

development is proceeding satisfactorily with only an occasional loan from the World Bank or the Export-Import Bank, no special coordinating machinery may be required. However, in other countries where a number of agencies are operating and where development progress has not been assured, such machinery might include among other things a committee on which all external agencies operating in the country were represented, with power to make specific joint recommendations directly to the headquarters of each of the agencies represented, as well as to high-level coordinating groups in Washington or elsewhere. The job of the committee would be to review development programs and requests or recommendations for various types of assistance and to reach agreed positions in connection with all negotiations with officials of the host country. Such negotiations might continue to be carried on by individual agencies or they might be conducted by representatives of the committee which would be chaired by the assistance agency most concerned. Since each independent foreign assistance agency is autonomous in its own field, it presumably could not be forced to take an action or refrain from doing so, but the combined decision of a coordinating group operating in the country would normally carry considerable weight.

A system of country-level coordination of the type outlined above would undoubtedly require some reorganization of existing coordinating machinery among the officials of the agencies themselves at the Washington level. However, the whole approach to development assistance in terms of a close and continuous relationship to the development programs of individual countries requires a considerable shift of authority from the headquarters of the aid organizations to the country missions. This represents a problem for virtually all multilateral institutions since they do not have—except in a few cases—resident offices in the developing countries. It is perhaps desirable that they have such offices, although one officer might conceivably be a representative for several African or Latin American countries. In any event, each of the important assistance agencies should have an official who would be in more or less continuous contact with the country committees and with the development activities of one or more countries themselves.

Coordinating machinery of the type proposed above is not likely to succeed in the absence of strong leadership, and there will be a tendency for the agency or agencies with the largest programs, and those with officials having the greatest influence and close and continual relationship to the developing country and its officials, to exercise this leadership. Thus both the country coordinating machinery and the leadership would tend to differ from country to country. Where a strong regional organization exists, such as we hope will be the case in Latin America, it is possible that the IDB, or conceivably a regional OAS representative, may provide both the close and continuous relationship with the host government and the leadership of the coordinating machinery. In India, on the other hand, the World Bank, which has a regional office in India and has taken the initiative in the organization of aid consortiums, may occupy this leadership role. It should not be assumed, therefore, that USOM will or should necessarily dominate the coordinating machinery and its policies. We may also raise the question as to whether leadership at the country level should, over the longer run, be centered in the U.S. mission or whether it would be