

## EDITORIAL

"Don't send men. Send money!" read the text of the now legendary Uganda telegram of the mid-sixties, a catchphrase enjoyed thoroughly among those in the aid business. This issue of the Bulletin takes a critical look at manpower aid, experts and foreign advisers in ldc's.

Compared with capital aid, manpower aid remains grossly under-administered and more open to obvious criticism both in donor and recipient countries. The transfer or supply of personnel can be at the same time more embarrassing, more complicated and more critically needed than large capital grants. Is it not, after all, the most obvious form of neo-colonialism to still have to rely on administrators, teachers, and experts, supplied in large numbers by the former colonial power who set up the structures? But yet, is there not a lot of waste of time and money (not to speak about exasperation) by providing personnel through international agencies who are unfamiliar with the country and its institutions? Where is the most effective dividing line between bilateral and multilateral manpower aid, or how can the combined effort become more complementary in a particular national or regional context? Such questions highlight the clash of interest between donors and recipients, which is at the core of many problems related to the ineffectiveness or inefficiency of manpower aid. On the donor side, the well-meaning architects of technical assistance programmes have often treated the export of knowledge and skill as if it were a tangible input which, when combined with the environment of need in developing countries would have a reasonably calculable output, and make a positive contribution to development. Such a simple formula undergoes critical examination below.

A. G. Hurrell (one of the most acute and well informed "architects" of manpower aid programmes) provides an introduction to the facts and figures as well as a series of arguments for the improvement of such programmes. Ron Dore substitutes "machines" for "money" in a similar spirit to the Uganda telegram, along with a few other brief and trenchant thoughts on technical assistance. Brian Johnson lifts the discussion of multi-lateral aid out of the jargon and mystification of U.N. Agencies to reveal the essentially political character of the debate, especially regarding the difference of donor and recipient views on the programmes.

Foreign experts are subject to critical scrutiny by the Nultys, who feel that they provide a fairly efficient service industry to the entrenched elite in ldc's, while proposing high-minded and complicated models for economic planning. But Gus Papenek, former director of the Harvard Development Advisory Service argues that there is a place for foreign experts even in

countries with fairly wicked regimes, as the "grey" area of potential agreement and influence remains important, and that the negative influence of foreign advisers on the whole exaggerated. The Lancaster Research Project summary indicates areas for study and enquiry among returned technical assistants, and provides suggestions on how recruitment and service might be improved.

Returning to a central debate in the field, economic growth versus a broader basis of development (see Bulletin Volume 2 No. 4, Growth but no Jobs), Dudley Seers takes a look at the Prebisch Report on Latin America in the Review Section.

R C O'B