

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

VIETNAM ADVISORY GROUP

MAILING ADDRESS: MSU-USOM
AMERICAN EMBASSY
SAIGON — VIETNAM

CABLE ADDRESS: MICHGOVBUR
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADVISOR

GENERAL OFFICE:
137, DUONG PASTEUR
TELEPH. NUMBER: 22.022 - 21.528
21.891 - 21.991

September 2, 1959

TO: Coordinator
FROM: Chief Advisor *[Signature]*



SUBJECT: Our New Approach to the Participant Program

Howard Waltman will leave Saigon toward the end of September. Before he leaves, we will be involved in various discussions within the Group which should lay the ground work for some rather sweeping changes in our approach to the participant program in Vietnam. Although you may have followed some of the correspondence on this before, perhaps I had better review it for you so that you can understand what is going on here.

For some time we have felt that the participant program was somewhat divorced from the work of the specialists within the Group. Although having one staff member attend to all matters pertaining to participants has been a convenient way of administering the program, both in theory and in practice it leaves something to be desired. We find that the role of the specialist or technician becomes somewhat divorced from the identification, processing, and general programming of participants who receive training within the particular field of concern to the specialist. It would be better if the individual specialist identified the needs for training, helped select the particular individuals to receive overseas training, provided the program ideas for the training, got to know the trainees well before departure, and felt responsible for the trainees' adequate integration and use upon returning to Vietnam. To put this in concrete terms, the ideal arrangement is for Milt Taylor working as an advisor to the Direction General of Taxation to determine what types of tax training are needed, to identify the persons to go for the special kinds of training, to agree with the Direction General on the need for this training and its priority within the agency, and to program the participant work as much as possible from his vantage point as advisor in taxes. Before the participant leaves, Taylor should get to know him well, should correspond with him while he is abroad and with Elsie Cunningham and other people supervising the trainee's work, and should see to his adequate use once he returns. This should become a part of the normal activity of a technician or advisor. In other words, training and participant training should be part of the regular thinking of an advisor in his attempts to improve the work of a particular agency.

We feel this would lead to the agency itself looking upon the technician as the one to provide outlets for the training needs of the agency. It would strengthen the ties between the advisor and the agency and between the advisor and people working within the agency. This arrangement, furthermore, would go a long way toward maximizing the value of the training and the full use of the newly trained participant upon his return.

Howard Waltman is going to be laying the groundwork for a general shift of responsibility for participant work to individual technicians within the organization. Lloyd Musolf in Public Administration and Jack Ryan in Police Administration (later Turner) will consider themselves advisors of the participant program just as they supervise other things in which specialists working for them are involved. The job of the Chief Advisor and the Administrative Services Chief will be to see that the participant program is not neglected in the case of the former and in the case of the latter to see that necessary processing for participant departures goes along on schedule.

The MSUG participant program will definitely be on the decline over the next three years. Our emphasis will be heavily in the academic area, and we will not be sending very many non-academic trainees; USOM participant funds will be used for the non-academics. This means we will probably send a small total number, but what we lose in quantity we will gain in quality in that this new arrangement should make our work much more effective.

There are bound to be mistakes made and some processing difficulties after Howie Waltman departs. If we can effectively pursue this new working arrangement, however, we have much to gain. And since we do not have many man years left under the participant program anyway, we have very little to lose should things not work out as we hope they will.

I would appreciate receiving comments from Elsie or from you and others who have been involved in participant work.

RHS/dcm