationally	19
Use of a political instrument - unique	20
UN like medieval system - best but-functions - UNICEF should stay as is	20
Challenge to get rest of UN to support CSDR	22
Disproportion in use of global resources	22
eg. space shuttle vs desertification, 400 B for armaments 3 M for peace keeping	23
Young people - hope of future - eager to work for UN and UNICEF need to offer better and more opportunities.	25

\*\*\*\*\*

2 March 1985 ... 1520Q

Interview with Mr. B. Urquhart  
Conducted by Mr. S. Moe in New York  
on 1 February 1985

This is Sherry Moe, currently a consultant with the UNICEF History Project, and I am having the honour and privilege of interview Mr. Brian Urquhart, Under-secretary General of the United Nations. Brian has been with the UN virtually from its beginning. And he and I have been friends since at least 1959-60 when I also worked on the 38th floor in connection with the World Refugee Year and helping the then Secretary-General Dag Hammorjskold on a report with regard to the future of UNRRA. The subject of this interview is Brian's views with regard to the history of UNICEF not in an attempt to provide basic factual information but to give his overall and olympian view of where UNICEF fits in the whole UN structure. He has before him a brief annotated history of UNICEF simply to jog his memory but we have agreed that perhaps the initial approach to the interview might be to look at UNICEF in relation with the system and in relation to perhaps two as it were key words management and perspective by that mean the need for all concerned but especially governments as they relate to the UN and the general public in so far as they are interested in the UN to see the UN as what it is and what it can do and what it cannot do in the sense that it is the creature of governments influenced to a certain extent by their public and secondly the need because of all the problems that have surfaced since the creation of the UN which require and indeed are the concern of the UN ranging from environment to peace keeping etc. The second general consideration is the explosion of

concerns of the UN as a result of the decolonization process which took place in the early '50s which was not envisaged when the UN was founded but which were to a small extent foreseen in the charter but for which the UN was not deliberately structured. We are talking now about the whole thing that we call the "development" respond a whole series of organizations including the UN Development Programme the Environment Programme, The Population Fund, etc. and involve the specialized agencies in tasks for which they were not really established having been established essentially as standard setting and research organization which involved them in much more active programmes than they had been originally conceived and founded for. Within this larger context UNICEF began in 1946, that is one year after the UN was founded, as essentially an emergency organization but because of this other explosion and indeed to a certain extent anticipating it UNICEF became involved crucially in the whole process of development in the sense that from the early '50s began to try to make its voice heard with regard to the importance of the child, its development as a part of the total development process. Now Brian this is a much too long introduction and we may eventually shorten it but I suggest this gives you a structure on which to frame your own remarks on which we have already been discussing. Let's hear from you.

Urquhart: I think that's a very good introduction and sets very clearly the kind of conceptual development of UNICEF. Like the UN itself UNICEF's development has gone from the first concept of the UN which was the inheritor and the saviour of the world from the

results of World War II into something very much broader. The great preoccupation of our organization in the mid '40s was the Second World War and its human results and the desire to prevent that ever happening again. UNICEF played an extremely important role in the humanitarian aspects of those problems which were enormous the inheritance in terms of humanitarian disaster of World War II.

Moe: And you saw that?

Urquhart: Certainly but I was in the Army in World War II so I was all too clearly aware of what the magnitude of the human disaster was. I didn't see it in Asia I saw it in Europe. The UN didn't drop as was intended in the charter...in the charter it was intended that the victorious alliance which had won the war would continue to maintain the peace and basically this was going to be a somewhat religious leadership operation in which the victorious powers the Soviet Union, the United States, France, Great Britain and China would lead the world into a world free from war and very much in the second place a world free from war, a world of human rights, a world of self determination but these were secondary objectives when I first joined the organization. Now the American insistence in 1945 and from then onwards that decolonization was a logical extension of the allied war ends had an absolutely crucial impact on the United Nations. In my view an entirely good one. It was an aim that was hotly disputed by the European colonial powers at that time Britain, France, Belgium and the Netherlands mainly but the United States won that argument and one of the main and unexpected

results of United Nations' activity was the great acceleration of the decolonization movement which, when I joined the UN in 1945, was supposed to take a hundred or a hundred and fifty years to a such an extent that with the exception of Namibia and one or two other small territories the decolonization process was actually complete by the mid '70s. This in turn led to a completely different make up for the United Nations in which the preoccupations of the UN seized so much to be the prevention of World War III among conventional powers as a much broader preoccupation with economic development, economic stability and some measure of social justice in a world which had completely changed. The easiest way to see how much it has changed is to look at the membership in 1945 which was fifty states and the membership now which is a hundred and fifty-nine more than three times as large and the coming of what is now called the third world which did not exist in my young days a completely new constituency in the world a constituency of the largest part of the population now aligned in the East-West struggle united by the desire for decolonization and later on by the desire for economic and social development.

Moe: And with the emergence of the East-West struggle.

Urquhart: And of course the East-West struggle has continued. Now in that situation the UN has found itself usually \_\_\_\_\_ to real development. We have had to face in various parts of the world political crisis which have appalling human consequences and it's been very difficult usually to meet up to that challenge through



the political organs of the UN. I think for example what happened, just to mention one, in what was then East Pakistan in 1970 when you have the eighth most populous nation on earth — a population of nearly a hundred million people it is now Bangladesh — in a state of complete economic and social dereliction. We started off with an effort to do a relief operation when East Pakistan was still East Pakistan the great problem was that to put in supplies there and to put in humanitarian help was supposed to be difficult because it would have to get into political difficulties between insurgence against Pakistan and the Pakistan authorities and one of the great problems I remember then was where the supplies would go. We have something of the same problem in Ethiopia where you have a political situation which is masking up vast humanitarian disaster now. UNICEF having started as a nonpolitical organization and continued, greatly to the credit of the people who run it, as such an organization which is very difficult to say no to because it deals with children and mothers and the future of the child has been an invaluable resource in the struggle to try to do something about these very difficult situations where human concerns are extremely mixed up with political disasters. I think that the way UNICEF has handled itself for example in Bangladesh or later on in Kampuchea and now in Ethiopia has been a tremendous resource for the UN. Nobody can challenge the credentials of UNICEF in its primary task. Everybody can challenge the political effort by the UN to do something and always does. I think that the imaginative running of UNICEF the fact that has managed to steer this extraordinary cause on the basis of its original mandate to such an extent that as far as I know it it's never been seriously

politically challenged whether it was in South East Asia or Bangladesh or Kampuchea or anywhere else in the world, has been a tremendously important sort of humane life blood of the UN as a whole. We have always tried, of the political side which I am partly responsible for, to spare UNICEF the problem of being challenged on political grounds. So far we've managed with some success, I think, to do that. UNICEF has had a very large part in proclaiming the ultimate basic objectives of the United Nations. it has carried this banner with outstanding success — even in the United States where the United Nations is considered to be a more or less superfluous organization. I think that this is a tremendously important thing. The trouble really about it, to me, is how you now take the extraordinary achievements of an organization like UNICEF and parlay it into a plan which will be geared to the future. I am thinking for example of the current efforts in Africa where, notwithstanding a great number of warnings over the past ten or fifteen years, we have now reached a point where there is an active possibility that a number of nation states are likely to simply not survive and to give the example, a state like Chad. Ethiopia as a nation state may be all right, but there are several others which won't survive at all unless a long-term effort is made to look at the real problem. People are perfectly capable of rallying themselves in response to the television for six months or so; it does not solve the problem at all. We need now to see the aims which have been articulated so long, for example by UNICEF, sort of somehow got into long-term policies of governments which support the UN.

I think our great problem in the UN is that people genuinely believe particularly in television-oriented countries that the answers to problems are short-term. They are not. The answers to problems, starting with international peace and security, are very long-term. For example when the UN was founded, it was believed, quite rightly in my view, by Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill that you had to establish a system of international peace and security before you begin to get disarmament. Due to the more spectacular aspects of nuclear arms, we had talk about nuclear disarmament and the effects of nuclear war and people don't any longer talk about establishing an international system of peace and security. I think this is a colossal mistake and I think it is one of the worst things and I think that it shows a certain pig-headedness in the public and in the media. I think it shows a lack of any understanding of the political process, either nationally or internationally and I think it shows a fundamental misunderstanding of the problems. The same is true on the economic and social side. We are not going to declare the millenium by some brilliant scheme which lasts three months and plays in prime time on American TV. The only way you can do it is in getting people to devote their whole lives in an imaginative way to massive projects which have a permanent validity and which would probably take most of their waking lives to achieve.

I think UNICEF has done a remarkable job in hanging on to the real essence of what these processes are. Every now and then they have an amazing breakthrough. They had the well-known thing, which was actually WHO about small pox. I think the recent thing about

oral rehydration . These are encouraging. They are like the green revolution in the fifties. These are very encouraging technological miracles, but the plain fact of the matter is that they are OK in the context of a serious plan of over thirty years of how the future is going to develop. This is how I think that UNICEF has shown over the years a great feeling of continuity. In my little part of the business which is on the political side, you really need more. It's very easy to get discouraged when you are told to solve this or that problem anyway which we very normally do mostly because we got problems nobody else can solve anyway. I think that this is very irrelevant to the general process. We have to see the UN as a kind of a whole approach to the problems of humanity, of which humanitarian problems, the problems of children — the problems of the future which are the problems of the children — problems of peace and security, the problems of the economy, the problems of a fair distribution of the world's wealth and resources are all part of the same thing. If we don't see that then this thing is going to be very a transitory phenomenon, this United Nations.

UNICEF will always be there to respond to emergencies, I hope, but that is only half the job. The other half is to get a coherent plan where we all go forward to a slightly better set up. And, I think that it's very much to be credited to people who run UNICEF like Maurice Pate, Harry Labouisse and Grant. I think they have had a very serious idea of this. There is a tendency to distinguish in our world the humane or the humanitarian side and all the rest of it; and there is even a tendency to distinguish

between economic and social problems and political problems. In my view it is not and it is a very dangerous idea. The thing has to be seen as aspects of the whole and the whole has to be agreeable to everybody and everybody has to have some idea of the common end and then we would get an effective organization. And I think that we have to see the spectacular work of UNICEF, one of the great jewels in the somewhat tarnished crown of international co-operation, as something which still has to remain a pre-eminent part of the very important whole picture.

Moe: Brian, I think that's marvellous. I am not quite sure where we'll go from here, or what more you would like to say.

Urqhart: We talked about Bangladesh and of course, we could go back to Nigeria, where perhaps we did something important

Moe: Well, I think we have tended, and I must confess I have been a party to that, to be ruthless with the use of UNICEF's humanitarian credentials to crack considerable political situations.

Urqhart: Well, we couldn't intervene politically in Nigeria because it was at civil war and under the Charter we can't do that. We couldn't get into Bangladesh because it turned out to be a take over from one party to another ending in another independent nation. That wasn't recognized until it was a fait accompli. In Kampuchea we still have a situation where to do anything about the enormous humanitarian needs of the country, you have to ignore the political situation, which is topsy-turvy in a most curious way and we have

ruthlessly used the credentials of UNICEF in all those and other situations and no doubt will go on doing it. But, I still think that we have the aim in the end for the whole thing to come together and UNICEF, apart from doing a very spectacular job in its own field, has been a very convenient kind of amalgam which can be put into fractured political situations.

Moe: I have often thought that it was a sort of Shakespearan wisdom by indirectly finding direction of. I don't think that the General Assembly in its wisdom when it passed resolution 57(1) which provided, as we discussed, that we can or that we should do these things for all children without regard to nationality etc., or anything and only with the consent of governments, was probably accidental, but it certainly was very fortuitous and I suppose the direction UNICEF can take credit for the fact that it had imagination to use that particular phrase. That was exactly what led us in Nigeria to work on both sides. Labouisse had said to General Ghana at the time that as far as we were concerned we were not making any judgement as to which side is legitimate, we are just helping kids and as far as you are concerned, they are all Nigerians. So we are helping your children, so he said "Well, I won't shoot down the planes unless I have to and that's how we were able to work on both sides and then emerged with fairly flying colours and that is also been the basis of our operation in Bangladesh and later in Kampuchea. Its a curious thing, but I think it's good that it happened and it was good that the administration was able to use it that way. I hope the General Assembly will never begin to change that resolution.

Moe: Well, of course, if you look at the other way around, and I hope it's true. Children are children really, the ultimately politics really, aren't they. I mean without them, there really aren't going to be any politics in the future. The sooner everybody gets around to realizing that, the better it would be so that what you in a given political situation. In fact there is an insurance to the continuance of a possibility of any kind of political solution in the future. I think it's very important.

And yet, we have had to deal with what nobody will say explicitly but you get the sense of it. The children are in some societies the most easily replaceable resource and they don't care too much about them.

I think you know also at the risk of appearing to be some kind of a western elitist, which I most certainly am not, I think one's got to first of all the fact that the word humanitarian is very specifically a word which is, until very recently at any rate, has been mostly confined to very fortunate advanced western societies. It doesn't exist in more hard strapped, more pushed societies because ...

It's lady bountiful because she's ...

we in the West to be humane. Unfortunately that isn't true in a lot of cases because it comes way down on the priority list and I think UNICEF has shown an extraordinary capacity for jumping over that particular problem simply by doing extremely practical things

which anybody can see is the sensible thing to do in countries which have very little time and resources for the kind of humanitarian activities we go in for in our very fortunate little corner of the world. And I think that that deserves a lot of credit. But I think its then got to be developed into something much wider and I am sure that is being done and then I think that really this is such an important element of a whole picture of a world which is in slightly a better shape of the one you've got now. We really are going to come to terms with the major problems, we are going to come to terms with social degradation, we are going to come to terms with famine, we are going to come to terms with complete economic and social instability and in such a way that you don't create a new and impossible situation — of overpopulation, or famine or something. These are all parts of a very difficult and complicated whole and we really are in the very early stages of the UN and this is still a very kind of a shoestring, kind of a put-together operation trying to tackle a problem which people are still quite uncertain of the real dimensions.

Exactly.

This is where I get very tired with all the ideology about the UN. I think it is the really most awful and the notion that it is in some ways a kind of take-over bid for world government is bullshit and unfortunately, we are very far from that. What we are talking about here are the elements of a civil society in the world at large, that's what we are talking about. This is no threat to anyone, on the contrary, and this is what bugs me about some of the



ideological nonsense which is now emerging in the western world. I think this is very very silly stuff because what people don't seem to understand is that the way we fixed it in the western world with technology, there is no way we'll escape it anyway, the consequences in the large part of the world which is outside the western industrial circuit. We have attached them to us with hoops of iron. We did it. They didn't. And therefore you have to now take the social and economic and humanitarian consequences and deal with them.

Perhaps Europe is somehow ahead of the United States in accepting that because of its former colonial history, because it has an emotional, political and psychological connection with the rest of the world which the United States really doesn't have and as you said quite rightly, the US is dedicated to the quick-fix. It's a pragmatic society and it is willing to deal with the problem so long as you can see a solution in three months or something like that but not to stay with it for a long period of time. I think perhaps we can take some satisfaction at least at the level of intellectual rhetoric as expressed in UN resolutions. There is of course this much larger concern and I think it does go beyond purely resolutions in the sense that as you know with your sense of history of the fact that even at sort of a rhetorical level, governments and people even in the United States are now actively concerned about, up to a point, what happens everywhere in the world. As for example, the Ethiopian thing right now on TV, even though it's a short-term and limited concern, a short-sided and not realized in its larger dimensions. Nevertheless, the fact that

there is this concern is something which I think you and I as lifelong civil servants can take some satisfaction from. But, what I am leading up to is my question which is as you've seen it from your post in addition to that do you see it in terms of your dealing with governments of any sort of a major change with regard to development in its larger sense including children rather than just coming up here and saying yes to resolutions to which it's really very difficult for them to say no.

Well, you know it's very tempting especially when one happens to be a westerner oneself to knock one's own part of the world and one is naturally more finicky about that than about any of the others and I want to say that we were just saying that people in our part of the world tend to have a short term quick-fix view. But, on the other hand, it is us also who invented this concern in the first place because there wasn't anything approaching UNICEF in the twenties and thirties when I grew up even in Europe, let alone in America. And I think that this is a terrific step forward and I think that the idea of a general responsibility of the rich and fortunate for the less fortunate which is something which is the great glory of our own societies, the American, the British, the West European especially in to put that on the international scale is a colossal achievement and a great thing to have done for western countries especially the United States. I don't want to appear to be knocking it. I think it is terribly important and nobody else could have done it. I am not sure where we go from here actually. What strikes me is that the world has got so rapidly moving and so complicated due to technology

developments, that I think we need to take another very hard look at what we do now. What bothers me is that I very much doubt that people have the patience or the farsightedness to now take the emergency humanitarian stuff and the immediate needs and try to mix that up with something that would produce a more stable situation where you won't have to go in for all these emergencies. After all in our countries, we don't have to do that any more. We used to, now we have to find how in a much more difficult situation in the rest of the world we can start to move towards that. I don't, I must confess, find in the countries that I deal with outside the western world a great inclination towards            and I think they take the western good works for granted and they get furious when they get stopped. Not a very attractive picture really. They expect to be helped out whenever anything goes wrong and at the same time not be particularly co-operative when things are more or less all right.

Urguhart: And I think that we've got a very long way to go, that's why I think it is so important to devote the whole political framework of the UN to where everybody gets to the point where they understand the communal enterprise, not just something where the rich help the poor, and I can understand actually the irritation that legislators, for example, in Washington can sometimes feel about the attitude towards the United States in this organization sometimes, in relation to what they've actually done for everybody else. I feel the same thing. I feel infuriated. It's very very difficult to help people who are in trouble, who don't feel they have an obligation, and the best thing to do is to develop a general obligation towards the general good, and that is what government is all about in a nation, and we have to develop that more in the international thing. You and I, Sherry, are going to be pushing up daisies long before that happens, so there is no harm in saying it. I don't buy this business about the obligation of the rich and fortunate in the west to help everybody else, unless we get a little bit more application and thinking about it in the other countries and I think in the UN in the last ten years or so the so-called third world ambassadors have shown a great tendency to start to try to understand that. We have here in the UN among the Ambassadors of the third world some of the brightest people by any standards you can find. I notice it doesn't seem to get mentioned, but it is true. There is a generation there who are serious, extremely intelligent, unideological, people who are really prepared to learn from what they hear and experience here and I think it is very foolish to downgrade them. I think those

are the ones who are going to help an organization like UNICEF to go into its next period of activity and it is going to help the whole outfit to focus with a much less one-sided attitude on the way we do with our problems. And I think this should be encouraged. I think we are seeing it. It is very hard in the UN to see any progress, unless you start writing about what happened 30 years ago, which I've just been doing, and what is very interesting to see is that it is not the same place at all. You have a completely different situation. I mean it is really amazing. There are very serious advances in thinking, governmental attitudes, and in the way people look at their place in the world. That is wonderful. But it is so gradual you can't see it unless you go all the way back and forward again. We have to capitalize on that and try to turn what has been up to now in UNICEF's case, very largely a great compassionate organization, into something where everybody takes part. You've got a much broader base for it and everybody feels that part of it is doing something for somebody else as well as themselves, and then we'll get a much better organization here I think. We'll get much less of this complaint on the Western side that they do everything and pay for everything, and complaint on the other side when the aid suddenly stops for one reason or another and they've been let down. And I think that is a very unhealthy business. I think charity is not a good idea as a basis for any social or political institution. The sooner you get into self-help and participation of the responsibility the better you are, and I think that UNICEF has paid a lot of attention to that and I hope the Development Programme has. I mean I think you

have the object of developing a political institution is to develop as far as possible as quickly as possible the sharing of responsibility and the feeling that everybody is accountable instead of just being the recipient of help and if we can get to that we might have a much stronger political organization here. I hope we are getting to it. I think there are some signs of it.

Moe: That is good to hear. I think we are perhaps well along the way in UNICEF in that we have shifted from two-thirds of our staff being at HQ to two-thirds being in the field and they don't function as experts, they function as helpers to government and of course we all need - we don't have our own projects, we simply help governments in their development or improvement of their own projects. We're just a catalyst.

Urquhart: It's very important.

Moe: Helping to get their basic health services going, their own education things going, etc. which is I think more of a perhaps co-operative enterprise than in most other parts of the system or the bilateral aid business generally. We have, for example, been allowed in India and in Pakistan I think others, to have offices at the provincial level rather than just at headquarters, which is a small step but it is an important kind of step.

I don't want to prolong this, Brian, longer than you're willing to talk, but maybe you'd like to say a few things about where we, as an organization - our type of operation - fitted into the system as compared with the UNDP system. I mean we are a Fund which raises our own money, but we also spend it as contrasted with the general system elsewhere in the system, centered on UNDP, of raising the money but then spending it through the specialized agencies. There are pros and cons to that, and as I say you present yourself as a management expert, but I wonder if you had any views on that, because it has been a continuing subject of discussion, and related to that is the whole question of whether really should there be a children's organization, because really health is looked after WHO, UNESCO looks after education, etc. We of course think that there is a case for it, and even Sir Robert Jackson in his report some years ago thought there was, but we go through a continuing kind of identity crisis, and I wonder what your views are on that.

Urquhart: Well, I suppose the original idea was that what was swept up the consequences of World War II, this kind of operation would phase itself out, but unfortunately, it turned out that far from phasing itself out you have recurring crises in different parts of the world, which in fact increase the need and increase the number of refugees and increase all of the emergency humane problems which UNICEF was set out to deal with and I think there is something to be said for having an organization with a purely apolitical aim, particularly when it has been, so far at least, as imaginative as

UNICEF has. I think this is a very useful sort of incentive to the other members of the system. I think it is a very useful political instrument in a time when we can't manage to do anything - that's when UNICEF tends to get designated as the lead agency. I'm not saying it is the answer, but I think it is a partial answer to some of these problems. I see it rather in medieval terms as the central monarchy and the feudal barons, respectively the UN and the specialized agencies, and then maybe a sort of crusading order of the church, which is somehow I decided a ——— of both.

Moe: Joan of Arc.

Urquhart: Well, something like that. Or let's say one of the more charitable organizations of the church. I think that they had a very remarkable stimulant effect on everybody else, but they weren't quite in the same ... they weren't held on by the same limitations as the others were and they got their support from a different constituency and they have a slightly more liberated objective. I don't think it would be a good idea at all to put an end to that, not at least because UNICEF established a unique place for itself, everybody knows what it is, everybody has heard of it.

Moe: A lot of disorder helps to create a sense of order.



Urquhart: I don't think a perfectly stratified international system at this point is going to help very much. I think that what we need is not a maverick organization but an organization which is unfettered by some of the rules which the others have, which is not strictly speaking a governmental organization, which is slightly independent financially, and which has series of aims which can not be shot down politically. I think we should stick to it. I think actually now you've got a \_\_\_\_\_ is a very remarkable relationship. I think we should not hand that over to the feudal barons or to the struggling central monarchy. I think that is not at all a good idea. Once you do that you tend to lap possibilities with progress innovation and imagination ... it does seem to me that the UNICEF history has been a remarkable gamble of everybody recognizing a special situation and the people who are running that special organization as having a lot of sensitivity towards the nature of the other organizations which they are cooperating with. I think that is very important. How long that can go on I don't know.

Moe: I think perhaps indefinitely, at least for some time. Going back to another thing you were saying, we do think there are very visible signs of significant progress - what Jim Grant calls the Child Survival and Development - with accent on development - Revolution, which is now shading off towards evolution and is picking up on everything we've done before. But there are enormous signs of \_\_\_\_\_. This is actually working. Where child mortality rates are really going down, and I think it is sort of, to use the by now familiar saying, we are now just before a kind of critical mass in which people will really say this is possible for minimal amounts of money and we can make significant ...

Urquhart: Well, of course the real thing there is to get the rest of the parts of the system to catch up and tackle the basic situations in which all these children have a chance of a decent future. That seems to me to be the great challenge now.

Moe: I would see this only as not a means of obviously increasing the population of the world, which you don't need, but of doing, getting back to what you were saying before of helping people in the west to see that all these things are doable so long as we make a commitment, put our backs to it and our shoulders to the wheel and all that, and see it as a long term thing.

Urquhart: It has always seemed to me that if something like a hundredth of the ingenuity and energy that has been put into manufacturing the space shuttle was, for example, put into the problems of desertification and we had the same time scale, which is a time scale of 20-30 years, and which seems to me to be right, maybe we could even develop it after a bit to the whole problems of peace. I managed the other day to be criticized by the Heritage Foundation because on peace keepings in 1945 we spent three billion dollars, ...

Moe: Big deal.

Urquhart: And I thought that was a terrific opportunity to answer because after all in a world which spends I think 400 billion dollars a year on armaments, I would have thought that three billion in 40 years on peace ...

Moe: That's a hell of a bargain.

Urquhart: was a bloody bargain. There is a very upset series of priorities here. The kind of money that you spend at UNICEF is peanuts.

Moe: It is over 400 million a year.

Urquhart: Well, we're going to have to do a ... and I think the young people would be interested in this, I keep talking to the young people who are for a mission \_\_\_\_\_, since spying for Washington appears to be out, and it does seem to be that if I was young and a little anxious to be a great success and wanted to do something that was really fascinating, one just might think of the proper technical grounding for going in and trying to reverse the African drought. There are all sorts of things, but the trouble is you need somebody from the outside with enough energy to start doing them. Nobody is going to get any great prizes or acclaims for that, but it might be the old fashioned idea of service you know, which I think your people have - all the UNICEF people I know, and I've known hundreds of them over the years, have a sense of great vocation and service, like we were all brought up to. It is sure more fun than being in People magazine. It really is. You don't know the \_\_\_\_\_

nice and you are actually doing something that seems the right thing to do and I think that UNICEF is a very good example of getting young people back to that notion. I think people might be far happier if they were competing to be in shape as something of a ...

Moe: Well, we have more applications of really good people than we can possibly accommodate.

Urquhart: So do I in this office as a matter of fact, and it is extremely embarrassing. I think what one has got to do is to try to broaden out the possibilities of taking on some of these people. In my experience people of 20-25 are extremely serious minded with a high sense of vocation, they actually want to do something specific - which isn't spectacular, they don't all want to get their name in the papers or something like that, they really want to do something that is the right thing to do. And I think that is a wonderful thing, if we can only develop that a bit, we're not very good at it in the UN I must say. We spend so much time trying to defend ourselves against preposterous nonsense and we don't spend enough time really finding where the strength of all of these things we do - UNICEF and everything else - the strength of it is in the dream of the future. And you've got to realize when you start in on it you're not going to see it in a lifetime, you're part of a

Moe: I think we've sort of come back to where we started. It is basically a problem of perspective, and getting that across to everybody concerned and seeing it as a long-term problem of global management rather than government or anything else. I thank you very much for this and as I said the ground rules are that we will type this up and I'll edit it, and then we'll send it over to you and if you care to edit it then you send it back to me, and then we'll give you a clean version of all that, and of course we won't quote you as such without your permission. I don't think you said anything that is unquotable, I think it was very good and very useful and I thank you very much, and if I have further questions or you have further thoughts you'd like to put on record we'll be in touch. Thanks ever so much Brian.

End of tape