GOVERNMENT
Storage

Y 4
.Ed 8/1
L 34

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

THE UNIVERSITY IN LATIN AMERICA: ARGENTINA AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

KSU LIBRARIES
A11900 992598

SEPTEMBER 1961

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
NOV 13 1962
MANHATTAN, KANSAS

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
75314 WASHINGTON : 1961

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

ADAM C. POWELL, New York, *Chairman*

CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, West Virginia
CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky
PHIL M. LANDRUM, Georgia
EDITH GREEN, Oregon
JAMES ROOSEVELT, California
HERBERT ZELENKO, New York
FRANK THOMPSON, JR., New Jersey
ELMER J. HOLLAND, Pennsylvania
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
ROBERT N. GIAIMO, Connecticut
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
RALPH J. SCOTT, North Carolina
NEAL SMITH, Iowa
CHARLES S. JOELSON, New Jersey
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, Washington

CARROLL D. KEARNS, Pennsylvania
CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Michigan
PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., New Jersey
WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan
EDGAR W. HIESTAND, California
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
CHARLES E. GOODELL, New York
PETER A. GARLAND, Maine
DONALD C. BRUCE, Indiana
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
DAVE MARTIN, Nebraska

LOUISE MAXIENNE DARGANS, *Chief Clerk*
RUSSELL C. DERRICKSON, *Staff Director*
WRAY SMITH, *Education Chief*
HOWARD G. GAMSER, *Chief Counsel for Labor-Management*
LIVINGSTON L. WINGATE, *Associate Counsel for Labor-Management*
TERESA CALABRESE, *Administrative Assistant to Chairman*
RICHARD T. BURRESS, *Minority Clerk*

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal	v
I. Introduction	1
II. Background	2
III. Problems confronting Argentine universities	4
A. Professors	4
B. Student participation in governing of the university	5
C. Student action in national politics	6
D. Universities and economic development	7
E. Relationship between public and private universities	8
F. Kinds and method of distribution of United States aid	9
IV. Recommendations	12
V. Acknowledgments	18

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C., September 15, 1961.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This report is submitted to the Committee on Education and Labor by two of its members who were commissioned by you to visit Argentina in the early spring of 1961 to gather information on higher education in that country. The study trip was undertaken following President Kennedy's message on Latin America of March 13 in which he called for increased cooperation between universities in the United States and Latin America.

JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana.
ROBERT N. GIAIMO, Connecticut.

I. Introduction

We believe that U.S. policies with respect to the role of the universities in Latin America must henceforth be considered in the context of the Alliance for Progress which President Kennedy outlined in his March 13th address.

The rise of Fidel Castro in Cuba has brought home to the American people more than any recent event the great importance to our own country of what happens in Latin America. Castro's revolution has convinced Americans of the urgency of building strong democracies in Latin America.

Our visit to Argentina persuaded us that the universities of Latin America are an indispensable key to the economic development and social reform which these nations must have if they are to create democratic societies and free political institutions that will endure. The universities of Latin America must produce the engineers, the agricultural specialists, and the technicians needed to fight hunger, poverty, and disease and to move the economies of their countries into the 20th century. Otherwise we can expect to see Castro-like movements spread to other parts of Latin America.

Among the 10 points the President urged for stimulating economic and social development in Latin America were proposals for helping to strengthen Latin American universities in what have been called "the strategic fields." As the President said, "We must rapidly expand the training of those needed to man the economies of rapidly developing countries. This means expanded universities, graduate schools, and research institutes."

We chose Argentina for study because of its economic and political importance and because its system of education is relatively advanced among Latin American nations. Most of the other countries in South and Central America cannot match Argentina's high rate of literacy or well-established public school and university systems.

We are aware that observations of one Latin American country may not readily apply in others. It is clear, however, that similar economic and social problems exist in all these countries and certain common patterns of university education as well.

Our findings are based primarily on our conversations, most of which took place in Buenos Aires, with a large number of Argentines, including the rectors of three universities, student leaders, professors, Argentine journalists and writers, the country's only Nobel Prize winner and Argentine Government officials, including the President of Argentina and the Minister of Education.

We feel that the value of these conversations was decidedly enhanced by their being conducted for the most part in the language of the country, Spanish (Mr. Brademas), and also in the language spoken by a sizable minority of Argentines, Italian (Mr. Giaimo).

We also profited from talks with our Ambassador, the Hon. Roy Rubottom, Jr., and members of his staff, as well as the director of the

International Cooperation Administration mission in Argentina, Mr. W. Albion Patterson.

We wish to make particular mention of the work of Mr. Seymour I. Nadler, Chief of the U.S. Information Service in Buenos Aires. We have met few public servants so hard working, so intelligent and imaginative in carrying out their mission.

We wish also to cite our appreciation to Mr. John R. Walsh, administrative assistant to Congressman Brademas, for his substantial contribution to the preparation of this report.

In exploring the differences in tradition and organization between universities in Latin America and those in the United States, we grew increasingly aware that Latin American universities have much more direct influence on social movements and national politics than do our own universities. We also became convinced that the universities of Latin America must play a major role in training a new generation of specialists with technical skills if the programs for economic development now being shaped under the President's Alliance for Progress are to be fulfilled. In writing the recommendations for this report we have tried to suggest ways in which these salient facts can be given greater recognition in U.S. official policy toward Latin America and in the activities of American private business, foundations, and universities.

II. Background

There are substantial and significant differences between universities in the United States and Latin America and we believe therefore that it would be useful to discuss the contrasts in both university traditions and in the accepted role of students in Latin America and the United States.

Although universities in Spanish-speaking Latin America differ markedly from country to country, all trace their origins to the medieval universities of Spain, particularly Salamanca. During the colonial period in Latin America, university teaching was virtually confined to the traditional disciplines of arts, theology, law, and medicine. The universities were operated by religious orders and the aristocratic spirit of the Spanish university prevailed.

After the wars of independence in the 19th century, the universities of Latin America were influenced by European political and social theories and became centers of republican, liberal, and anticlerical ideas. In Argentina, all universities were secularized and were operated by the National Government. Granting of degrees was reserved by law to the national universities. In Argentina, as elsewhere in Latin America, training students for the traditional professions continued to be the chief function of the university and university education remained a privilege of a privileged class.

Serious efforts at democratization of Latin American universities date from the famous reform of 1918, the main tenets of which were promulgated in a manifesto at the oldest university in Argentina, Cordoba. The primary aim of the reforms was to give the university a social mission. Universities were to set the goals for society and to provide the leaders to achieve these goals. The Cordoban reforms came at a time when the emerging middle class in Argentina was demanding recognition and only 2 years after the first genuinely democratic elections the country had known. The manifesto obvi-

ously reflected as well the intellectual and political ferment caused by World War I and the Bolshevik revolution.

The reforms represented a revolt against the pro-Spanish aristocracy through a return to the medieval practice of student participation in the control of the university. One of the practical consequences of the movement in countries like Argentina, where the ideas took firm root, was that students did acquire an important role in governing the university.[1]

The power of the students extends beyond the academic boundaries into politics, an important factor we discuss in a later section of this report. We shall also treat the status of professors.

If students in Latin American universities exert more influence on university policy than students in the United States, Latin American university administrators lack the authority vested in university administrations here. Historically the separate faculties in Latin American universities have operated as self-contained and nearly independent entities. University administrators have had little control over policy, professors or curriculum, particularly in the case of the strongly entrenched faculties such as Law.

Research and advanced training outside the traditional profes ions have not developed as rapidly as in the United States in part due to the absence of a departmental system and to limited funds.

Although the Latin American university may appear to us weak in organization, it is in many ways a very strong institution. The idea of academic freedom, for example, is firmly rooted in Latin America. For more than a century Latin Americans have felt that professors and students should enjoy the right to hold and espouse ideas which might be disapproved by the government in power. In Argentina, for instance, the universities were the institutions which longest and most vigorously opposed the Peron regime until they were taken over in the mid-1940's. The sanctuary rights of the university on political issues have certainly not always been observed, but as in the case of Peron, the universities remain a challenge and reproach to the most oppressive regimes.

One factor that should not be ignored is the difference in the economic and social situation between university students in Latin America and those in the United States. In Argentina, although tuition is minimal, the cost of maintaining a student through school and university is more than low income families can bear. Few scholarships are available and, as a consequence, most graduates of universities and even of secondary schools come from the relatively small upper and middle classes. The great majority even of these students are compelled to hold jobs while they study. The typical university student in Latin America therefore is a part-time student who is often older than his North American counterpart, has a more

---

[1] Argentina has now 11 recognized universities, 8 national and 3 Catholic. The national universities are the University of Buenos Aires, with some 60,000 students, the largest; the University of Cordoba, the oldest; the University of Tucuman; University of Cuyo, Mendoza; University of the Litoral, Rosario and Santa Fe; University of La Plata; University of the South, Bahia Blanca; University of the Northeast, Corrientes. The Catholic universities are the Catholic University of Buenos Aires, Catholic University of Cordoba, and the Jesuit University of El Salvador in Buenos Aires.

A third type of institution has recently been established, a private but non-Catholic technical institute at the university level, called the Universidad Tecnologica Nacional, in Buenos Aires.

Besides the universities, a number of special institutions at the university level under the Ministry of Education grant diplomas for university and secondary teaching including special areas such as music and fine arts, domestic science, and physical education. The Ministry of Education and other departments of the Government also supervise and finance institutes for technical, scientific, military, industrial, and commercial training. Teacher training for primary schools is conducted by normal schools. These are at the level of secondary schools and are operated both privately and by national and provincial governments.

75314—61——2

direct experience of the problems of his society, and is accustomed to political action.

The strongly nationalistic spirit generated in Latin American universities has been accompanied by a critical and often overtly hostile attitude toward the United States. This spirit is not new. The Cordoban Reform movement, for example, had strongly anti-Yankee overtones. These feelings stem in part from charges of economic and political domination by the United States. In addition, since their colonial beginnings the universities have been regarded as agencies for transmission of Hispanic culture and bulwarks against alien influences, the most powerful of which were North American.

Communist organizers, highly disciplined and emphasizing economic issues, have undoubtedly widened their influence among students in recent years, particularly in the early period of the Castro regime. It should be noted, however, that at least until the present, Latin American students have generally been on the side of democratic reform and the preservation of democratic guarantees. In this century, when oligarchic control and dictatorship have been not uncommon in Latin America, most students have been libertarian in sympathy and have not sought solutions in Communist or other totalitarian doctrines.

III. Problems Confronting Argentine Universities

To learn about the Argentine universities, we asked the same questions of many different persons. We found agreement on what the major problems of the universities are. It will be obvious, however, that the people with whom we spoke were not all agreed on how to resolve these problems.

A. PROFESSORS

"The lack of full-time professors is the weak point of all Latin American universities," one university rector told us.

In the University of Buenos Aires, for example, there were only 5 full-time professors 3 years ago; there are now 86. The Jesuit University of El Salvador, which was founded 4 years ago and now has 1,500 students, has no full-time professors at all. The faculty consists almost entirely of lay personnel, 10 priests and 280 lay instructors.

The title of professor is highly regarded in Latin America and most of the people who hold it are not career teachers but professionals in their own right, lawyers or physicians, for example, who teach only part time at the university. Their professorships may therefore be important because of the prestige and value they bring to careers outside the university. A main reason for the shortage of full-time professors is low pay. Moreover, another observer advised us:

> Professors have no offices in university buildings * * * neither the time nor in most cases the desire to confer with students * * *; they direct no research and themselves do little rigorous thinking and investigation.

Most teaching is still done by formal lectures to large groups and critics of this traditional magisterial method say it insulates the professor from his students and releases him from pressure to keep his ideas or lectures fresh.

A tenet of the university reform movement is that there should be no tenure for professors, but that they should be elected periodically, for example, in some universities, every 7 years. This requirement does not encourage professors to make stern demands on their students or to speak out clearly and candidly their views on controversial matters.

We are pleased to report, however, that significant progress is being made in Argentina toward changing the universities into institutions better organized to meet the needs of a developing economy.

Since 1958 there has been no political intervention by the Argentine Government in university affairs and the universities of Argentina may now be considered autonomous. During the Peron dictatorship, the Government exercised a control which thoroughly disrupted and demoralized higher education.

At the University of Buenos Aires, Rector Risieri Frondizi (brother of Argentine President Arturo Frondizi but often in disagreement with him) has moved to break down the system of jealously independent faculties. Rector Frondizi has, for example, set out to end the tradition of prohibiting the transfer of credits from one college to another within the same university.

The rector has also won acceptance in principle from nearly every group in the university of the proposition that full-time professors with good pay are essential. That he is making some headway the increase in the number of full-time professors indicates.

Dr. Frondizi has also urged that more student scholarships be provided, a relatively recent innovation.

Finally, Dr. Frondizi has breached the isolationism of the university. The University of Buenos Aires has accepted both Government and foundation aid from the United States.

We should point out that all these gains have been made in the past 3 years and that they are steps away from the traditional Spanish, aristocratic view and toward a more scientific, 20th-century idea of a university.

B. STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN THE GOVERNING OF THE UNIVERSITY

One characteristic of the Argentine university, and of Latin American universities generally, is that the students participate actively in governing them. This tradition is one of the most significant legacies of the Reform of Cordoba, an early proponent of which said in an often quoted phrase, "The university is a republic of students."

At the University of Buenos Aires, for example, on the superior council of the university, students make up one-fifth of the total representation. There are 10 deans of faculty, 5 professors, 5 alumni, and 5 students. In other universities in Latin America, the students have as much as one-third of the votes on the governing bodies of each faculty and of the governing body of the university.

This power means that the students feel free on some cccasions to make or break professors, to judge what research ought to be undertaken, to pronounce themselves on university organization, and to propel the university into national politics.

Examples were cited to us of students ousting individual professors by the device of the strike.

In our conversations with university rectors and political leaders, we found substantial differences of opinion on what the role of students should be. Of course the students themselves have their own views.

One rector favored continuation of the system under which students participate in the governing of the university: "I would rather have the students across the table than shouting from across the street."

By consulting students on university matters, this rector believed, he passes to them a share of responsibility for action taken by the university. They, not the rector, must then handle student opinion.

He did not at all agree, however, with the view expressed by a group of students from his university that student participation was essential in order to keep pressure on part-time professors to maintain teaching standards.

It was clear from our discussions that the private, Catholic universities did not look as kindly on the idea of student participation in running the university. The rector of one Catholic university told us his students have no say in governing it. The relationship between professors and students, he said, is that of "father and son," adding, "just as in the United States."

Another Catholic rector believed there was too much politics in the national universities and that the students' studies therefore suffered.

C. STUDENT ACTION IN NATIONAL POLITICS

Not only is there politics within the university in the sense of elections of student representatives to governing boards. Argentine students also stand in the Latin American tradition of intense student interest in national politics. It should be noted that voting is compulsory in Argentina on pain of a fine and that the legal voting age is 18 years. Many students, moreover, do not regard the university primarily as a place of learning but as a springboard from which to vault into political life.

Given these circumstances, the 55,000 to 60,000 (the estimates vary) students at the University of Buenos Aires, in the nation's capital and largest city, must clearly be regarded a significant factor in Argentine national politics.

Here is one example of political activity at a university. A day or two after we arrived in Buenos Aires, we flew with Ambassador Rubottom to the city of Cordoba, the birthplace of the university reform movement to which we have referred. The purpose of the Ambassador's visit was to dedicate a new Argentine–United States institute for the study of English. During the day we paid a visit to the University of Cordoba. We went to the law school where it happened that all the students were on strike. The dean had apparently decided that examinations were to occur somewhat more frequently than before.

We walked through the library and into a small room just off it which houses a bust and the papers and writings of Dalmacio Velez Sarsfield, author of the Argentine Civil Code and the leading scholar-hero of the university. As we looked at the books, the large doors leading from the library into the room swung open and a group of 20 young people—whether they were students at the university or not is a matter of dispute—strode into the room. One of their number, a young man in his twenties, came up to Ambassador Rubottom, and

rudely declared, "Señor Embajador, repudiamos el imperialismo norteamericano!"

"We support Fidel Castro," he cried, as the group stomped out of the room, shouting "Cuba, Cuba," showering us with mimeographed sheets which, in extravagantly left-wing language, attacked the United States, all our recent Ambassadors to Argentina, John Foster Dulles, and the United Fruit Co.

The university authorities were of course greatly embarrassed by the event, and it would be most unfair to conclude from this incident that all or even a majority of Latin American university students are so hostile to the United States. But the incident does serve to dramatize the fact that many students do feel such an animosity toward the United States and, which is more to the point for our analysis here, that students are far more likely to indulge in political demonstrations than they would be in our country.

The impact of student political activity on the universities is illustrated by instances in which left-wing students have caused a university to refuse financial aid for certain programs because it came from the United States.

A student group, anti-Marxist and friendly to the United States, told us that Marxist—and particularly Communist—students were better organized than other groups. Still more significant, the Marxist students maintain standards of academic excellence; they are good students.

We are aware of the interest in the United States in the political complexion of Latin American university students and, in particular, the extent of Communist influence among them. But we do not feel qualified to offer an accurate judgment on this matter on the basis of our conversations in Argentina. One authority told us, however, that the actual Communist group at the University of Buenos Aires was "very small but very well organized" and could thus "move leftist students in its direction," giving the "impression of being much larger than it is." [1]

A Catholic rector told us that communism in Latin America is dangerous in the universities but that Latin American communism was not Soviet but nationalistic.

D. UNIVERSITIES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

One of the most critical problems of Latin American universities is their weakness in training persons for what have been earlier called the strategic fields, those that lead to rapid economic progress.

For example, a 1958 student census at the University of Buenos Aires showed that nearly 20 percent of the students were studying law while, in this great beef country of the Western Hemisphere, only 2 percent of the students were studying agronomy and veterinary medicine. The heavy enrollments in law and medicine at Buenos Aires and other Latin American universities are evidence of deeply ingrained social attitudes. They are a legacy of the traditional Spanish view that law and medicine are old and honored professions and that the

[1] The same authority said the actual division of leftists and rightists, to use his terms, among students would be about 60 percent leftists (five groups comprising what are known as the Reformistas) and 40 percent rightists (Humanistas, Catholic). Of the five student representatives on the superior council of the university last year, three were left-wing Reformistas, that is, Marxist-Communists; one was right-wing Reformista; and the other Humanista. This year, there remains one Humanista, but the other four are left-wing Reformistis.

lawyer or doctor can claim a superior place in society over the engineer or the administrator or the technician. For those who regard the university as an apprenticeship to politics, the law school is an anteroom to power.

Although Argentina earns nearly half its foreign exchange through the export of animal products, for the last 20 years the Argentines have lived in technological isolation in this field and so know little about genetics, fertility, supplementary feeding, artificial pastures, and land management.

According to one reliable authority, there were, as of 1 year ago, in terms of English or American standards, "only about a half dozen really well trained economists at work in the whole of Argentina (population, 20 million) and they all received this training abroad."

Public administration courses are not offered in any Argentine university and business administration is only now getting underway. In certain types of engineering, on the other hand, Argentina is strong.

We should at this point reiterate that we are discussing a nation that is regarded a leader in education in Latin America.

The University of Buenos Aires has moved to attack this serious overemphasis on law and medicine. The rector told us that under Peron there were 4,800 students in the medical school, a number reduced to 2,800 after Peron, and with entrance examinations, brought down to 700.

Three years ago, there were 20,000 students in the law school; today, 9,000, the rest having gone to other schools of the university.

The students are fully aware of the fact that far too few are enrolled, for example, in agronomy and far too many in the law school. They insisted that there is still too much emphasis among the Argentines on getting a professional degree for purely social reasons.

Our conversations impressed upon us that it is not enough for the United States to provide capital assistance to the nations of Latin America. They face not only a financial but a serious technical deficit, especially in such fields as agricultural engineering, industrial engineering, and economics.

E. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

Another problem with which those concerned to improve higher education in Latin America must necessarily deal is one not unknown to us in the United States and that is the relation between church and state. In Argentina, and elsewhere in Latin America, the church-state issue often resolves itself into a feud between national universities, which are supported with public funds, and private universities, which in almost every case means Catholic universities.

In some Latin American countries, such as Chile, the Catholic university has high scholastic standards and, therefore, exercises a positive influence in raising standards in national universities. In Argentina, however, it has only been within the last 3 years that Catholic universities have been permitted to grant degrees and they have, therefore, not yet exerted any great influence in determining academic standards.

It ought to be noted that only after the election of Arturo Frondizi as President were private (Catholic) universities permitted to grant degrees. It should also be said again that although the national

universities derive all their funds from the Government, they are autonomous and not controlled by the Government.

The main source of funds for at least one of the Catholic universities, its rector told us, was tuition fees. No government funds are permitted to go to private universities. Because there is little tradition of private philanthropy in Latin America, universities obtain meager support from contributions and gifts. Only last year a law was passed in Argentina permitting individuals and industries to take a tax deduction for contributions to universities. We were told that Catholic universities are increasingly successful in obtaining private contributions.

That significant tensions and strong partisanship exist between the public and private universities was clear to us. One university official identified with the national University of Buenos Aires remarked that teachers and students who have been rejected by the national university go to private universities. He argued that the growth of private universities would not result in stimulating national universities to high standards because the private universities are "very small groups with very narrow minds."

One government official was sympathetic to the private universities and argued that any assistance which the United States might provide to higher education in Argentina should go, for the most part, to them rather than to the national universities. It was his view that as the private universities grow, they would establish standards of academic excellence which the national universities would be forced to emulate.

On the other hand, the argument that the private universities were not strong enough to raise academic standards generally was supported by other authorities, none, we should point out, identified with the national universities. One of these authorities said that for this reason only limited U.S. aid should be made available, at least in Argentina, to the private universities.

A serious problem for both public and private universities, we learned, is a shortage of classrooms, libraries, and laboratories. Unlike students on most American campuses, many Latin American students simply have no place to study.

F. KINDS AND METHOD OF DISTRIBUTION OF U.S. AID

There are two types of problems with respect to assistance the United States might provide Latin American universities. The first is the kind of aid that ought to be made available. For example, should our emphasis be on bringing more Latin American undergraduates to the United States or sending more American professors to Latin American universities?

A second issue of no less importance is the appropriate channel through which U.S. assistance should be provided. Should the U.S. Government directly aid Latin American universities, or should American private foundations or business firms undertake assistance programs? Or should a combination of methods be employed? Another relevant question is whether our help should be distributed to Latin American public universities or to private (i.e., Catholic) universities, or to both.

We should perhaps first explain why the way in which the United States gives any help to Argentine universities is often as important

as the kind of aid we provide. The Latin Americans to whom we spoke were extraordinarily sensitive about receiving funds which they held to be directly from the U.S. Government, especially those that could be ascribed to our Department of State.

Although we may not like it, the traditional Latin American fear of excessive U.S. influence combined with both an increasing nationalism and, most significant now, the rise in anti-Yankee sentiment due to the success of Castro means a greater suspicion of aid directly identified with the U.S. Government.

As a university rector told us, ministries of education all over Latin America are "too politically minded." When the State Department is the source of assistance, he said, "it puts democratic recipients in a tough position."

A group of students very friendly to the United States told us they thought any funds for educational exchange programs should be channeled through institutions such as private foundations but not through the U.S. Government.

One highly influential university rector told us that he favored fellowships for Latin American students to go to the United States but expressed caution on the manner of awarding the grants. He felt the Argentine National Research Council, under the leadership of Dr. Bernardo Houssay, the Nobel Prize winner, was an excellent vehicle for this purpose, completely above suspicion of U.S. Government control. The council is roughly similar to our National Science Foundation.

The Argentines' concern that they not appear to be under the thumb of the United States in any university aid program is demonstrated by an instance in which students with Communist or similar leanings forced a university to refuse to accept money from "foreign," which is to say, U.S. sources. An offer from the Ford Foundation was involved.

Among the private institutions which were mentioned by the people with whom we talked as being acceptable agencies for distributing U.S. aid, governmental and private, was the Rockefeller Foundation, which Dr. Houssay praised highly. He also cited scholarships awarded by the Institute of International Education and those provided through I.I.C.A.N.A., the binational center in Buenos Aires. Although one highly regarded authority told us that professors sent to Argentina under U.S. Government auspices might not be acceptable to the students, he saw no difficulties if such professors came under private sponsorship at the invitation of the university concerned with their travel expenses paid for with U.S. Government funds.

If a visiting U.S. professor who had been invited by the university were successful, the beneficial propaganda effects would be obvious, said this authority.

Although the Minister of Education told us that he thought any American aid to education should be channeled through the Ministry of Education, not a surprising suggestion, a university administrator expressed disagreement with this view, also not surprising. The rector said that sufficient control of the funds could be maintained by a foundation if a grant were given, for example, to a particular department or faculty of a university on the condition that a specified professor or dean be in charge of the administration of the funds.

A second issue with regard to the method of distribution of U.S. assistance concerns public and private universities in Latin America.

We have earlier noted the tension that exists between the national and Catholic universities. We must decide in any given country whether our aid will be limited to one or provided to both. A third alternative would be a technical institute, publicly supported but not controlled by an existing university.

We have suggested earlier that U.S. aid for Latin American higher education should not be limited to Government funds. Clearly, U.S. Government financing is already available, under the Alliance for Progress, for education, including specifically higher education. We urge nonetheless that other sources such as U.S. private foundations, universities, and business firms be encouraged. The Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, to cite two examples, have already done an extraordinarily useful job in developing Latin American universities and can undoubtedly play an even more fruitful role in the future, perhaps as channels for the distribution of U.S. Government funds in addition to their own.

We found no evidence of any assistance at all by U.S. private business to Argentine universities, even from those firms with enterprises in Argentina. Nor is there much basis for hope that Latin American private business will soon provide substantial help to Argentine universities. There is simply no tradition of private philanthropy on which to draw. One rector of a private university told us, however, that under a law passed last year in Argentina, individuals and industries can take a tax deduction for contributions to universities, and that some industrial money has come to the university as a result.

An example of the way in which an American university can serve as a source of support for Latin American universities is the contract between the University of Chicago and the University of Santiago in Chile. Operating with funds from the International Cooperation Administration, the University of Chicago sent economics professors to Chile to replace a number of Chilean students of economics who then came to the University of Chicago to take their doctorates. Upon completion of their graduate studies, they returned to Chile there to strengthen greatly the faculty of economics and the teaching of economics throughout Chile generally. Until this cooperative, university to university program was developed, the teaching of economics in Chile had been monopolized by the Marxists.

We should like now to consider not the method of distribution but the kind of aid that the United States ought to make available to Latin American universities. Our conversations showed clearly that the Argentines viewed this question chiefly as one of either encouraging more U.S. professors to go to Argentina or more Argentina students to come to the United States.

With the exception of one group, the students, almost everyone we saw emphasized professorships. What is most needed, one Argentine scientific leader told us, are more professors from the United States. He also said he would prefer to see visiting professors, at least in the scientific field, devote most of their time to working with students in the laboratories rather than delivering formal lectures. He noted the importance of more intimate contacts between professors and students.

A university rector told us that the three top needs of Argentine universities so far as assistance from the United States is concerned are visiting American professors, fellowships for Argentine students to go to the United States, and equipment. Another university rector agreed that American professors are especially desired while a scien-

tist told us that although the university has funds for some fellowships, it has none for exchange of professorships.

It deserves mentioning that all the persons who urged the sending of more American professors stressed that they should be our ablest ones, not our poorest. They did not want our beginning college teachers nor our retiring ones.

Not surprisingly, the students with whom we talked felt there should be increased exchange of students at the undergraduate level. They complained, however, that too many exchange programs which take Argentine students to the United States were for too brief a time and were simply disguised vacations. They argued therefore that if the total amount of money available for such programs remained the same, fewer students should go to the United States but for longer periods, for example, 1 to 2 years rather than 6 weeks to 3 months. Some students were also strongly critical of the process for selecting undergraduates to receive scholarships for study abroad, contending that undeserving students were too often picked.

Although agreeing that more Argentine students should be sent to the United States, Dr. Houssay and most other university persons with whom we talked would limit them to graduate students and would require a guarantee of their return to Argentina.[1] "Too many are lost," he said, and his view was echoed by the Minister of Education. Apparently many Argentine students have found employment opportunities here more promising than in their own country. If they remain in the United States, the investment in future leadership for their country is of course wasted.

One way to encourage Argentine students to return, suggested Dr. Houssay, especially those who plan to go into university teaching, is to provide them appropriate equipment for their work and to make arrangements for them to maintain contact with those under whom they studied in the United States. Our conversations produced repeated references to deficiencies in both equipment and libraries in Argentine universities.

IV. Recommendations

Although we visited only Argentina, we believe that many of our recommendations can apply to Latin America generally. These recommendations are of course not offered as a complete program for U.S. aid to Latin American higher education but rather as suggested approaches which we feel to be both consistent with one another and with the objectives of the Alliance for Progress.

1. We recommend that in any U.S. aid to Latin American universities priority be given to strengthening the teaching of the "strategic fields," [2] those subjects that contribute most directly to the economic development of the country.

Studies in recent years in the United States have shown that in our own country, the important cause of rapid economic and technological growth has been highly trained and skilled human beings rather than physical resources or capital investment. There is a serious lack of

---

[1] Dr. Houssay also told us that most Argentine students who had studied abroad prior to 1920–25 went to Europe. The greatest number studied in France, some in Germany, Switzerland and Italy, and a few in England. Around 1928–30, more began going to the United States and today we attract more than any other country. During World War II and the Peron era, the United States was in effect separated from the best in the Argentine educational field.

[2] We are indebted for the phrase "strategic fields" and for the concept of development it represents to Mr. W. Albion Patterson, the able and well-informed chief of our ICA Mission in Argentina.

such persons in Latin America in the fields of agronomy, industrial engineering, economics, the natural sciences, and public administration.

It is clearly impossible for the United States over a protracted period of time to serve as the postgraduate school for Latin Americans. In the long run, only Latin American universities themselves can be expected to meet their national needs for training enough persons in the strategic fields. As one American authority who has done a great deal of work in Latin America has put it, "We must help other countries build strong, indigenous institutions which can produce locally most of the technologists and managers that developing countries need in order to speed up their economic growth."

In urging that U.S. assistance be directed primarily to the economic and technical fields, we do not mean to suggest that the humanities are without importance. We do point out, however, that our own resources for such aid programs are limited and that the emphasis we here suggest is more in keeping with the purposes of the Alliance for Progress concept than some other uses of funds. This is another way of saying that we believe our investment in Latin American education will pay greater dividends for the Latin Americans and for us if it is directed toward helping these countries move into the 20th century economically than toward some other objective. It is the land-grant type of university and the economic development and social progress it has generated in our own country that Latin America needs most urgently and not the university of law and the classics.

We should note that following our return to Washington, we talked with Mr. Cecilio J. Morales, Economic Counselor to the Argentine Embassy in Washington, who agrees strongly with the thesis that emphasis should be given to strengthening the Latin American universities in the strategic fields as a means of stimulating economic development in those countries.

Mr. Morales was one of the authors of the proposal offered by Argentina at a meeting in November 1958 of the Committee of 21 under the Organization of American States which proposal called for "technical and financial assistance to the universities of Latin America so that they can modernize, broaden and extend their installations and facilities for research and instruction in subjects related to economic development (agricultural technology, engineering, industrial engineering, business administration, public administration, and economics). Such assistance should include, among other things, consulting services in the preparation of their curriculums, appointment of professors from other countries, donation of books and laboratory and research equipment, travel subsidies for Latin American professors, and the use of local university research institutions for scholarship students from adjoining areas. The goal of such a program would be to enable the Latin American universities to produce a sufficient number of graduates adequately trained for the professional activities most closely related to economic development."

At a meeting in 1960, the Committee of 21 received a report recommending the upgrading of Latin American universities in technical fields. The OAS has done little to implement these policies in higher education since then.

Appropriation of funds by the 87th Congress for the Alliance for Progress now makes it possible to move forward in these fields. The

demands of industrial and agricultural development in Latin America make it urgent that we do so promptly.

2. We recommend that U.S. aid to education in Latin America be primarily directed to higher rather than to elementary and secondary education.

Again we do not mean to suggest that elementary and secondary education are not important. With limited U.S. resources, however, we should invest them where the most lasting results will be produced most quickly. We do not believe it would be a wise investment of U.S. Government funds to seek to wipe out illiteracy in Latin America. Although we realize illiteracy is a grave problem throughout Latin America, we believe that a major share of Alliance for Progress funds for education should be earmarked for other programs. To support this choice of priorities, we cite Mexico, which has a far higher illiteracy rate than Argentina. By emphasizing higher education the Mexicans have trained far more people in the strategic fields than the Argentines have.

3. We recommend that U.S. aid to Latin American universities emphasize sending U.S. professors to Latin American universities rather than bringing more Latin American undergraduates to the United States.

We feel this is a key decision for, as one authority told us, "It is not the same to bring Latin American students to the United States as it is to build good universities here."

Our goal should be to help build up strong departments in Latin American universities in the subjects which provide the greatest spur to economic and social development. As the University of Chicago-University of Santiago project demonstrated, American professors in Latin American universities can have far greater impact in the developing of groups of well-trained economic and technical personnel these countries require than can Latin American undergraduate students in the United States.

Latin American undergraduates studying in the United States, moreover, are confronted with serious language and other adjustment difficulties. In addition, as we have noted before, too many of them remain here. We do think it wise however to send carefully selected Latin American graduate students to the United States and that some guarantee of their return to their own countries, at least for a limited period of time, be devised.

4. We recommend specifically the establishment of a new system of exchange chairs or professorships between the United States and Latin America.

In Latin America in each country where such a chair would be established, it could be known as the Franklin D. Roosevelt Chair of North American Studies or the Abraham Lincoln Chair or George Washington or Thomas Jefferson Chair. Such a chair might be established in each of half a dozen major universities in Latin America and an outstanding professor from the United States designated to fill it for 1 year. In line with the main thesis we have set forth, priority should be given to professors in the economic and technical fields.

In return there should be established in the United States an equivalent number of chairs of Latin American Studies each named after a leading Latin American hero who is now beyond controversy, such as Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, the reformer of the Argentine public school system (the 150th anniversary of whose birth is this year);

Benito Juarez, Simon Bolivar, Bernardo O'Higgins, et cetera. In the United States in particular these chairs should not be filled at the same university every year but should be assigned to different ones and care should be taken that they not all go to the older and better endowed universities but to other institutions as well. The Latin American professors might more appropriately come from the arts, literature, history—the humanities in general.

The advantages of such an exchange are several. They would lift the level of Latin American university education and would dramatize the importance of professorships. By requiring that the Latin Americans send us some professors, we would make clear our own desire to learn from them.

We recommend that where possible, the exchange professorships from the United States not be financed by U.S. Government funds but either through a university-to-university arrangement or by American business firms that might want to subsidize a chair in a country in which they do business.

5. We recommend the strengthening of existing universities in Latin America rather than the creation of a new university such as the proposed University of the Americas in Puerto Rico.

In addition to the fact that many Latin Americans do not regard Puerto Rico as part of Latin America, the substantial needs of these countries for improving their systems of higher education will not be significantly affected by the establishment of a single new institution of this sort. A good university, moreover, is not produced in a short period of time.

We recommend specifically the development of existing Latin American universities as regional centers, each specializing in a certain subject in which it is recognized as particularly strong. For example, the University of Mexico might become the chief center in Latin America for the study of some types of engineering, a university in Chile for the study of economics, one in Brazil for architecture.

We believe that in the selection of the subjects to be stressed in each of these regional centers, priority should be given to the strategic fields.

There are several advantages in developing such regional centers. It is clearly much easier to build up an existing university than to start a new one. It is equally obvious that it is more economic to have several universities each concentrating on a strong department in one field than for all of them to try to be strong in every field. In the United States, university libraries are already moving in the direction of specializing in certain subjects for the same reason. The experience gained in the United States by the Southern Regional Education Board is particularly relevant, we believe.

The S.R.E.B. administers programs which enable students from Southern States with limited facilities for training in certain professions to attend universities with stronger programs in other States in the South.

One of the greatest advantages of the regional center approach is that it will be financially much easier for Latin American students to travel to and study at a university in Latin America than to come to the United States. They will also avoid problems associated with the language barrier and differences in tradition and custom which many encounter when they come to a university in the United States.

Another less apparent advantage of the regional center is that it offers one avenue for overcoming some of the difficulties in university structure and tradition in Latin America which we have discussed earlier. Our conversations persuaded us that it would be unrealistic to expect a thoroughgoing reform of Latin American universities. We were told that it would be possible to reform graduate studies because they are now in the formative stages in Latin America and there are fewer walls to break down. For example, we were advised that in helping to improve graduate studies, we would encounter far less resistance and hostility from those who believe that U.S. assistance means U.S. domination.

The development of regional centers would certainly mean the strengthening of graduate programs which in turn could favorably influence undergraduate studies.

6. We recommend that among the self-help measures the United States should urge under the Alliance for Progress are tax reforms to encourage Latin American individuals and private business to contribute far more to the support of their own universities than they have historically done.

The insistence in the new AID program on self-help measures on the part of recipient nations gives us an unusual opportunity to stimulate the development of private philanthropy in these countries. Such a policy would not only assist the universities by providing increased financial support but would also encourage greater public interest among the citizens of these countries in their universities. If Latin American countries do a better job of supporting their own universities, they will supply the best answer to a question that can fairly be raised in the United States: Why should we help them when they won't even help themselves?

7. We do not recommend that the U.S. Government assume entire responsibility for U.S. assistance to Latin American higher education.

We do strongly recommend that a significant amount of the funds available under the Alliance for Progress be invested in education in Latin America, specifically for higher education and with particular attention to the strategic fields.

We recommend, however, that U.S. private business firms consider seriously providing selective aid to Latin American higher education, for example, through subsidizing exchange professorships between the United States and Latin America or by establishing fellowships for Latin American graduate students in the United States. This support should be directed still to the strategic fields.

Such selective assistance would not be expensive and could, if the thesis we have here offered is correct, have a beneficial effect in Latin America and, if the programs were handled with care, improve the image of U.S. private business in Latin America, which has not always been favorable.

We recommend also the continued activity of U.S. private foundations in improving Latin American higher education. They have had considerable experience and have for the most part won acceptance because of their performance and because they are not identified with the U.S. Government.

We recommend particularly increased use of the university-to-university device in Latin America. Whether the funds for such cooperative programs come from the U.S. Government, as with the University of Chicago-University of Santiago contract, which was

financed with ICA money, or from private business or from university funds, the university-to-university approach is most promising. The structure of the program is nongovernmental and the development of close relationships between individual universities in this country and universities in Latin America is obviously beneficial in a number of ways.

A promising example of joint action of the sort we recommend is the agreement under which the Ford Foundation will provide most of the funds and Yale University the faculty to set up an astronomical observatory at the University of Cuyo. The observatory is intended to serve as a training center in astronomy for students from throughout Argentina.

8. We do not undertake to recommend a specific organizational structure through which Alliance for Progress aid to higher education should be allotted.

We do not feel that the knowledge we gained from our visit to Argentina qualifies us to propose a particular kind of administrative organ for U.S. assistance to universities throughout Latin America.

We are aware that each country has its own peculiar problems but we believe that available U.S. assistance for education must be programed on the basis of the needs of Latin America as a whole.

9. We recommend that in Argentina, *U.S. aid for higher education be primarily directed to the national universities rather than the private ones.*

We wish to make clear that we are not saying that Argentine private universities are not worthy of support but only that we do not recommend that *in Argentina* this support come mainly from U.S. Government funds. The private universities in Argentina are still too small to have a significant effect on the rapid economic development of the country.

We point out that in Chile we applaud the use of U.S. Government funds to private universities because in that country they are better established, have higher academic standards, and do contribute significantly to the achievement of the purposes for which we believe our support should go.

We recommend therefore that the issue of whether U.S. Government funds should be used for national or private universities in Latin America be decided on a country-by-country basis. The test should be which universities can contribute most to training the personnel required to develop the economies of the countries.

10. We do not recommend bringing greater numbers of Latin American undergraduates to the United States under U.S. Government programs.

We realize that many young people from abroad have profited greatly from their studies here and that our Nation has earned important dividends in friendship among these students. We in no way suggest halting the flow of undergraduates to the United States but we believe that U.S. Government funds can, as we have said earlier, better be invested in sending American professors to Latin America.

We feel that scholarship programs for foreign undergraduates can best be devised, financed, and administered by universities, foundations, and other nongovernmental groups and that private citizens can play a particularly effective part in providing the help and hospitality needed by Latin American students coming here.

Our experience in Argentina leads us to suggest that there needs to be more emphasis on academic ability as well as need in the selection

of students to come to the United States. Perhaps a selection process in each country patterned after that used by the Fulbright, Marshall, and Rhodes scholarships could be developed with the selection handled by a private organization and not by United States or Latin American governments.

V. Acknowledgments

We talked with many persons in Argentina about higher education there. In addition to those we have already mentioned, we wish particularly to acknowledge the contributions of the following. The responsibility for the views expressed in this report is of course solely ours.

We were pleased to meet with the President of Argentina, Dr. Arturo Frondizi; the Minister of Education, Dr. Luis R. MacKay, and his assistant, Mr. Hector Blas Gonzales, Director-General, Culture, Ministry of Education.

We had valuable conversations with the rectors of the three universities in Buenos Aires: Msgr. Octavio N. Derisi, of the Catholic University of Argentina; Dr. Risieri Frondizi, of the National University of Buenos Aires; and Padre Ernesto Dann of the Jesuit University of El Salvador.

Dr. Bernardo Houssay, head of the National Research Council and Director of the Institute of Experimental Biology and Medicine, received us most graciously.

Two American professors at the University of Buenos Aires who are well informed on Argentine higher education are Prof. Kalman H. Silvert, of Tulane University and the American Universities Field Service; and Prof. Robert Havighurst, of the University of Chicago, a Fulbright professor at the university.

Dr. Pedro David, executive director of the Fulbright commission in Argentina, arranged for us to meet with the following student leaders, all in the Law School at the University of Buenos Aires and all members of the Movimiento Universitario del Centro: Jorge Alberto Bogo, Carlos Alberto Castilla, Raul Eduardo Jeannot, Jose Maria De Lorenzis, Martin E. Piñeiro, and Cesar B. Rezzonico.

We profited from a meeting with the following Argentine Government officials and newsmen: Juan Carlos Taboada, Chief of Press Section, Office of President Frondizi; Gaston de Prat Gay, Press and Public Relations Adviser to the Foreign Minister; Mariano Grondona, a political analyst for the newspaper, La Nacion, and professor of law at the University of Buenos Aires; Jose Blanco Amor, economic analyst for La Nacion; Jacobo Timmerman, of the editorial staff of El Mundo; and Norman Ingrey, editor of the Buenos Aires Herald.

We found useful as well our conversations with Mr. Kent A. Herath, Director of I.I.C.A.N.A. in Cordoba, the United States-Argentine Institute for the teaching of English.

○

KANSAS STATE U
NOV 13 1962
KANSAS