

formed in the West, into key decision-making posts within national governments. The Ivory Coast Prime Minister...for example worked for the IMF... before taking a post in his own country...."⁶⁹ Secondly, these organizations constitute an ongoing experiment in multicultural and multilingual understanding, communication, and cooperation. Although these organizations have their administrative and personnel weaknesses resulting from this polyglot nature, the fact that they work at all testifies to both the symbolic importance and the practical viability of such "meeting grounds" in a divided world. One should not expect perfect efficiency in organizations part of whose purpose is to provide experience in policy development and administration to the nationals of Third World countries.

It might be questioned whether multilateral employees qualify under the concept used here of "on-site, developmentally relevant, N-S collaborators", in view of the location of its major organizations in New York, Washington, and Geneva. The uniqueness of the UN's intercultural workplace makes it reasonable to bend the "on-site" aspect of the definition a little, but it is not necessary to bend it very much — in actuality almost half of UN employees are located in developing countries, especially in regional offices and in development projects as technical advisors, relief officers, and the like. As the politicization of the Cold War era and North-South confrontation wanes, it is likely that field work to directly benefit the populations of member-states will increase even more, at the expense of headquarters rhetoricians and bureaucrats.

It is probable that the United Nations and its development and related programs will grow to take on the importance that the global nature of so many of the world's problems justifies. As a former UN Undersecretary General

69. *Time*, September 7, 1992, p. 32.