



PN-ABT-604

Principles of Technical Cooperation

by

D. A. FitzGerald

*Deputy Director for Operations
International Cooperation Administration*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

This is the text of an address given by Mr. FitzGerald before the Eighth Conference on Agricultural Services to Foreign Areas at Washington, D.C., on October 22, 1958.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE PUBLICATION 6759
Economic Cooperation Series 48
Released January 1959
Public Services Division

Principles of Technical Cooperation

by D. A. FitzGerald

It is especially rewarding to meet with you this morning to listen, to learn, and to talk about the technical cooperation policies of ICA. I am always keen to discuss the technical cooperation program, more so than any other part of the mutual security program, because point 4 is one of the positive ways we have of working with other nations to help make the world a better place in which to work, to play, to do business, and to live. Furthermore, point 4, as it is commonly known, has to do primarily with people, and people are much more interesting than balance of payments or budgetary deficits, or the buildup—however necessary—of free-world military forces to deter aggression by the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Background Facts

Before getting into discussion of technical cooperation policies, it might be useful to put on record some facts to form the background for our discussions.

First is the fact of *partnership*. The point 4 program is a series of partnerships undertaken by the U.S. Government at the request of, and in accordance with, agreements reached with other governments—governments of self-respecting sovereign nations. In the bilateral technical programs in which ICA participates,

both governments contribute funds, manpower, supplies, equipment, and other needed items.

A second fact is that of *mutuality*. Out of any partnership arrangement each of the partners expects to obtain some benefit which he could not obtain through his own efforts alone. If there were no mutuality of interest and if the benefits were only onesided, there could be no basis for a successful partnership.

A third fact has to do with *steady growth* in the technical program. The number of countries with which we cooperate in technical fields is now at an alltime high: 48 nations and 7 dependent territories. The number of U. S. technicians overseas is at an alltime high also. As of last June 30 there were in the technical cooperation program more than 5,000 U.S. nationals working overseas. Of these almost 3,000 were directly on the ICA rolls and 2,000 were working under contract, including the type of contract you are all so familiar with--the university contract. Through these bilateral programs record numbers of men and women from other countries are coming to the United States, or sometimes to third countries, for advance training in their special skills.

There has been—in response to need and requests—a steady increase in the number of technical fields in which the United States cooperates with other countries. Technical programs now embrace an amazingly wide variety of activities, ranging from agricultural demonstrations to show how a steel plow does a better job than a pointed stick, on to and including a worldwide program for the eradication of malaria undertaken in cooperation with various international organizations, and further on to training in the peacetime uses of atomic energy.

We have more money available for technical cooperation than ever before—a total of \$171.5

million for all programs—the bilateral programs and the multilateral ones carried on by the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

Guiding Principles

After 8 years of working together with some threescore countries and territories—out of struggles, successes, failures—I think it is possible to find some workable rules to guide present and future practitioners of the art of technical cooperation.

The first principle is this: *Successful technical cooperation can take place only if there is rapport and mutual respect on the part of the United States and the host country technicians.* This would seem to be the most obvious kind of principle, but we have not always followed it. It is not enough for a technician to be top-notch from a professional point of view, that is, knowing his subject from A to Z. He must be able to get along with other peoples and communicate his knowledge and attitudes to others. We cannot afford to be so anxious to get programs going or keep them going that we send out technicians who are not adequate in all respects to their jobs. We in ICA have realized this and have requested and obtained from Congress several million dollars of additional funds which we will use to increase the amount, the type, and duration of training for our technicians before they are sent to their overseas assignments.

A second principle of technical cooperation is: *Start with those activities that are most important to the people you wish to work with.* Philosophers of education long ago discovered the principle: Begin with the known and familiar and work from there to the unknown and unfamiliar.

For real, sustained social and economic progress of a whole society, progress must take place at the bottom—not just at the top—and the progress must start with the needs and desires of the people at the bottom. If this is not the case, the technician will find that he is doing things *for* people, or perhaps doing things *to* them, but he will not be doing things *with* them. There will be no partnership. And since his work is not based upon desires of those with whom he is associated, the results, if any, will last only so long as the technician sticks around. Naturally, this is not the objective of technical cooperation. Rudyard Kipling long ago saw the frustrations of outsiders trying to impose progress from the top, and the central lesson of the “white man’s burden” is still valid.

A third principle is this: *The development of attitudes toward solving problems is more important than transplanting specific techniques.* The central attitude which we should try to develop is one of a pragmatic, rather than a dogmatic, approach to solving problems. In too many places in the world people are slaves to old habits and customs. They do things “by the book” even if the book is wrong or outdated. A technique adequate to solving the problems of today is not much good if applied unchanged to the different problems of tomorrow. The development of attitudes which recognize change, attitudes which make possible adjustment to changes, attitudes which will encourage the seeking of new ways to solve new problems or better ways to solve old problems—this should be a major objective of technical cooperation.

A fourth principle of technical cooperation is usually defined as *working ourselves out of a job.* This is convenient shorthand phraseology but does not really tell the whole story. What

we are really aiming at is to help create within other nations institutions of all kinds—educational, financial, bureaucratic—which will enable needed changes and longed-for progress to come about in evolutionary rather than revolutionary ways. Furthermore, these institutions must be able to stand on their own feet. They must be staffed with competent people. They must have support of the legislators in order that they may be adequately financed, and they must have the support of the great mass of the population.

One of the greatest monuments to the success of international cooperation would be the development in other countries of local institutions for education, research, and extension similar to the ones which are represented in this room today.

In the early days of point 4, technical cooperation of the United States was thought to mean mostly the “show how” of existing “know how.” Many people thought that the other countries would make progress if only they could be shown the “right ways” of doing things and perhaps were given a few bags of seed to improve their crops. We have found that this Johnny Appleseed approach to technical cooperation is not enough. We discovered fairly quickly that technical cooperation—the development of human resources—although probably the most important component of economic and social progress, was not the only one. We found out that it made little sense to show farmers how to use fertilizers if, after demonstration supplies had been used up, there was no other fertilizer available at prices farmers could afford to pay. We discovered the same thing in the health program, and in other areas, and so we were faced with the need for the development of capital enterprises, fer-

tilizer plants, dams, irrigation systems, transportation networks, factories, hospitals, and schools.

Need for Research

An additional need which was not recognized in the early years, and is not fully recognized today, is the need for *research*. We need to do more research ourselves and we need to help other countries equip themselves with people and institutions qualified to do research. I am thinking of such fields of basic research as oceanography; the desalinization of water, both large-scale and small-scale; further research in meteorology and weather control; medical research into the cause, cure, and prevention of widespread and debilitating diseases; and, of course, additional research in peaceful uses of nuclear energies.

We need, in addition to basic scientific research, more imaginative thinking about solving some of the obvious everyday problems. You may have seen an example of this in the papers, magazines, and on the TV screen last month—a homemade, wooden, hand-operated washing machine. This easy-to-build, inexpensive device was developed by two ICA technicians at the request of eight of our missions overseas. The plans for it have been sent out to all our ICA missions and many of them are giving it test runs. If widely adopted, this simple device will not only make easier the job of millions of women around the world but will also result in a great saving in clothing which is now worn out in the washing process as well as through normal wear and tear.

Another area in which practical research would be of enormous benefit is that of devising yokes, collars, harnesses, and hitches which will

make more effective the animal power which is now the main source of nonhuman power available to most peoples in the world.

Tangible Results

It is a popular misconception that in the point 4 programs, as in other parts of the mutual security program, the United States gets few tangible results from our cooperation with other countries. The falsity of this attitude has recently been demonstrated in a very dramatic way. The work of ICA in Iran has brought great benefit not only to that country but also to the United States. I refer to the control *here* of the spotted alfalfa aphid. This bug, which causes severe damage, was first reported as a general pest in Southern California, Arizona, and New Mexico early in 1954. By 1955 it had spread to seven more States and caused damage estimated at \$15 million.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's research service and the California Department of Entomology and Parasitology learned from the ICA mission in Tehran that alfalfa aphids existed in Iran, the home of alfalfa, but caused very little damage. Dr. Robert Van den Bosch was sent to Iran where he soon learned that two tiny Iranian wasps, called *paron palitans* and *trioxys utilis*, preyed on the aphids. The wasp seeks out an aphid, stings it, and deposits an egg in its body. The aphid is paralyzed and its body acts as a cocoon for hatching out a baby wasp. As the baby wasp is hatched, the aphid dies. In this manner one wasp kills many aphids.

In a few months 50,000 cocoons containing fertile wasp eggs were shipped by air at low temperatures to laboratories at Riverside and Albany, California. They were hatched and released in controlled patches of alfalfa in-

fested with aphids. *Paron* and *trioxys* did in California just what they had done in Iran for centuries, and aphid damage tapered off rapidly.

The State of California and the U. S. Department of Agriculture entomologists regard the parasitic plan of control as highly successful and have moved this year to spread the wasps to other areas of infection. This is one example of how international cooperation benefits each of the partners.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of technical cooperation and other joint work for economic development. At this time in history we cannot put our trust alone in military might to prevent or to resolve certain kinds of conflicts of interest among nations and groups of nations. We must, of course, do what is needed for defense; do what is needed to deter the use of armed force on a large scale; do what is needed to avert a nuclear holocaust. At the same time we must realize that a stalemate in military affairs puts a premium on other means available to the nations of the world to influence the course of history.

One of the greatest influences in the coming decades will be the degree to which, and the rate at which, economic development takes place in the underdeveloped countries of the world. And, equally important, is the *way* in which such development takes place, whether it takes place in ways that we can live with, or takes place in ways which will ultimately be harmful to the values and practices of the free world.

You, I—all of us—have an opportunity, through our own lives, our own work, to influence the outcome. Let us, working with willing partners around the world, create an age of peace, of progress, and of freedom.