

AIRGRAM

PD-AAA-297-EI

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Technique III 14B0
BRAZIL

~~UNCLASSIFIED~~
CLASSIFICATION

For each address check one ACTION INFO

P.B. 2/2

PA

5120263 (44) 11p

BR JUN 14 1963

350,0007 TO - AID/W TOAID A-967
US8a
3 Sherwood '63

DATE REC'D.
3-6
DATE SENT
12/05/63

DISTRIBUTION

ACTION

La 10

INFO.

ESD
HESD
FRD
and
amp
SPD
Res
Pat
AAID/SA

FROM - Rio de Janeiro

SUBJECT - Prof. Frank P. Sherwood (Contract AIDc-1138)
- End-of-Tour Report

REFERENCE -

Enclosed is the End-of-Tour Report of Prof. Frank P. Sherwood, Chief of Party, University of Southern California Faculty in Brazil, covering period of July 26, 1962 - November 15, 1963.

Mission's comments are incorporated in this end-of-tour report.

GORDON

65W

OTHER AGENCY

State
CIA
NSA
HEW

A.I.D.
Reference Center
Room 1656 NS

PAGE PAGES

1 OF 16

DRAFTED BY

EGParker:llpb.

OFFICE

FBAD

PHONE NO DATE

11.29.63

APPROVED BY

Edlow G. Parker, Act'g Chief, FBAD

AID AND OTHER CLEARANCES

FAO/Garin, EXED

~~UNCLASSIFIED~~
CLASSIFICATION

(Do not type below this line)

END-OF-TOUR REPORT OF

**Frank P. Sherwood, Chief of Party
University of Southern California
School of Public Administration**

From July 26, 1962 to November 15, 1963

(Contract N° AIDc-1138 - Project N° 512-11-770-044)

The cooperative program to improve education in Public Administration at the university level in Brazil dates back to 1959. At that time the governments of Brazil and the United States entered into a project agreement which foresaw the employment of the services of a U.S. university contractor to work with a total of five institutions geographically dispersed throughout Brazil: three universities, the independent superior school of public administration (EBAP) in Rio, and the federal school of public service (DASP School) also in Rio. The University of Southern California was selected as the contracting university.

Program plans seldom work out as originally conceived; but at the same time the program plan remains a basic frame of reference for the work of the project. The University of Recife, for a variety of political reasons, never did join the program. The University of Minas Gerais, which was twice expected to become a member of the group, never participated. The hopes that we had for the DASP School to become a really effective in-service training institution have not been realized because of the environment prevailing within the Federal government itself. Our anticipation that each of our programs would be anchored in an undergraduate degree curriculum has not been realized in Rio Grande do Sul. Yet I doubt that these should be considered as anything more than normal events in the four year life of a program.

However the fundamental goal of the program, rather clearly a part of the original thinking, seems to need re-emphasis. I refer to the idea that this should be a national program, involving the development of a national center at EBAP and vital regional units. As it is, our efforts have been confined to the extreme south, Rio Grande do Sul, to the state of Bahia, and to Rio de Janeiro. Our hope that there would be four or five institutions in key geographic sectors has simply not been realized.

Unclassified

967

The reasons for this result do not lie in a lack of institutions which have expressed an interest in participation. Probably the most fundamental problem has been leadership. The second has been money. It is my impression that the U.S. Aid Mission in Brazil has really not adopted a posture toward its public administration programs during the past two years. There was clearly a disenchantment with the Mission's own direct hire efforts at the DASP; and our project also faced some real difficulties during the first two years. It is clear, too, that AID disenchantment with public administration was not restricted to Brazil alone. Many people have had very simple-minded notions about what it takes to improve government. They have thought miracles could be worked over night. They have failed to recognize cultural problems and the long term required for change. Furthermore, public administration has been seen in the most frightfully narrow terms-- as system analysis, personnel classification, and performance budgeting. The AID missions have seldom tried to recruit people who would look at decision processes, who understood the complicated business of organizational development, who were really sophisticated about leadership processes, and who understood the political consequences of various administrative acts. When I arrived in Brazil, the tax experts and the methods men were going home. We soon were down to a two-man unit; and it was never clear whether this truncated Business and Public Administration Division would survive. As it happened, it did -- but its reduced scale of operation has left little time for innovative activity.

In this environment, leadership efforts to achieve the original geographic goals of the project could hardly be expected to have appeared. They did not. The Brazilians, too, did very little. Yet this is understandable. The real negotiation was between AID and the institutions involved. In our case, we had three institutions who expressed interest in the program and actually applied for admission. In each instance there were major delays; and none of the institutions ever got into the program. In the case of Minas Gerais, a vital element in our planning, there were problems within the University and aggressive action was called for. It was not forthcoming. It is my conviction we could have done some good work there, could have served the U.S. interest, and could have developed a significant program. I think others thought so too; and that is why certain elements pushed to keep us out. They won. As a result, both business and public administration are limping along in the Minas faculty of economic sciences while marxist panaceas remain the standard academic fare.

Unclassified

In the case of the University of Ceará, the delay was excruciating, with Washington the major culprit. At last, the university was told that it would be admitted. Later that admission was withdrawn. The University of Brasilia was told informally that a request for admission would be received with interest; but nothing happened for months. True, AID got requests for a great many other kinds of help from the University, and this did make for complications. The fact remains, however, a chance to work with a potentially significant entity in the field of Brazilian public administration, and thus to fulfill the geographic aspirations of this program, was never provided.

Why is it important to review this dreary history? I suspect it is because I feel some concern -- and a certain amount of guilt -- that ways were not found to broaden the bases of our efforts. I happen to believe that, over the long run, Brazilian government can be improved and the U.S. can help in a modest -- I repeat modest -- way. Secondly, I think the AID group must accept leadership responsibility. It is easy to say the Brazilians should have done more; but I think that is unrealistic. The weakness in U.S. program commitment, I think, was our basic problem; and this suggests the importance in technical assistance of firm, long term guidelines. If there was a firm policy not to follow the original geographic precepts of the project, then it would have been far better to say so at the beginning and to refuse to receive requests for participation. As it was, the whole process of decision was halting and uncertain. For my part, the experience was a frustrating one.

Project Accomplishments

With regard to our project operations during the past year, it seems to me the experience further emphasizes the importance of taking the long view of such technical assistance activities. Not much that is important and durable is built rapidly. I was in Brazil as a short term consultant in 1960 and so I have had a good chance to observe the development of this program. It has, to be frank, been tedious, at times painful, and always trying. We did not come here to be exchange professors but to find meaningful ways to facilitate institutional development and improvement. Even defining our job has been difficult. Thus I understand very well what my predecessors have gone through and I realize, in a great many ways, how the successes I think we have had in the past 15 months have been built on groundwork which they painstakingly laid.

In this report, I do not intend to detail the events of the past year. I feel these have been adequately covered in our monthly and semi-annual reports, which we have been careful to prepare as a full documentation of our work. It perhaps will be useful, however, to indicate what I have seen as our major accomplishments over the past year:

a. Steps to close the "book gap." My predecessor, Henry Reining, emphasized the need to do much more to provide a literature in Portuguese. In June, 1963, a new agreement was reached between AID and the Fundação Getulio Vargas, amounting to \$45,000, which will permit the translation and publication of approximately 15 titles, in the field of administration for development. Furthermore, the monies derived from the sale of these works will go back into more editing and translating. The program does an important thing. It provides a base in the Brazilian School of Public Administration for an editing and translating facility, which has been lacking in the past. While six volumes of readings in various fields of public administration were published during the year, the task was made infinitely more difficult because of the lack of any Brazilian structure within which such work could be undertaken. The first book in the administration for development series is now at the printer and two more, on local planning administration and on administrative organization for economic development, have been translated and are now being edited. The slowness with which things go in the publication field, however, is illustrated by a comment made by Dean Reining in his terminal report, written in June, 1962. He indicated that a bibliography prepared by Professor Ivan Richardson and involving 6,000 items, would be published within 90 days. It is still not published. The number of items increased to 8,000 and then there innumerable negotiations about publication. These were finally resolved; and the final product, now in page proof, will be a book of 800 pages, the most costly ever published by the Fundação. In these matters, I should like to recognize the extremely effective work of Ivan Richardson of our staff and the fine cooperation of Mr. James Asper, of Technical Aids Branch/AID. We are deeply committed to the importance of the work of Mr. Asper's organization and hope that it will continue to receive major support in the Mission.

b. Professors to the United States. It has always been clear that everything depended on the recruitment and training, in the United States, of an elite group of professors. Certainly our experience with the approximately 20 who have returned further emphasizes the soundness of this approach. In both Bahia and Rio Grande do Sul, the public administration cadres of both of these institutions are USC-trained and are performing spectacularly. The Brazilian School of Public Administration (EBAP) is a more complex institution; but still the USC trained people are making a major contribution. During 1961-62 there was a noticeable reluctance to send more professors to the U.S. It seemed that the Brazilian institutions were underestimating their manpower needs very much. Furthermore, they were reluctant to make the long-term commitments involved. In order, however, to avoid the real issue, they simply said they could not find good people to send. This problem was countered with the idea of a national examination. Under Professor Jess Swanson's leadership, this examination was held in the fall, 1962. A number of good candidates were uncovered, but more importantly, it caused the member institutions to give a good deal more attention to the whole question of professorial training. During 1961-62 Dean Reining reported that only one professor went to the United States. Between August 1962 and September 1963 (a fourteen month period), a total of 15 professors departed for the United States. We anticipate that approximately 12 more will depart for February, 1964 classes, the last group expected to go in this program. When all have returned, the University of Rio Grande do Sul should have an SC-trained faculty of 10, Bahia a faculty of 12, and EBAP about 20. No new professors are being sent from the DASP School. Two of the four sent from the DASP are currently teaching also at EBAP and one in the Guanabara School of Public Service. Three of the four continue to work at DASP School.

c. Research and Writing. In a university-level program, research is the under-pinning of all other activities. This fact has often gone unrecognized. This is not to say that all universities are equally committed to research or that all research equally finds its way into publications. As a general rule, however, the distinguishing feature of university life in the United States is the full time professor who is committed to the advancement of knowledge. From this commitment comes the vitality that makes a university. In the under developed countries the need for research is vital. We cannot write textbooks without basic data obtained through research. Classroom teaching will not have a reality base until the phenomena of Brazilian life in government are being captured and recorded. Finally the discipline of public administration, or any other discipline for that matter, cannot grow and mature without its research base. This last point bears further

discussion. I have been struck by the fact that many Brazilian scholars tell me they will require technical assistance for many years to come because they need continuous communication about new ideas emerging in the U.S. Why do new ideas emerge there and not in Brazil? Precisely because people are doing research.

I think we have made some progress in these directions, though we face formidable obstacles. Most heartening has been a general predisposition of the Ford Foundation to make research grants in public administration, as a result of a survey made by a Ford team in May, 1963. The acting Ford representative told me that our AID project had provided the "infrastructure" which made it possible for the Ford Foundation to consider grant requests in the public administration area. The first grant, of \$132,000, was made to the University of Bahia. When I visited Bahia in 1960, I would never have believed that three years later, the university could have developed a research posture sufficient to warrant this expression of faith by the Ford Foundation. Furthermore, I do not think the Foundation is making a mistake. The grant monies will be effectively used. There are many other evidences of a growing research commitment which I do not have space to describe here; and two further indications will have to suffice. The DASP School, our problem child, has assigned some 2 million cruzeiros of especially budgeted money to its research center, created at our instigation in 1962. Several interesting projects are underway. At EBAP Professor Herminio Faria, who was trained at SC, is doing an outstanding job of building student research into his classwork. At his instigation, many USC faculty members have participated in this undertaking. I am also pleased that the American faculty has itself devoted more attention to personal research, in such areas as governmental planning, administrative organization and reorganization, state government, urbanization, budgeting, state enterprises, and others.

d. The National Conference. The interchange of information is another vital element of a mature educational system. This involves the development of skill in conceptualizing a conference program, planning, and managing such affairs. We participated in three such ventures during the past 15 months but the most important was the first National Conference on Public Administration, held in July, 1963, with a registration of about 125 people. Professor George Bemis provided our leadership to this venture; and the venture must be counted a success. The Brazilians themselves were highly pleased and we are very confident that a second conference

will be held in 1964. The Brazilians made it their conference, and they deserve a great deal of credit for having carried it to a successful conclusion. The press covered the conference exhaustively. The proceedings were recorded and will be published, probably by the end of the year.

e. Teaching and Training Methods. We have clearly had success in demonstrating new methods of teaching and training. My philosophy is that it does little good to exhort people to change their methods; there need to be incentives for change in behavior patterns. As a result, I think the best way to get change in methods is the development of more sophistication about the training process. Since there is a great demand for training in administration in Brazil, the provision of this skill to the professors thus has economic significance. Furthermore, I do not think that professors who are effective trainers can behave one way in an academic classroom and another in a training situation. Training involves a sensitivity to needs; and it is because of this that training represents an important departure point for the improvement of teaching methods. At USC we have made some efforts to develop these skills and the results are clearly evident in Brazil. We need to do much more, however. Professor Edward Jones has provided leadership to our efforts in this respect; and his work in the development of sensitivity laboratories is a particularly significant aspect of this work. As of the moment several of these laboratories have been held, with very considerable success, in each of our institutions: at Rio Grande do Sul, Bahia, and Rio de Janeiro. Professor Jones is editing a series of papers on these experiences, which should soon be ready for publication. Professor Joao Matta of the University of Bahia has written a 100 page report on one of his laboratory experiences.

It is easy to continue a lengthy description of the accomplishments that I have felt more important. In the preceding paragraphs, I have sought to limit myself to some of the developments which I think have had strategy significance.

I now turn to two other areas, upon which I feel it necessary to make a comment; (a) relationships within the party, with the Brazilians, with USC/Los Angeles, and with USAID/Brazil; and (b) recommendations.

Relationships

The experience in Brazil has been of immense personal and professional importance to me; and this has only been possible because of the many people who have been supportive and helpful. Certainly my general feeling is not one of criticism, but of appreciation to those who have helped create such a meaningful work environment.

Within the party. I think we have had an able group of people in Brazil; and I have been most impressed by their dedication and general industry. They have been good representatives of the United States. Because they are highly effective and accustomed to doing things in their own way, the task of the party leader is not easy; and it has to be recognized that such a group cannot be treated in the same hierarchical way as would be those in a governmental agency. On the other hand, I think there is something of a tendency for such group members to expect independence and flexibility that anyone accountable to the government, even on a contract basis, cannot hope for. The problem of navigating between individual independence and hierarchical demands is not always easy; and a successful resolution of the problem calls for tolerance on everyone's part.

With the Brazilians. This relationship has, in a word, been delightful. I leave Brazil with the deepest respect for the integrity, industry, capacity, and commitment of my Brazilian colleagues. They are really superb people who make many sacrifices in pursuit of their ideal of effective and honest government. The tragedy, of course, is that the system is so intensely political that these kinds of people do not have an opportunity to move into positions of top governmental power. Yet it is also significant that power in Brazil is sufficiently diffused that our project prospered precisely the time when the government as a whole was going through some of its most difficult times. The Fundação Getulio Vargas is really one of the great contributors to Brazil. It is efficiently, intelligently, and honestly operated. In my opinion, it deserves far more support than it has gotten from U.S. sources, not just AID but also the foundations. There has been receptivity to every one of my ideas and I have never worked in a more cooperative climate. I have been accused of becoming "Brazilianized." Perhaps so. However, I worry that a good many people charged with technical assistance programs are so removed from these kinds of exposures that their own attitudes become warped in the opposite direction.

As between the two possibilities, I would choose the first. In reality, I do not think I have been "Brazilianized." I do not think the Brazilians need me to defend their society. My particularly fortunate experience has been that I have seen where some of its strengths are.

With USC/Los Angeles. I think we have gotten good to excellent administrative support from Los Angeles, which represents a process of continuous improvement since 1959. There is still need, however, for a more effective definition of the role relationships between the campus and the field. Apparently university contracts are here to stay and it is therefore increasingly important that more consideration be given to such problems. To provide some illustration of the problems involved, it must be recognized that universities -- and faculties too -- are large and complex. To get attention for one program is difficult. As a result there is a tremendous amount of program delegation -- and consequently little leadership -- from the campus to the field. Interventions tend to come on salary, certain perquisites, appointment of consultants, and similar circumstances where controls are traditionally applied. Yet these seem to be exactly the areas where flexibility is required. To put it another way, the campus seems to find it taxing and difficult to do some of the things it might most constructively do; and at the same time it encounters problems in avoiding arbitrariness in certain kinds of detail controls. I do not write these lines to be critical of USC. The fact that I feel free to write them is itself a matter of significance. What I do desire to indicate is that these are matters deserving of a great deal more attention on the part of all universities and the AID.

With USAID/Brazil. As I have implied earlier in this report, I have not always been in agreement with the attitudes and approaches of the Mission. However, on the whole, I do not see how a contractor could have been treated better than we have in the past year. The attitude, on the whole, has been one of providing support to our activities, without exercising detailist control. Furthermore, I have respect for a number of the individuals in the Mission and have enjoyed having the opportunity to work with them. At the one really critical point in our relationship, the problem of further financing, I was treated very fairly. Positions were frankly stated, were sufficiently explored, and opportunity was given to appeal to the top leadership of the Mission. The fact that the decision was ultimately favorable was, of course, satisfying; if it had been otherwise, however, I could not have criticized the process by which it would have been reached. Out of all this has come an increased conviction that the biggest problems of AID rest

in Washington. USC/Los Angeles has continually faced problems in getting information and decisions; and the same story is repeated by the Mission people here. I found, too, that our communications system through Los Angeles was generally better than that between the Mission and Washington.

The experience with the budget produced some interesting insights. In the first place, ^{the} AID budget system itself is archaic. But more important is the psychology of the budget. When I was Acting Dean of the School of Public Administration, I participated in negotiations for fiscal year 1962-63. It was a fairly artificial negotiation, in which Washington asked the usual stock, detailist questions. As it turned out, we ended up with more money than we asked; and that I have never been able to understand. In our financial negotiations here, though, it became clear to me for the first time that we were dealing with a total amount of money, with- in which the Mission was disposed to give us a considerable amount of flexibility. If we could save money on transportation, it meant we could buy more books or send one more professor to the United States. As this has come clear to us, I think our cost consciousness has grown appreciably. I know mine has. What I am arguing is that this kind of assignment of total responsibility for the use of a sum of money is a better means of insuring its effective utilization than the detailist controls which generally seem to permeate the AID budget system.

Two other items deserve some mention here. One is the problem of chain of command. As contract people, we do not recognize any chain of command between ourselves and officials of the Mission. We feel free to contact anyone within the Mission or Embassy as the need arises; and I do not think efforts to channel us through one person or office will be satisfactory to either side. This does not mean at all that the kind of supervisory and supportive activities exercised by the Contract Representative should not continue. Undoubtedly, that is our chief point of contact. What I am arguing is that this should not be regarded as a hierarchical relationship; and no one should be offended if we have business relationships with other officers of the Mission. Naturally, the contract representative should be kept informed; this is in everyone's interest. But I have found it quite impossible to observe the kind of hierarchical protocol that some feel is desirable. Here I might note one result of an attempt to observe hierarchical protocol which has ended up as a matter of personal irritation to me. Early in my tour, I expressed a desire to be introduced to the Ambassador.

I thought this perfectly logical. The program which I was seeking to lead was quite large by technical assistance standards and it was in an area of rather major importance. Furthermore, there was the personal fact that I felt a certain professional identification with the Ambassador as a professor. I do not mean by this that I expected anything more than a brief introduction. I realize he is busy. In August, 1962, I addressed a formal request for such a presentation through AID/Brazil channels. To this date (November, 1963) I have never received a reply to my request or have I ever seen the Ambassador. In this kind of situation, the unsuspecting Ambassador becomes the object of some of my hostility; for I do not know whether I simply was not important enough to merit a brief encounter or whether my request got lost in the AID bureaucratic maze. But I haven't forgotten it; and I would recommend that something be done to permit my successor the opportunity to pay his respects.

My other point has to do with the increasing control that seems to be developing within the Mission. This touches us directly in the administration of local hire people, for example. We are not located at Mission headquarters, our files are completely open, and we have no security clearances, as was demonstrated by the fact that we were barred from a meeting of AID officials where the Director spoke. Nevertheless, our local hire people have to have a security clearance; and there are a number of other "before the fact" actions that a new directive on hiring of local personnel requires. Since we seek to direct our energies toward program goals, every little increase in administrative requirements causes something more basic in our undertaking to suffer. Where a gain is to be had, this is appropriate. But it is hard to see why a reporting system, on an "after the fact" basis, would not serve just as well. I mention this, not so much for the importance of the local hire question, but to emphasize the need to make sure that controls, when imposed, really serve a purpose sufficient to justify the expenditure of time involved.

Recommendations

In this section, I do not propose to develop a laundry list of recommendations for action that have been suggested to me by my experience. Some can be deduced by what I have said above. In general, however, I think the present directions of the program are sound, the relationships with other units healthful, and the need is to continue as aggressively as possible along the same paths.

What I have not discussed previously is the "after '65" question. (The present contract expires in May, 1965) I think it is quite clear that the full job will not be done by that time. We will have good institutional bases in Rio Grande do Sul, Rio, and Salvador. But this is not all of Brazil. That problem will have to be faced. Secondly, the three institutions will face a number of specific problems where they will feel the need for further technical assistance; and, in a general sense, they will want the continued stimulation offered by the North American professors, as I indicated earlier. The problem for the AID/Brazil is to consider the manner in which such requests will be received. It will not do simply to brush aside any further requests. The Brazilians feel they have done a good job, and this feeling will probably be further strengthened at the end of the contract. In short, I think AID/Brazil should anticipate that this felt success experience will engender certain anticipations on the part of the Brazilians. I am not saying that the USAID/Brazil should provide further support in this field; I am only arguing that the process of decision-making should be such as to take into account the presence of these kinds of feelings. Earlier in the year, I recommended that there be a major evaluation of the project in 1964; but the Mission did not accept this proposal. I still think this is the logical step and hope that the earlier decision will be reconsidered.

Another aspect of the "after '65" problem has concerned me a great deal. This involves the development of a continuing relationship between the University of Southern California and the institutions with which it has had such close associations. The continuation of these relationships, it seems to me, is very important to individual scholars, to the institutions involved, and to the governments of the two countries. As of the moment, I do not think the University of Southern California has done all that it could conceivably do on its own to maintain these relationships. We have made a number of suggestions -- development of a specialized collection in Portuguese language materials, development of an off-campus program in Brazil, joint research projects, and so forth. None of these has gotten beyond the talking stage; and at this point I do not frankly know what the disposition of the University of Southern California is. It seems to me that the time has come for University officials, Brazilian officials, and the AID/Brazil people to give attention to this problem. My own attitude is that there will have to be financial investment on all sides; and the University of Southern California particularly should be asked to indicate the ways in which it is prepared to use its own resources to further existing relationships. These steps perhaps should have been taken earlier;

but I frankly do not think this was possible. There is now a scholarly investment on both Brazilian and American sides; and innovative steps should be taken to see that it is protected and indeed augmented.

After this report was typed, word was received that the Inter-American Bank has made a grant of over \$300,000 to support the Getulio Vargas Foundation in the development of an inter-american school of public administration in Rio. This program, which will be supported also by a special appropriation from the Brazilian government, has been carefully articulated to meet the needs for separate identity of an inter-american center and at the same time to make maximum use of the Foundation's resources and experience in public administration. As a matter of fact, the reason the Foundation appears to have gotten the award was its presentation of a very strong infra-structure within which to fit the new undertaking. The USC group has played a role of some significance in the development of this proposal, in the articulation of the program of the new school, in advice and consultation to the Foundation, and in sessions with the Brazilian representative of the Bank, Cleanto Leite, who worked very hard to secure the school for the Foundation. What this leads me to conclude, as an addendum, is that an important measure of the success of a program is the extent to which it is able to attract other resources. The amount of money which is flowing into the institutions we support -- with the exception of the DASP School -- is vastly more than was the case four years ago. True, the U.S. government has spent a good deal of money to get this movement going, but the increasing flow of funds from a variety of sources provides significant evidence that this seed money is going to result in a pretty fair harvest.

Frank P. Sherwood
Chief of Party
USC Faculty in Brazil

FS/ef

Unclassified

USAID/B's Comments on Prof. Sharwood's
End-of-Tour Report

Supplementary information is provided below by the Public and Business Administration Division concerning subject report:

1. Re. University of Ceará (Page 4):

On November 7, 1960, two professors from the School of Administration of Ceará visited the Mission Deputy Director to request assistance and were advised to submit their request through the Brazilian Coordinator's Office, which was done on December 1, 1960 and referred to the Mission on December 29, 1960. A Mission team surveyed the School of Administration of Ceará and concurred in the request for assistance in a report dated February 1, 1961.

Correspondence and telegram on January 9, 1963 sent by the Mission and the Brazilian Coordinator's Office, subsequent to admission of the survey report, were never acknowledged by the School of Administration which indicated interest only in a reply to the follow-up telegram of January 21, 1963.

Six messages from May to November 1962 were exchanged between the Mission and AID/W relative to admission of the School of Administration of Ceará in the program. The last message indicated that unless a reply was received from AID/W the Mission would assume that AID/W had no objection to its admission to the program.

As the institution is in the Northeast, it was necessary for the Brazilian Coordinator's Office to obtain SUDENE's concurrence to include the School in the program. A letter of inquiry dated March 25, 1963 was never answered.

On July 22, 1963, at a meeting in the Coordinator's Office, it was reported that Ceará no longer sought assistance from AID inasmuch as it had entered into an agreement with OAS.

2. Re. University of Brasilia (Page 4):

The University of Brasilia, beginning in April 1962, showed great interest in joining the program. Letters were written to U.S. Chief of Party, Ambassador Gordon, Dr. Simões Lopes, Dr. Faria Góes, and others. However, at a meeting with Mr. Mingos, Chief, Office of Program Planning, on July 19, 1963, the Coordinator's Office representative, Dr. Faria Góes, appeared indecisive relative to participation of the University. The Mission resolved not to admit the University of Brasilia inasmuch as the program was two-thirds completed.

3. Re. Relationship with USAID/B (Pages 11 and 12):

a) A Contract Representative was appointed by the Mission Director to three University contracts, to serve and facilitate interests of both parties to the contract - the Mission and the University. No offense is taken when the Contract Group contacts other Mission officers; but for maximum usefulness it is in the interest of the Contract Group to keep the Contract Representative informed.

b) Prof. Sherwood, by memorandum of September 27, 1962, requested a meeting with the Ambassador and was informed that the request was forwarded to the Executive Office. Regretfully, it was not until reading Prof. Sherwood's report did I ascertain that he had never met the Ambassador.

c) Clearances are required for all prospective local-hire people, prior to employment.

d) Prof. Sherwood was not barred from an AID meeting. The meeting to which he refers was the Director's regular staff meeting with Division chiefs to which he requested attendance of all direct-hire personnel. In October 1963 the Director visited the USC Group in its offices in the Getulio Vargas Foundation.