

301.2  
T578

PW-ABI-165  
71909

CDD Paper No. 7

**ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

**NEW GOALS, NEW EMPHASIS**

**FOR ECONOMIC AID**

**David S. Tillson**

Reference Center  
Room 1656 HS

**Community Development Division  
Office of Public Services  
International Cooperation Administration**

**June 22, 1961**

**ANTHROPOLOGY**

301.2 International Cooperation  
T578 Administration.  
Anthropology and Social Develop-  
ment: New Goals, New Emphasis for  
Economic Aid. David S. Tillson.  
June 1961.  
18 p.

1. Anthropology. 2. Social change. 3. Econ-  
omic assistance- Sociological aspects. 4.  
Sociologists. I. Tillson, David S. II. Title.

100V is n = 15784  
local = 8571

NOTE

This is the seventh of a series of papers prepared by the staff of the Community Development Division in connection with the Administration's plans to redirect the foreign aid program.

The author, David S. Tillson, who obtained his Ph.D in 1957 from Syracuse University where he majored in anthropology, sociology and economics, prepared this paper while serving temporarily as a member of the Community Development Division staff. Following an initial overseas ICA community development assignment in Libya he transferred to Pakistan. Dr. Tillson who conferred with Dr. Thomas Gladwin, anthropologist, National Institute of Health and others in the preparation of this document is being granted a year's leave of absence by ICA to teach anthropology at the University of Ohio during the 1961-62 school year.

This paper does not necessarily represent the official view of the Office of Public Services of the International Cooperation Administration. It has been cleared by the Chief of the Community Development Division. In his opinion it represents the best current presentation of the subject and warrants study by those responsible for assisting in redirecting the foreign aid program.

Louis M. Miniclier, Chief  
Community Development Division

## I. THE PROBLEM:

For many years the U.S. economic aid program overseas has been subjected to criticism of various kinds. Much of it has been prejudiced and unjustified. A certain residue of past criticism, however, certainly has been fair and just. In the world of today, it would be folly indeed for the U.S. Government to ignore advice given by informed and well-meaning friends of foreign assistance, both foreign and domestic on how to improve our aid efforts. Ramon P. Binamira, head of the Philippine Office of the PACD, recently has levied a thoughtful critique of our policies, as has Harvard economist John K. Galbraith, new U.S. Ambassador to India. Others, both inside and outside the government are much concerned with improving our aid measures.

Clearly the pace of progress of our work abroad has not been so rapid as we hoped. Our own accomplishments have seemed limited, while the 'multiplier effect' of U.S. aid has not been so great as we expected. In some countries, indeed, such as Pakistan and Iran, Paraguay and Bolivia, almost no discernible net economic or social improvement has been noted, while in other cases such as Iraq and Cuba revolutions have occurred. In more than half a dozen important nations which receive U.S. economic assistance, military dictators or military juntas have taken control. Of course in some cases our accomplishments have been outstanding. Japan and India seem to be countries which have benefitted or are benefitting greatly from U.S. aid. And we can always fall back on our major successes in Western Europe after 1948. Still, in the light of the ambiguous situation as to what U.S. economic aid really has accomplished worldwide, and in the light of the staggering economic and social problems of the world today, the question keeps arising as to whether the U.S. Government, whether ICA or its successor agency, might be able to make improvements in our aid programs, might begin to do still better than we have done in the past in extending our economic know-how, our resources, and our active spirit of development to the new and poor nations of the free world.

It is quite justifiable then that the question of improvement of our foreign economic aid program has been raised again at the outset of the new Kennedy administration. Since the new countries in Africa that we are now beginning to assist are radically different both in ethnic and social composition and in cultural and economic values from those in Europe and elsewhere, the question of reorientation of our aid takes on added importance. A further spur to reconsideration is President Kennedy's new emphasis on the extremely important problem of achieving Social Justice in aided countries. This emphasis gives new urgency to the question of perfecting our mechanisms of foreign aid, for questions involving Social Justice--hence 'meddling' with indigenous social structures--are about as

touchy and as ticklish as can be imagined. Both politically and sociologically, these problems are loaded with booby-traps.

This paper then addresses itself to the general question of the appropriateness of our present level of utilization of the social sciences other than economics. More specifically, can the planning and administration of U.S. economic development programs be improved through Washington and Mission action:

- (a) To utilize the services of sociologists and cultural anthropologists more extensively?
- (b) To take existing human and social factors of country and community situations in which we operate more fully into account generally?

If so, what particular actions towards these ends should be taken at this time?

## II. BACKGROUND:

U.S. economic aid programs never have employed many social scientists.<sup>1/</sup> ECA, the Marshall Plan administration for aid to Western Europe, was founded in 1948 and hired numerous economists. But the Economic Cooperation Administration did not consider that it needed sociologists or anthropologists in great numbers to help channel industrial equipment to modern Western nations such as Britain, France and Germany. In 1950, however, after President Truman announced his original Point Four proposal, a new organization, the Technical Cooperation Administration was set up in the State Department to provide technical assistance to newly developing nations in other continents. Three years later, creation of the Foreign Operations Administration brought together ECA (by that time MSA), TCA, and the Institute of Inter-American Affairs under a single organizational umbrella to provide U.S. economic and technical assistance throughout the world.

Changes in the conception and the organization of our economic assistance overseas brought about an increase over a period of time in the number of anthropologists and other social scientists hired by our foreign aid agencies. One well-known anthropologist, for example, served briefly ten years ago in a high echelon of TCA. Several anthropologists were taken on by IIAA in Latin America. In recent years ICA's Community Development Division gradually has added half a dozen sociologists to the rolls as well as about a dozen cultural anthropologists, including several with experience in the U.S. Trust Territories in the Pacific. As of April 1960, Community Development Division, worldwide, employed 21 sociologists and anthropologists. Several others were scattered elsewhere in the agency, were assigned, e.g., to particular Health or Education projects; one worked in Career Development. In recent months several anthropologists have been called on to serve as consultants to ICA and to the Department of State. According to Dr. Thomas Gladwin of the National Institute of Health, we should realize that ICA, largely through the employment policies of the Community Development Division become the leader among U.S. Government agencies in the progressive use of anthropologists.

A reservation should be expressed at this point, however, since neither FCA nor ICA have ever used anthropologists consistently or for any length of time in planning, in programming, or in connection with the selection and supervision of personnel. Both planning and operating decisions in the past frequently have been made in full innocence of the

<sup>1/</sup> See footnotes.

relevant and available social scientific and anthropological insights. On this point one illustration will suffice. Both FOA and ICA, have had a "Europe and Africa Region". As economists and administrators completed Marshall Plan assignments in such Western capitals as London, Paris, or Vienna, they frequently were assigned to two-year terms in such dissimilar lands as Egypt, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, or Sudan or they undertook work in ICA/W to make policy towards such countries. New, more suitably trained and experienced personnel, were not substituted in the new lands, nor, until recently, was in-service training in non-Western cultures and values provided to veterans of European service.

### Sociologists and Anthropologists in CDD in 1960-61

Of the 21 professional sociologists and anthropologists overseas in April 1960 who were backstepped by Community Development Division, four were attached to Program Offices and bore Mission-wide advisory responsibilities, while 17 were members of Community Development Divisions. Eleven of the 21 bore administrative or project responsibilities, while ten provided staff advisory services. Of the 21, eight bore the title "CD Advisor" or Deputy, and four had "Area" or "Provincial Advisor" jobs; four were "Community Analysts" assigned to do program oriented research, while three others, "Evaluation Advisors", helped analyze or organize programs to analyze instances and degrees of success and failure of on-going Community Development programs. Two others were "Training Advisors."

Of the 21, four were assigned to Pakistan, three to Iran, two each to Laos, Nepal and Korea, and one each to eight other countries. Of the 21, one had previous field work experience in his country of assignment before he was hired by ICA, while one was on his second tour in his country of assignment. Six of the 21 had some knowledge of a local language helpful at post.

As of January 1961, Community Development Division had eleven sociologists and anthropologists on the rolls who had spent an average of three and one-half years each in 13 different countries. Many of these had made or are now making substantial contributions to success of ICA programs. For example, Dr. Isabel Kelly, Dr. Kalervo Oberg, Dr. Ferdinand Okada, Frank Mahoney, and Dr. James Green, have done important advisory work, respectively, in Mexico, Brazil, Nepal, Somalia, and Southern Rhodesia. In addition, Dr. Green, Dr. William J. Cousins, Robert Galloway and most recently, Dr. John Cool, successfully developed major Community Development projects, respectively, in Pakistan, West Bengal (India), Jordan, and now Laos. In certain other cases, brevity of assignment of anthropologists and occasional lack of understanding in the field of the purpose and the importance of social science were factors limiting the contributions of these specialists in field analysis.

### Recent Emphases in Program Planning

A number of steps have been taken recently towards bringing our economic aid programs closer into line with the basic needs felt by the most primitive of our potential host countries among the newly independent, non-Western nations. For example, (1) two years ago ICA

initiated the Africa Studies Program to help educate our administrators on indigenous cultures and development requirements in Africa. Last year (2), the planning office of DD/P in ICA/W was strengthened considerably; personnel were added while small allotments were introduced to support operational research. In late 1960, moreover (3), in sponsoring the Act of Bogota, the U.S. Government officially recognized the urgent requirements of "Social Development" in Latin America. At the close of the year, the new Majority Leader-to-be of the U.S. Senate, former professor of Latin American History Mike Mansfield, recognized publicly in writing the need for revision of the social structure of Latin America. Mansfield urged that we seek to "enlarge the beachhead societies of our southern neighbors of Latin America into truly national democratic states... to provide that... essential element of prideful participation in the present which... is the the keynote of political stability." 3/

In his Inaugural Address President Kennedy committed his administration to this theme with the following promise: "To those people in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves..." In his 'Alliance for Progress' address, he followed up this general statement with a clear promise of assistance of 'Marshall Plan' magnitude for human, social, and economic development in Latin America. In his speech of May 3, 1961, Secretary of State Dean Rusk added this note of urgency: "Social justice is an imperative of the 1960's. The fostering of social justice must... be a major objective of our aid programs... simply because we wish our aid to be effective." These new emphases in policies of U.S. foreign economic assistance enunciated so clearly by our national leaders suggest the necessity of suitable concomitant changes in our methods of analysis and preparation of country programs and in our methods of program implementation.

A contrary tendency also was being manifest, however. In the last year or two several ICA Regional Offices and such USOMs as Pakistan began to concentrate major attention on large industrial projects of clear 'visibility', projects productive of quickly countable "accomplishments". This emphasis had to come of course at some cost to interest in less dramatic, longer term projects in human and social investment, projects in such fields as health, agricultural extension, adult education, and community development, where quick results are hard to achieve and even harder to define and to publicize. And the agency has not yet moved forward to increase our utilization of social scientists to complement work of our engineers and technicians overseas and to supplement the services of our economists and program officers.

### III. DISCUSSION:

As we have turned our attention from Europe to the newly emerging and underdeveloped countries of the world, ICA has made a beginning in recognizing and taking into account human and social factors in development and in making use of the services of anthropologists and other social scientists. Let us suggest the possibility, however, that we still have not gone far enough along this road. Perhaps we have tended on the whole to take the cultures of host countries for granted or to neglect them and have tended to treat the developmental problems of Latin America, Asia and Africa too much as though they were the same as those in Western Europe or in the United States. On this point we have the confirmation both of experienced anthropologists and also of international economists of the stature of C. P. Kindleberger, J. J. Spengler, and Bert F. Hoselitz.<sup>4/</sup>

As the late Felix Keesing, renowned anthropologist of Stanford University, once wrote about administration and welfare, "If work is to be intelligently planned and effective... the existing culture of a people must be made the constant point of reference..."<sup>5/</sup> He bases his argument on the experience of enlightened British Colonial Office administrators and anthropologists working in Africa. This same point of view is held by such other renowned anthropologists as Melville Herskovitz, Allan Holmberg, and the British economic anthropologist, Raymond Firth.<sup>6/</sup> The well-known development economists Bert Hoselitz and W. A. Lewis also share this point of view, while W. W. Rostow and Wilfred Malenbaum have advocated the related concept that economic interest is just one of man's many socio-cultural motivations. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, under the leadership of the Honorable William Fulbright, has shown itself extremely well-informed and advanced in its thinking about the significance of social and cultural factors in economic development.

At this point let us introduce, as hypotheses for discussion, ten major propositions on the relationship of human and social development to economic growth. These propositions--intentionally stated rather bluntly--are intended to reinforce understanding of and concern with the additional complicating effect of non-economic factors in economic development. These propositions define an argument which, if sound even in part, builds a foundation for the conclusion that ICA should lay increased emphasis on the importance of these other elements of socio-cultural life. They are intended to provide a clear rationale, (1) to make certain adjustments in the staffing of Washington and Mission Program

Offices and, derivatively, (2) to modify the present emphasis of numerous ICA programs in the field. The propositions are as follows: 17/

1. Economic incentives are not the controlling forces in human affairs that they are widely thought to be in the world today. Economics, as economists themselves increasingly recognize, is only one major aspect of man's socio-cultural life.
2. The amount of unutilized social and economic resources and techniques available right now for economic growth in even the poorest countries is tremendous. Theoretically, the potential opportunity for stepping up the pace of development activity around the world is, indeed, enormous, even staggering.
3. Unfortunately, however, many potentially valuable resources and techniques are shut out of use in all these societies due to the simple fact that their members have not learned ways of thinking and ways of living which would make use of them.
4. Since their habitual activities, ideas, and values provide them a certain set of accustomed familiarities, both individuals and social groups, moreover, normally show great reluctance to modify either their habitual ways of thinking or their traditional ways of living.
5. Whenever individuals are placed in situations which force them to change their ordinary patterns of action, they react emotionally against such forces-to-change which for them are disturbing factors.
6. Unplanned, unexpected change, which just "happens", therefore, generally gives rise to severe individual frustrations and serious social dislocations.
7. Even carefully thought-out, sensibly programmed, measures for improvement of society are difficult to administer. Unexpected repercussions occur which are difficult to control--even difficult, often, to identify.
8. Alterations in one part of the fabric of society necessarily give rise to tensions elsewhere in social life. Economic development does not occur "cleanly", i.e., independently of social change.
9. Economic development usually occurs under conditions of wide-spread psychological stress and social strain.

10. Economic development itself--"progress" itself--unfortunately, generally produces further human mental and emotional stress as well as further social strains and dislocation.

The foregoing argument--this set of ten bald propositions-- is not meant to be accepted by any one as dogma. Still less is it meant to be accepted as proved in this paper. Certainly this argument is not advanced as an indictment of the development policies of ICA or of any predecessor agency. Nor is this set of propositions presented, moreover, for its own sake, that is, not in order to advocate the academic validity of any of the ten propositions individually or of all of them. These propositions do represent a distillation or summation of relevant academic, industrial and governmental research and thinking on cultural change and social and economic growth, both in the U.S.A. and in other countries. They are indeed valid, so far as we know, both individually and as a set.

These ten propositions are advanced here in order to stimulate deep thinking on one single, underlying, general proposition, namely the following:

Human and social development are closely related to economic growth. If economic development is not, indeed, just one facet of overall socio-cultural development and change, certainly social and economic development are inextricably interdependent. Neither can be dealt without full consideration of the other.

Verification of the intrinsic interconnection of social change and economic development, to our mind, would establish our practical argument, namely that ICA, or its successor agency, (1) should increase its attention to human and social factors in host countries and (2) should therefore, call increasingly on specialists in sociology, cultural anthropology, and other disciplines of social science to contribute their services to analysis of particular ICA projects and to planning and evaluation of overall ICA programs.

When it comes to individual projects, the use of social science naturally would depend on the extent of involvement of human and social factors. Certain large projects primarily of a fiscal nature and other projects involving simply doing more of something that a given host government is doing successfully already, presumably would not require extensive sociological advice or cultural analysis.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS:

1. Since the time of the Marshall Plan, ICA and its predecessor organizations have emphasized the obviously major role of economic factors in economic development. In recent years ICA, especially the Community Development Division, has recognized and has moved to meet the fundamental and critical importance of social and cultural elements in economic development.<sup>8/</sup> Possibly ICA has underestimated the significance of human, social and cultural factors, however, and thus tended to oversimplify the process of economic growth and to reduce our chances of implementing successful development programs in the field. Certainly our success has not been so great as we anticipated ten years ago.

2. At present ICA is leading the way among U.S. Government agencies in making use of anthropologists and sociologists. A number of social scientists have been used in community development to do research in the field and to administer small action programs in community development. Certain cases have been registered of notable success. In certain instances that anthropologists have been utilized, however, (1) either they have not been stationed at one post long enough to become truly expert about conditions there or (2) their advice and abilities have not been made use of in the field as fully as they might have been. Furthermore, ICA has not employed or consulted anthropologists to any great extent to help plan, formulate, and evaluate overall country programs.

3. ICA or its successor agency should seek to move forward to a more advanced position in utilization of the personnel, tools, and insights of the other fields of social science besides economics. The new AID agency should plan economic aid measures with extreme care, in accordance with recommendations grounded in expert knowledge of each particular country and community and each particular cultural situation where our administrators and technicians are expected to work. We who seek to extend technical and economic assistance to newly-developing nations must use all the tools and techniques that we can assemble for this purpose. This includes, besides the services of economists, also long-term assignment and utilization of anthropologists and other social scientists where appropriate, both in Washington and in the field.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. A senior anthropologist with considerable experience in applied social science should be assigned to the office of the Director or Administrator of the new economic AID agency, in order to advise the AID agency at the highest level on long-term planning and on current operations. He would advise the Administrator on practical matters of program operations from the perspective of the human, social, non-economic concerns of social science. In addition, he would offer advice on overall program planning and on overall program evaluation; he would maintain liaison with universities, foundations, and private corporations which educate, employ, and provide research support for anthropologists; and he would plan AID policies on employment and use of social scientists, both in administrative positions and in research roles.
2. At least one senior sociologist or anthropologist should be assigned to the office of the Assistant Administrator for each of the four operating Regions-- AFE, NESAs, FE, and LA -- to advise each Regional Office on program composition and on methods of implementation. Very preferably, each would have a background of substantial field experience in the region for which he would be responsible. Each such staff advisor would assist the executive and administrative officers, as needed, on matters where insights of social science might suggest the superiority for a given country or situation of a particular administrative decision or arrangement. His primary function, however, would be to apprise the Regional Director, the Regional Program Officer and Program Economist, and the sub-regional Division Chiefs and Desk Officers, of relevant points of view of the social sciences on matters of program implementation and evaluation. In addition, each one would supervise and backstop any anthropologists working in the field within his Region.
3. Insofar as the agency can find suitable candidates and can recruit them for such difficult and delicate work, one experienced anthropologist should be assigned to the Program Office of each Mission, present or prospective. He should serve the entire Mission by providing general advice on program planning and specific insights on inception, implementation, and evaluation of individual projects. His title, presumably, should be "Program Sociologist" or "Program Anthropologist", since he would be a co-worker of the present Program Economist and Program Officer. Since others sometimes resent the aura of pretentiousness apparently associated with such unfamiliar titles, however, an alternate designation might be found more suitable.

4. As determined by the size and the social heterogeneity of the host country and by the size and the nature of the USOM Program, an appropriate number of "Community Analysts" should be assigned to each Mission, to assist the Program Sociologist to make community and area studies, and to advise Division Chiefs, as requested, on individual projects and problem areas. These field analysts could be moved about the country flexibly, as required, to assess project progress and to check project impact, i.e., to measure popular reception of and response to USOM field programs.

5. Recruitment for the positions in the field should be done with the scientific prerequisites for success of anthropological work clearly in mind: Before he can be considered fully qualified to offer advice to his Mission on the importance of various social and cultural factors in his area, the anthropologist or other research worker ideally should have accumulated experience in the country or area where he is to work and should have achieved minimal rough working knowledge of one helpful local language. Needless to say, his personal qualifications also must be suitable. The senior social scientists selected for the handful of positions in Washington ought to have a successful record of such field experience themselves.

6. The Community Development Division should continue its present policy of utilizing sociologists and anthropologists both in staff advisory roles and in line or project positions. Other Divisions and Offices, as appropriate, and the new AID agency as a whole should seek out candidates for employment with background in social science whenever such experience can be found along with other desirable qualifications. A variety of administrative and field positions could be filled to advantage by people with some training in sociology, anthropology, psychology, or even history. Possibly there are too many employees in ICA now with background and experience mainly in administration, often only in stateside administration at that.

- 13 -

FOOTNOTES

- 1/ The terms "sociologist" and "anthropologist" are used almost interchangeably here to designate social scientists with professional university training in any field of sociology and social and cultural anthropology, including social psychology, who possess doctoral or M.A. degrees. In practice the training of a great many sociologists and social psychologists is too specialized for ICA work or their field of training and experience has been limited to the United States.
- 2/ This calculation excludes countries, years, and anthropologists working for CDD in cases where the individual concerned did not spend a full two-year tour at one post.
- 3/ See Senator Mansfield's article in the New York Times Magazine, December 4, 1960.
- 4/ See Bert F. Hoselitz's essay "A Sociological Approach to Economic Development", p. 54ff, in his SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH, 1960, Free Press. Kindleberger and Spengler have been critical of the reports on economic development programs put out by the World Bank. They note that "Ethnocentricity leads inevitably to the conclusion that the way to achieve ... capital formation, productivity, and consumption is to duplicate these (Western) institutions."
- 5/ See Felix Keesing's essay "Applied Anthropology in Colonial Administration", p. 392 (pp. 373-98) in Ralph Linton's THE SCIENCE OF MAN IN THE WORLD CRISIS, 1945. Keesing's argument strongly favors group or "cultural self-determination" and "self-motivated" change as the only effective change mechanisms for underdeveloped areas. Perhaps we should state this as proposition eleven (see page 9) in order to close our set of propositions on a clearly constructive note.
- 6/ See, e.g., Melville Herskovits' testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U. S. Senate, 86th Congress, 2nd Session, "Possible Nonmilitary Scientific Developments ...", Part I, pp. 106-29, and his Senate "Study No. 4" on U. S. foreign policy for Africa.
- 7/ Argument in support of these propositions is relegated to a second appendix, in order to shorten the body of the paper. Evidence and authorities cited there serve only to indicate the existence and the line of reasoning of the body of fuller evidence for these propositions which is available elsewhere. They are not meant to provide conclusive proof of the validity of the argument. It should be stated, however, that these propositions are not regarded, really, as very controversial. Most of them are widely accepted today as quite commonplace.

8/ Perhaps it is not an accident that the Community Development Division is the section of ICA which has utilized social scientists most extensively. CDD is the only Division or Office in ICA which, (1) by definition recognizes the importance of dealing with natural whole groups in working for economic growth, and which (2) in practice is forced to recognize the importance of group or social factors in economic development. CDD is forced to employ social scientists, both in "line" or project roles and in "staff" or research positions. And CDD is forced to build and to modify its field programs realistically in terms of what local people at grassroots levels actually want and what they are prepared to work for.

15.

**APPENDIX**

To the paper on Anthropology and Social Development

**PROGRAM SOCIOLOGIST: PROPOSED JOB DESCRIPTION**

**A. Duties**

**B. Qualifications**

**C. Position and Status**

16

A. DUTIES:

1. Provide overall advice to the Program Officer and the Mission Director on social and cultural dimensions of the aid program and on individual projects both present and proposed. Help USOM judge popular success of ICA projects as well as success of related host government programs.
2. Serve as informal liaison of Program Office with provincial, district, and local officials of host government and with local populace. Help Program Officer and Division Chiefs to evaluate significance of attitudes and actions of host government officials and non-officials with whom they come in contact both officially and socially.
3. Advise Division Chiefs and Technicians on individual projects, as requested, concerning (1) best approaches to host government officials for discussion of host government needs and initiation of project proposals, (2) best methods of implementation to win grassroots support of and participation in project work, and (3) proper evaluation of degree of success and failure of on-going and of completed projects.
4. Advise Embassy, USIS, and Country Team on cultural matters as requested. Receive relevant social and cultural information from U.S. Embassy, USIS, and other elements of Country Team.
5. Uncover, assemble, coordinate, and interpret existing information, including research findings, on social and cultural factors relevant to project success.
6. Make field studies to fill gaps in existing knowledge, to determine social structure, cultural values and motivational systems of communities and regions of the host country, as required to fulfill his advisory duties.
7. Prepare the social factors and "country situation" sections of the CPB, thereby to assist, according to his sphere of competence (and only that), in the blueprint exercise.
8. Help orient each incoming USOM, USIS, and Embassy technician and administrator through interviews and discussions, as well as give suitable group instruction to families of all U.S. Government employees.

B. QUALIFICATIONS:

1. The candidate should have had field experience in anthropology or rural sociology, in addition to at least a Master's degree in anthropology, sociology, or social psychology.

2. His references and his interviews with ICA should provide evidence that he is energetic and active, not an arm-chair expert. He should not be "too rigid" nor "too scholarly"; if possible he should have had practical administrative experience in applied social science.

3. He should be willing to commit himself, at the discretion of ICA, to a minimum of two tours, or at least four years of service, in his country of assignment.

4. Before he takes up his work in the Mission as a fully qualified USOM Advisor, the anthropologist should have had six months' to one full year's experience in his country of assignment or in a country nearby with similar culture.

5. On his arrival at post for active duty, or after a period of training there preceding program work on his part, he should possess conversational ability in at least one of the tongues useful at the grass-roots level in the geographical area for which he will be responsible.

C. POSITION AND STATES:

1. Since the incumbent would have Mission-wide responsibilities, he should be assigned to the Program Office. His salary and support should be funded, therefore, by Administrative Funds or by Technical Support. His services should not be tied to any one specific project or to any host government request for technicians.

2. Candidates for field positions should be recruited and backstopped by the social scientist in the appropriate Regional Office. The Region also may desire to consult the Community Development Division, the Division of ICA which has handled sociologists and anthropologists in the past. Incumbents of field positions should submit quarterly reports to the Region, with copies to the planning office.

3. The position might be entitled "Program Sociologist", "Program Anthropologist", "Cultural Analyst", or even "Program Analyst", if this position can be revised suitably and upgraded. Whatever his title, the

18  
- 4 -

incumbent should work as a partner of the USOM Program Economist.

4. The position should be of high grade -- up to that of the Program Officer himself, to whom the anthropologist should report.

5. The Mission Anthropologist or Program Sociologist should be one of the first men to arrive in each new Mission. In order to supplement his experience and to work on a local language, if possible, he should be sent out one year before each proposed new Mission is opened. During this initial period his services would have to be funded by Regional funds or by the planning office and he would receive any necessary administrative support from the U.S. Embassy.