

## RECENT RESEARCH ON LATIN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

*John H. Petersen, Western Kentucky University\**

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS HAVE BEEN A HIGHLY VISIBLE PARTICIPANT IN LATIN American politics for many years. To cite a few examples, they played an important role in the overthrow of the regimes in Cuba (1933, 1959), Guatemala (1944), Venezuela (1958), and Bolivia (1964), and have led significant anti-government demonstrations in nearly every Latin American country at one time or another. No government in the region can afford to disregard students as a political group.

For this reason, and because the current student generation will become the national leaders of the future, scholars interested in Latin America should be making them the subject of systematic study. However, until recently this was not the case. Frank Bonilla could say in 1960 (page 311) that "student organizations seem to have a permanent and institutionalized place in Latin American society, yet little analysis has been made of the main features of this distinctive social phenomenon." And the statement applied not only to student organizations, but to student behavior in general. Since the time of that statement, however, there has been a marked increase in the study of the role of students. It will be the purpose of this article to review the recent research on students and comment on the findings that flow from it. An extensive bibliography follows the text.

Because university students constitute a part of the tiny educated elite in Latin American countries, they have been disproportionately important for a long time. From the founding of the earliest universities in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries until the Reform Movement of this century, higher education was an aristocratic preserve. Most students took degrees in the socially prestigious faculties of law or medicine. Although the university underwent significant changes, it remained, by and large, under the control of the Church and the government. The Reform Movement, which originated earlier, spread from Argentina after 1918 and constituted a revolt against this traditional system. The effects of this movement are still being felt in Latin American universities.

The Reform Movement, which had swept through most of Latin America

\* I wish to thank Sandra Petersen and Shirley Kregar for their help, as well as Professor Cole Blasier, who suggested the article and advised me during its completion.

by the mid-1920's, marked the beginning of a new self-consciousness and assertiveness by students. In addition to demands for change within the university, they became increasingly involved in national politics. Students have developed a reputation for leading the opposition against the established authorities, especially when that authority is dictatorial.

In recent years Latin American universities have experienced change in at least two areas. First, enrollments have been expanding rapidly, and second, attempts are being made to diversify and modernize the curriculum and the university structure itself with an eye toward making it a more effective instrument for national development. The impact of these trends on the composition of the student body and the social and political role of students is not yet clear.

For convenience, the literature covered here has been divided into three categories: 1) the Reform Movement and its consequence, 2) the contemporary role of students in the political and social systems of Latin America, and 3) attitudes, motivations, and background characteristics of students. Not all of the literature, of course, fits neatly into these categories and there are several studies that overlap. The essay will deal directly only with selected examples of the literature mentioned in the bibliography.

#### I. THE REFORM MOVEMENT AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

The Reform Movement of 1918 was probably the single most significant event in the history of Latin American student life. A large literature, particularly by Latin American authors, has developed to explain the Movement.

The most prolific writer on the subject has undoubtedly been Gabriel del Mazo. He was one of the students involved in the original Movement at the Universidad de Cordoba and became the Movement's historian. His major work appeared in the 1920's and early 1940's and is hence outside the scope of this review. In a more recent study (1957: 13), however, he sets forth the goals of the Reform Movement, which include: student "co-government" of the university, a role for alumni in university decisions, free attendance, free instruction, periodic review of faculty competence, publication of university rules and decisions, university extension for popular education, and university autonomy, among others. He claims success for the Movement by pointing to the fact that the goals of the Reform have been enacted into law in 18 of the Latin American countries.

Del Mazo and several other Latin American authors (Foción Febres Cordero, 1959; Francisco J. Vocos, 1962) have been primarily concerned with an historical description of the Movement and with promoting its extension and consolidation. Other recent studies of aspects of the Movement

have been done by Kenneth Walker (1966), John P. Harrison (1961, 1964), Orlando Albórnz (1967), León Cortinas Peláez (1963), and Richard Walter (1968). These writers, however, disagree about the effects of the Reform on the contemporary Latin American university.

Cortinas Peláez (1963: 172), in a study on Uruguay, concludes that the autonomy which resulted from the Reform has been a crucial element in the protection of academic freedom and that student participation in university policy-making makes the university a better instrument for achieving the goals of national development and national integration.

Albórnz (1966: 250–256), on the other hand, believes that the Reform Movement has not resulted in progress for the university, but rather lowered its quality. He concludes that “co-government and inviolability of the campus work again academic freedom” because they introduce politics into university affairs. This he believes to be undesirable and a distortion of the university’s role. John P. Harrison (1961: 80) agrees with this latter view. As a result of the Movement, he says, the primary function of the university has become social, and hence political, rather than academic. He points out that “it is not possible today to touch any part of the university structure in Latin America without becoming enmeshed in local, national and even international politics.”

Walker (1966) makes a comparative study of the Movement in Colombia and Argentina. He finds that in Argentina students successfully organized themselves and were able to achieve their reformist goals. The benefits included needed reform in the universities, the defense of academic freedom against the state, and a politicizing experience for students in the democratic process. In Colombia, however, the student movement was never similarly institutionalized. The Reform did not successfully take root and as a result the ultimate effect was negative. The students became disillusioned with the system and seriously alienated from the political process.

Even though many of the goals of the Movement have apparently been achieved in most other Latin American countries, it still is a relevant issue in university affairs. The struggle now is between those who continue to support the traditional goals of autonomy and student power within the university and those who want to see the university modernized and rationalized to be more responsive to the developmental needs of these countries. The latter group argues that Latin American universities remain incapable of fulfilling these tasks partly because of the lax academic standards and curriculum that the old-line “Reformists” of the 1918 tradition insist upon. So long as there are weak admission standards, irrelevant course work, and student intimidation of faculty, the latter group argues, the universities will never achieve excellence. Much of United States’ economic and technical assistance for Latin American higher education supports these “modernization” efforts.

Opponents of "modernization," that is, those who continue to advocate the traditional goals of the Reform Movement, apparently do so on two grounds: first, that the current university practice of unrestricted admissions and student "co-government" is both democratic and valuable as an educational experience; second, that national development problems cannot be solved by "modernization" of the university. What is really needed, they say, is a revolution in the entire social system. They see these new academic reforms as breathing new life into and perpetuating an odious system. Moreover, reforms are supported by the "imperialist" United States and hence are automatically suspect (Harrison, 1964a).

Faced with this struggle involving the larger institutions, some Latin American governments attempting to sponsor internal development have turned to private universities or the establishment of technical schools as a source for trained personnel outside the political atmosphere of the state universities. Of course, the older universities resist this competition and its attendant erosion of their own prestige and funding sources.

One of the most significant cases of student political action in recent Argentine history developed in 1958 over accreditation and degree-granting rights for private schools. After a hard and long fight, the traditional Reformists in the national universities lost the struggle to their rivals in the private sector (Walter, 1968: 158–168). Such conflicts may well appear elsewhere in Latin America, especially if governments devote more and more resources to the support of private and technical schools.

Thus, the Reform Movement continues to affect student political behavior to this day. It is likely that the issues raised by the Reform some 50 years ago will continue to be relevant to an understanding of students and universities in Latin America for a long time to come.

## II. THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ROLE OF STUDENTS.

Frank Bonilla's study of the Chilean Student Federation, which was completed in 1959, stands as a landmark in the research on Latin American students. It marked the awakening of great interest by political scientists, sociologists and historians in the role played by students.

Bonilla's study, a short version of which was published in 1960, examines the organizational structure, goals, tactics and effectiveness of student action in Chile. He found (1960: 316–317) that the basic issue dividing the student body there was over the students' conception of their proper role. One side, the "guildsmen," said students should be concerned with university problems and student welfare and that politics should be kept entirely separate. The other side, the "political activists," argued that students have a special re-

sponsibility to help solve national problems and therefore must involve themselves in politics. At the time Bonilla wrote, the "guildsmen" were generally associated with the Catholics and the political Right, while the secularists and the Left were identified with the "political activists." This type of split is also found in other Latin American universities.

In making an overall assessment of the role played by Chilean students, Bonilla (1960: 315) concludes that "students have been a force for progress within the university, (and) their dedication to democratic ideals, their readiness to protest injustice, and their resistance to political repression have helped keep Chile politically moderate."

Bonilla combined with Kalman Silvert to write *Education and the Social Meaning of Development*, which provided a theoretical base for discussing the role of students in developing systems. Silvert has since produced several other articles dealing with students and politics. In one of these articles (1964a: 218–220) he presents a series of propositions which are useful in explaining student political strength in the Latin American setting. These propositions can be summarized as follows: 1) All Latin American countries are pre-national (except possibly Cuba) and as a result governments are relatively weak. 2) Interest and occupational groups are unstable and disorganized. 3) Students come essentially from the upper middle classes and thus already have status. 4) The university is viewed as a training ground for leaders by both traditional and reformist groups. 5) Students are viewed as more mature in Latin America and can be trusted with responsibility. 6) Demands for socio-economic development naturally turn to the university for ideological leadership. 7) Economic growth and business expansion have resulted in greater demand for trained specialists from the university. 8) Student organizations are usually organized along the lines of national political parties. 9) Latin America has been traditionally open to new ideas, especially from Europe, and the university is the transmitter of these ideas.

In addition to these hypotheses explaining the potential strength of student political activity, Silvert asserts that student effectiveness varies with the general social environment. He suggests (1964a: 222–224) the following typology for differentiating this environment: 1) Situations of stable traditional societies, including Nicaragua, Haiti and Paraguay. Here students play a small role. 2) Situations of beginning modernization and disarray, including El Salvador, Guatemala, Ecuador, Peru, the Dominican Republic and Panama. Here, more than in any other social milieu, students can exercise their greatest power. 3) More mature situations of temporary resolution, including Colombia, Venezuela and Bolivia. Here students are usually very active, but are limited by the growth of other groups. 4) Situations of institutional complexity and relative strength, including Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Uruguay, Costa

Rica, Chile and Cuba. Here student power is limited by a plural interest structure and a complex class system.

Silvert focuses on the idea that students are most likely to be influential in systems where the government is relatively weak and where other, potentially more powerful, groups are unorganized. He is supported in this analysis by Myron Glazer's (1968) work with Chilean students. Glazer adds that student power is greatest in crisis situations, following a breakdown in established patterns.

Another writer who has provided a good deal of integrative insight into the nature of student behavior is Seymour Martin Lipset. Most of his work deals not only with Latin America, but discusses the phenomenon in developing countries generally. The introductory chapter in his new book, *Student Politics* (1967: 3–53) provides a good summary of propositions on students from a wide variety of sources.

Francisco Miro Quesada (1960: 3–5), in comparing the university in North and South America, finds the major difference to be in their contrasting social roles. The Latin American university is much more influential in society because it is recognized as the crucible of political ideas. The University is seen as the instrument for setting the goals of society, and as a result university students are naturally looked upon as leaders.

The image of the student as a natural leader in society increases the impact of the petitions and public statements so often made by students. When students take the more active step of organizing mass demonstrations, the established governmental authorities are almost invariably forced to react by either immediate suppression or compromise with student demands. This is so because the public prestige of students enables them to mobilize masses of people to support their cause and because of the ever present threat that such demonstrations will get out of hand and lead to the overthrow of the government.

John P. Harrison (1964a: 35–37) believes that radical students recognize this power and are actively engaged in an attempt to build an alliance with the urban lower classes which could result in a true revolution. Isaac Ganon (1965: 58–60), who has done a good deal of work on Uruguayan students, agrees with the assessment and asserts that such an alliance already exists in that country. Students and workers often cooperate in Uruguay, he says, when issues of common interest are involved.

Student influence is also based on the cooperation and support they get from other organized groups. Student organizations have at various times allied themselves with labor unions, professional and alumni groups, teacher organizations and political parties or movements. It is this latter relationship that has evoked a certain amount of disagreement among commentators on student politics.

On the one hand, there are those who assert that student political groups are simply the tools of outside parties. L. D. Therry, (1965: 30) in a Brazilian study, calls students a "maneuver mass" who are manipulated by outside forces, usually political parties. It is in this way, he says, that they come closest to being a participant in national politics. S. Walter Washington (1966:119) agrees, "It is an old practice of opposition leaders to place students in the forefront of demonstrations that might provoke violence on the part of the powers-that-be. In both Cuba and Venezuela all political parties have had youth directors to organize the students."

The question of communist influence has stimulated much of the discussion of this issue. Washington is only one of the many writers who have pointed to outside communist agitators as being responsible for initiating most student political activism. The 1958 demonstrations against Vice-President Nixon in Venezuela, for example, were described by him as an example of students being manipulated by communists inside and outside the university (1916: 118).

The situation in Chile and Argentina, however, is quite different according to the studies made by Frank Bonilla and Richard Walter. Bonilla (1960: 329) found that the relationship between student groups and national parties in Chile was not one of control, but of interaction. "The university political groups enjoy considerable independence within the broad framework of basic party policy and organization. They are able to influence party decisions through their dominance of youth sections and by allying themselves with sympathetic elements in the party hierarchy."

Walter's study in Argentina (1968: 198) came to a similar conclusion: "the university federations themselves, despite the political inclinations of their individual members, generally have remained independent of the influence and program of national political groups." Part of the differing interpretations in the relationships between students and national parties and movements may stem from differences between the national situations of these countries. Nevertheless, the degree of independence of action exercised by students remains a significant bone of contention among the commentators on student politics.

The situation of students in post-revolutionary Cuba is unique in Latin America. Students there were in the vanguard of the movement to overthrow Batista in 1958 and have since been held up as a leading revolutionary force by Castro. However, the activity of students has been kept under tight control and the student organizations have become little more than an arm of the state for political indoctrination (Luís Boza Domínguez, 1962). Castro is well aware of the potential power of students in an opposition role and is taking measures to prevent that possibility.

Another area of some controversy in the literature is whether students are "agents of social change." C. Wright Mills (1963: 256) suggested that stu-

dents and intellectuals, rather than workers, may be a “possible, immediate, radical agency of change.” And as such he said they should be the subject of further study. León Cortinas Peláez (1963: 172) is in essential agreement and represents the view of many when he says, “student (political) participation promises to give, indeed has already given, spontaneity, dynamism and passion to the pursuit of the urgent social ends that the University has set and must realize without delay.” And as Kevin Lyonette (1966: 655) has pointed out, “almost all political movements in the last 20 years posing radical alternatives to repressive governments have come from the universities”. Examples here, of course, are the *Aprista* and Christian Democratic movements.

Other commentators, however, point out that the universities remain essentially a part of the traditional system and that students continue to represent middle and upper-class groups with a vested interest in the status quo (Orlando Albórniz 1966a: 372–373). Alistair Hennessy (1967: 125–130) asserts that “the early hopes of university reformers that universities would be the agents of social change have not been fulfilled.” Students still talk in the rhetoric of the Reform Movement, he says, but are actually very resistant to change and really form obstacles to social and economic development.

In spite of disagreements whether students are “agents of social change,” most commentators believe that the popular image of students is that of a progressive force in society. This image does much to strengthen the influence of students in political decision-making. As Robert Scott (1968: 70–75) and others have pointed out, students are influential partly because they are viewed as the “conscience of the nation.” Scott also indicates that the growing demands for development throughout Latin America have aided the students’ political position because the universities are expected to “provide leaders for nation-building.” As suggested earlier, however, the ability of students to take advantage of this leverage is related to the struggle within the university as to whether the students should be a “reformist” or a “revolutionary” force.

Another more direct way in which students can wield political influence is through the positions they hold in outside employment. In most Latin American countries a majority of the students must hold jobs in addition to studying at the university. Particularly in the smaller countries with a less-developed middle class, these students often hold positions of importance in government ministries and agencies, hospitals, schools and the courts. Through these positions they can have an important impact on day-to-day decisions. In the event of a student general strike, they are capable of crippling much of a country’s normal activities.

It is generally recognized that the Cuban Revolution is one of the most important events in recent Latin American history. Its impact has been felt throughout the area and the nature of student political behavior has been



affected. David Spencer (1965: 91) believes it has influenced student politics in several ways, including: 1) radicalizing and further politicizing students; 2) enhancing the importance of ideology by increasing the impact of Marxism (of the *Fidelista* type), and in reaction contributing to the rise of Christian Democracy; 3) as ideology has become more important, structures like student governments and National Unions of Students have become less important; 4) national political parties have become more involved in student politics, and 5) the changing nature of Latin American youth and student politics has further complicated the work of international youth and student organizations. As a result of these changes, he says, violence has been more commonly employed by students and many have become active guerrillas in an attempt to emulate the Castro success in Cuba.

Kenneth Walker (1965b) has made a study of Castro supporters among university students and found them to be more radical, more alienated and less "Catholic" than other students, which is what one might expect. He found support for Castro greater among more advanced students, implying a radical socializing effect of the university. Law, humanities, and economics students were most likely to support Castro, while agronomy, medicine, engineering and architecture students were least likely.

Whether the Cuban Revolution will have a permanent effect on student politics elsewhere in Latin America remains unclear. There is some indication that its impact is declining and that student political behavior is returning to more traditional patterns.

Robert Scott (1968: 70–98) suggests that insofar as other nations evolve along a path similar to that followed by Mexico there is likely to be a gradual decline both in student activism and in the impact of students. He says that Mexican students have gone through a complete cycle from student recruitment as nation-building leaders, to active involvement in the national integration process, and finally the beginning of a withdrawal from political activism. Whether the recent outbreak of student demonstrations in Mexico would cause him to change his analysis is unknown. It should, however, give pause to anyone who believes it easy to predict the nature of Latin American student behavior in the future, as James Goodsell (1969: 31–35) points out.

The role of Latin American students in the years ahead is yet to be determined. If the Cuban model is followed elsewhere, the role of students as an independent group may be essentially eliminated. However, in light of U. S. policy in the area and changing attitudes of some Latin American leaders a repeat of the Cuban revolution is unlikely. As a result, it is probably safe to say that students will continue to act in a more-or-less familiar pattern as a force that must be recognized in Latin America.

Frank Bonilla (1960: 334) has provided a good summation of the role

and impact of students. His comments directly concern Chile, but I believe they can be just as well applied to Latin America in general:

No facile generalizations can be made concerning the influence of students on national politics in Chile. There have been occasions when students have proved the decisive voice; not infrequently they have gone unheard. As has been noted students come to the foreground in abnormal times, when the usual machinery of national decision-making is weakened or monopolized by a single group, and of course, students are the bane of strong regimes. Instability, disorganization and disunity have been chronic characteristics of student political efforts in Chile, but those who seek to understand or anticipate Chilean political developments must be sensitive to the changing patterns of student thought and action.

### III. MOTIVATIONS, ATTITUDES AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS.

A good deal of the recent literature on Latin American students deals with their socio-economic background, their attitudes and the motivations for their social and political behavior. Some of these assessments are essentially impressionistic and others are based on surveys conducted at various universities.

Seymour Martin Lipset (1964) has summarized much of this literature and has set forth a series of hypotheses which attempt to explain the bases for student political activism. As he points out, one of the themes common to much of the writing on student politics emphasizes the importance of the natural rebelliousness of youth and the conflict of generations as a motivation for student activism. Lipset (1967: 17) suggests that "The older generations are more attached to traditional norms regarding topics such as familial authority, women's rights, authority, religion, etc., than are the younger. . . . University students being both younger and more highly educated are especially inclined to diverge from the prescriptions of tradition in their cultural and political beliefs." Alistair Hennessey (1967: 140-141) asserts that the conflict of generations "accounts for much of the political radicalism of middle class students." Peter Bachrach (1957: 331) found in a study in Puerto Rico that 40 percent of the university students rejected their father's political party.

Other writers, however, emphasize the continuity from generation to generation and the relative similarity of the attitudes of sons and fathers. Kalman Silvert (1964: 225) maintains that the generational conflict is overdrawn in Latin America and sums up his attitude by simply saying, "The Latin American university student is the child of his parents. To assume that the student is but a hot-eyed revolutionary is to presume that somehow registering in a university is sufficient to cut family ties, break class and other group identifica-

tions, and produce a special kind of creature divorced from his society." Myron Glazer essentially agrees and found in a survey of Chilean students (1968: 110–115) that the attitudes of fathers and sons yielded the highest correlation of any set of factors tested.

An explanation for these differing interpretations may be that while a desire for change and a rejection of existing institutions seems to characterize and motivate behavior, most of these activist students probably have fathers who feel essentially the same way but are not political activists. On the other hand, it may be that student activists are not nearly as revolutionary as outsiders believe and that, once the rhetoric is penetrated, they are basically supporters of existing political structures and processes.

Another point of some disagreement among commentators on student politics is the class composition of student bodies and the relationship between class and political attitudes and behavior. It is clear that the traditional Latin American university was the preserve of the upper and upper-middle classes. One of the primary goals of the Reform Movement was to broaden the social base of the student body and make a university education available to members of all social classes. In most countries, however, this remains a distant goal. Although there appear to be increasing numbers of students from middle and even low-middle class backgrounds, the rural and urban working classes remain grossly under-represented in proportion to their numbers in the total population (Scheman 1963: 340–341; Ganon 1965: 55). And, of course, this says nothing of the large Indian populations in many of these countries, most of whom receive little education of any kind.

S. Walter Washington (1966: 125) has stated that "Leftist thinking is natural for the increasing number of students that come from the poorer classes and are looking for quick solutions for social problems." This statement includes two ideas which can be examined further: 1) that students increasingly come from the poorer classes, and 2) that these poorer students are likely to be leftist.

The changing social composition of student bodies is widely discussed in the literature (Lipset 1967: 25–29). However, there is disagreement as to the extent of the change. Some, like Washington, believe higher education increasingly includes lower class students. Others like Silvert (1964), Ronald L. Scheman (1963) and most of the survey studies, find that universities do include large numbers of middle class students, but still very few from the lower classes. Isaac Ganon (1965: 55–57), in his studies of Uruguayan students, found them to be dominantly upper and middle class. In comparing enrollment statistics over several years he found no evidence of a shift toward lower class students. "*La universidad crece numéricamente, pero no varía su composición social.*"

The most reasonable conclusion to draw from this is that, while Latin American universities have expanded a great deal in enrollments, their student bodies are drawn primarily from the privileged classes. When one speaks of lower class students at the university, the term must be understood in a relative sense. The lowest class with significant representation at the university corresponds to the lower middle class on a national scale. The trends toward greater class inclusiveness in the university that many writers have indicated undoubtedly exist. However, any change is proceeding at a slow rate.

The second part of Washington's statement suggests that there is a positive correlation between lower class background and political leftism. This has also been examined by several writers.

Daniel Goldrich (1961), in a study of Panamanian law students, found that "radical nationalists," when compared to "moderates," were more likely to be from rural or small town backgrounds and low-income families. Scheman (1963), however, found that middle-class students in Brazil were more political than either upper or lower-class students. Glazer's (1968) survey in Chile revealed greater political activism among lower-class students, but also greater affiliation with the Christian Democrats as opposed to the more leftist FRAP. Orlando Albornoz (1964), after studying results of surveys from Mexico, Panama, Puerto Rico and Colombia, concludes that there is no clear relationship between political affiliation and involvement and social class. Apparently, then, there are no clearly established findings in this area and further detailed research is needed.

Some writers have attempted to assess the characteristics of the activist student as opposed to the less active, or the radical as opposed to the conservative. Some of the more interesting work in this area has been done by G. A. D. Soares (1966). Based on his work with students in Argentina he finds that radical students tend to participate in politics more than conservative students. He accounts for this by the different "role images" of the two groups. The perception of the radical is of an integrated role image, which includes student life as a part of national life and does not distinguish activities in one or the other. The conservative role image is the opposite; it is compartmentalized, and student life is clearly distinguished from non-university matters. He emphasizes that the radical activists make up only a small part of the student body.

E. Wright Bakke (1964: 205–206), is another who has done some work with the idea of students' "self-image" as a motivation for political action. Based on his research in Colombia and Mexico, he includes the following factors in the student "image."

- A student is:
1. A privileged member of the elite.
  2. A man with a title.
  3. A member of the professional class.

## RECENT RESEARCH ON LATIN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

4. A member of the fraternity of educated men.
5. A man with influential contacts.
6. A symbol and pillar of his family's social status.
7. A free man in an authoritarian society.
8. An active participant in governing the university.
9. An active participant in changing and determining the course of events in society.
10. A carrier of popular ideals of justice, human welfare, and people-centered government.
11. A spokesman for the underprivileged.
12. An actual or potential leader.
13. A man of knowledge, intellect, and analytic ability.
14. A man of special competence in a particular function.

Bakke tells us that this all leads to direct action by students because "Students experience a frustrating inconsistency among (a) the 'image' of the student which provides his expectancies as to the contribution the university should make to his standing at the university and in the society, (b) the actual experience provided by university life, and (c) the actual opportunities in the society. The inconsistency is a stimulus to corrective action." If on the other hand "these three variables are consistent, they take such a form as to encourage and support direct action on the part of the students."

Other factors which motivate student activism, according to Bakke, are excess energy, the desire for group integration and support, and "several characteristics of Latin American temperament, culture, and history." Attempts by some universities to modify these factors have not as yet been effective. The prospect of future national political leadership also serves to encourage political activism by students as a way to establish reputations and acquire leadership skills. As Bakke (1964: 203) asserts, "Registration as a student becomes *the* accepted way of preparing for and entering political life.'

Several studies have found that the law and humanities faculties are more radically activist than students in engineering or medicine. As Soares (1967: 449–450) puts it, those who identify themselves as "intellectuals" (the humanistic students) are more likely to be leftist than those who identify themselves as "scientists" or "professionals." This may be partly due, as Lipset (1967: 18) suggests, to their relative confidence in the system to provide them with security after graduation. "Students engaged in the courses of study which entail something like apprenticeship for a definite profession, e.g., engineering, medicine, and preparation for secondary school teaching, where employment prospects are fair, are likely to be less rebellious than students in courses of study without determinate destination" (i.e., the "intellectual" types).

Soares (1967: 450) foresees that as universities in Latin America become more academic, with a greater emphasis on the sciences and technology, it is

likely that the proportion of students supporting diffuse leftist positions will decline. However, he says, it is likely that the "intellectual" types will always be alienated and will probably never be fully incorporated into the system.

A common assumption in the United States is that most Latin American students are radical activists. However, nearly all those who have carefully studied the situation at the universities agree that this view is incorrect. While it is true that most students appear to be sympathetic to the need for reform and change in their country, the majority remain basically apolitical and never involve themselves in political matters. Silvert (1964: 226), for example, suggests that only a few are really activist on a sustained basis with another one-fourth to one-third of the student body forming an "available public." The remainder are passive.

The small activist group is divided into a variety of ideological camps and is not controlled by communists as U. S. journalists so often assert. Marxist-oriented students are strong in every Latin American country, but few are controlled by the local communist party. The strongest unifying factor for most student leftists is hostility to United States' foreign policy in the area. In the current situation of international conflict between the United States and the communist powers, observers often mistakenly conclude that students are simply communist tools (Albornoz 1966: 372).

Another point of disagreement that emerges from the literature is the importance of the so-called "professional" students as leaders at the universities. Many agree with Alistair Hennessy in assigning an important place to these perennial students as agitators and instigators of political action. Hennessy (1967: 132) claims that "Professional students, often but not necessarily Leftists, and whose careers may span several student generations, come to play a vital role in student politics." Francis Donahue (1966: 94) agrees that older, "professional" students are an important part of campus leadership.

However, after a careful study of the student movement to Argentina, Richard Walter (1968: 193) found that leaders throughout the period studied (1918–1964) "were all in their early or mid-twenties when active in the university groups. There is no evidence that 'professional students' have had much influence in the history of Argentine student politics." Frank Bonilla (1959: 329) comes to a similar conclusion about Chile. Thus, while student careers are on the average quite long in Latin America and older students are common, there are conflicting views on the significance of "professional" student agitators as leaders and activists.

Seymour Lipset (1964), among many others, has related the level of student activism in Latin America to such factors as the lax academic standards and undemanding curriculum, lack of extra-curricular outlets for excess energy and the early maturity of young men. There is general agreement on the first

two, but less on the third. Washington (1966: 117) for example, says that "although the Latin American youth are no more experienced, they are on the whole more mature than the Anglo-Saxon. . . . It is not surprising that in school and college he acts and talks as if he can solve all the world's problems, and that politics becomes the major extra-curricular activity in Latin American institutions of learning." This conclusion is contradicted in a study of Mexican students in the United States by Ralph Beals (1954: 109–110). He quotes a Mexican student who compares his own experience with his impression of the situation in the United States. "In Mexico . . . a boy of eighteen years old is really a boy; he belongs exclusively to his parents. Here (in the U. S.) an eighteen-year old boy, he knows how to do things, he knows how to answer for himself." Resolution of this issue requires further comparative research.

Finally, a point raised by Washington (1959: 473) might be repeated. In his study in Venezuela he found that there were as many Venezuelan students receiving higher education in the United States, 7,000, as there were at the Central University in Caracas. As a result, "the future of Venezuela and of Venezuela-United States relationships may therefore be determined as much by those who return from the United States as by the students at home."

If we are to understand the possible future role of the current student generation we must also learn more of those large numbers who study in the United States and Europe.

To summarize, there are few things that emerge from the literature on which there is general agreement. Further research, especially more comparative research, is needed in all phases of this subject. The growth of scholarly interest in the study of Latin American students is indicated by the great expansion in the number of articles and books dealing with them which have appeared recently. However, the surface has still barely been scratched. Most of the important questions remain unsolved because of conflicting findings or lack of data.

There is agreement that students in Latin America are activist and that they form a politically significant group, at least on occasion. However, exactly why students are activist, which students are activist and which are not, the directions activism takes, and factors that affect the political impact of student activism remain unresolved questions. Among other things, we need to know more about the relationship between ideology and participation; the effects of family, class and educational background on student behavior; the importance of the academic environment and extracurricular opportunities in relation to political activism; and the relationship of the unique cultural and historical experience of Latin America to the behavior of students. We need to know more about how students act as a political group; how they organize themselves;

what tactics they employ; and whether their overall impact should be characterized as revolutionary, reformist, conservative, or reactionary. Moreover, we need to learn how the university fits into the developmental process in this area of the world.

It is to be hoped that academic interest in Latin American university students will continue to expand. As suggested in this essay, much work remains to be done.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is limited to publications which have appeared in the last ten years, with one or two exceptions. This period was chosen for two reasons: to keep the subject within manageable limits and because most of the scholarly work on the subject has appeared since 1959. This limitation, of course, excludes some useful earlier studies, particularly those by Latin American authors dealing with the Reform Movement. Gabriel del Mazo's multi-volume works, all entitled *La Reforma Universitaria* (Buenos Aires, 1926–1927; La Plata, 1941), are good examples.

It should also be reiterated here that the bibliography deals only with university students, which, for example, resulted in exclusion of some of Daniel Goldrich's work based on secondary schools. In addition, works which deal primarily with structural, organizational or financial problems of universities have generally not been included.

In compiling this list, the standard bibliographic guides for both English and Spanish publications were consulted, in addition to numerous other sources. In some cases, works which were essentially polemical or of very narrow interest were not included.

##### ALBORNOZ, ORLANDO

- 1966a Student Opposition in Latin America. *Government and Opposition*. 1: 351–374.
- 1966b Academic Freedom and Higher Education in Latin America. *Comparative Education Review*. 10: 250–256.
- 1967a Estudiantes y desarrollo político. *Política* (Caracas). 6: 35–53.
- 1967b Estudiantes y política, conferencia internacional en San Juan, P. R. *Revista Latinoamericana de Sociología*. 3: 290–295.
- 1968 Estudiantes y política en las Américas. Caracas.

##### ALEXANDER, ROBERT J.

- 1965 Evolution of Student Politics in Latin America. In: *The Latin American Student Movement*. David Spencer, ed. United States National Student Association, Washington, D. C.

##### ALTBACH, PHILIP

- 1966 Students and Politics. *Comparative Education Review*. 10: 175–187.
- 1967 Select Bibliography on Students, Politics and Higher Education. Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, Cambridge.

##### ARISMEUDI, RODNEY

- 1966 Encuentros y desencuentros de la universidad con la revolución. Montevideo, Uruguay.

##### BACHRACH, PETER

- 1957 Actitud de los estudiantes hacia la autoridad. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*. 1: 321–344.



## RECENT RESEARCH ON LATIN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

**BAKKE, E. WRIGHT**

- 1964 Students on the March: The Cases of Mexico and Colombia. *Sociology of Education*. 37: 200–228.  
1966 Roots and Soil of Student Activism. *Comparative Education Review*. 10: 163–174.

**BEALS, RALPH**

- 1954 The Mexican Student Views the United States. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 295: 108–115.

**BEALS, RALPH AND HUMPHREY, NORMAN**

- 1957 No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the United States. Minneapolis.

**BEN-DAVID, JOSEPH AND COLLINS, RANDALL**

- 1966 A Comparative Study of Academic Freedom and Student Politics. *Comparative Education Review*. 10: 220–249.

**BENJAMIN, HAROLD R. W.**

- 1965 Higher Education in the American Republics. New York.

**BONILLA, FRANK**

- 1959a Students in Politics: Three Generations of Political Action in a Latin American University. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University.  
1959b Student Politics in Latin America. *Political Research—Organization and Design*. 3: 12–15.  
1960 The Chilean Student Federation. *The Journal of Inter-American Studies*. 2: 313–330.  
1965 Brazil. In: *Education and Political Development*. James S. Coleman, ed. Princeton.

**BOU, I. RODRIQUEZ**

- 1963 La educación superior en América Latina. Pan American Union, Washington.

**DE BRITO, SULAMITA**

- 1966 O radicalismo estudantil. *Cadernos Brasileiros*. 8: 71–77.

**BUNGE, MARIO**

- 1961 The Argentine University: A Defense. *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*. 47: 53–55.

**CALDERON, RICARDO ARIAS**

- 1967 The Universities. In: *Integration of Man and Society in Latin America*. Samuel Shapiro, ed. Notre Dame.

**CANTON, DARIO**

- 1966 Universidades en conflicto y sus reacciones. *Revista Latinoamericana de Sociología*. 2: 396–416.

**CORTINAS PELAEZ, LEÓN**

- 1963 Autonomy and student co-government in the university of Uruguay. *Comparative Education Review*. 7: 166–172.

**DALTON, ROQUE**

- 1966 Student Youth and the Latin American Revolution. *World Marxist Review*. 9: 30–35.

**DAME, HARTLEY F., HAYS, MARGARET P., and HOFFMAN, CHRIST ANN**

- 1965 The Political Influence of University Students in Latin America: An Analytical Survey of Research Studies and Related Literature. Washington.

## *Latin American Research Review*

- DONAHUE, FRANCIS  
1966 Students in Latin American Politics. *Antioch Review*. 26: 91–106.
- DOMINGUEZ, LUIS BOZA  
1962 La situación universitaria en Cuba. Santiago, Chile.
- EINAUDI, LUIGI  
1963 University Autonomy and Academic Freedom in Latin America. *Law and Contemporary Problems*. 28: 636–646.
- EMILIO, FILIPPI M.  
1963 Acerca de la formación política de los estudiantes. *Revista Interamericana de Educacion*. 23: 5–11.
- EMMERSON, DONALD K.  
1968 Students and Politics in Developing Nations. New York.
- ESCARDO, FLORENCIO  
1960 Política Universitaria. *Política (Caracas)*. 10: 88–94.
- FALCON, LUIS NIEVES  
1965 Recruitment to Higher Education in Puerto Rico, 1940–65. Río Piedras, Puerto Rico.
- FEBRES CORDERO, FOCION  
1959a Autonomia Universitaria. Caracas, Venezuela.  
1959b Reforma Universitaria. Caracas, Venezuela.
- FLORIA, CARLOS ALBERTO  
1962 Ideas e Ideales Políticos de los Jóvenes Latinoamericanos. *Occidente*. 17: 12–17.
- FORACCHI, MARIALICE MENCARINI  
1965 O Estudante e a Transformação da Sociedade Brasileira. Sao Paulo, Brazil.  
1966 El radicalismo vinculado al sistema: condiciones sociales de la politización de estudiante brasileno. *Revista Latinoamericana de Sociología*. 2: 368–377.
- GANON, ISAAC  
1964 Nuestro estudiante contemporáneo. Instituto de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de la Republica, Montevideo. Mimeographed.  
1965 El movimiento estudiantil en Uruguay. *Cuadernos Americanos*. 143: 51–63.
- GLAZER, MYRON  
1965 The Professional and Political Attitudes of Chilean University Students. Ph.D. thesis. Princeton University.  
1966 The Professional and Political Attitudes of Chilean University Students. *Comparative Education Review*. 10: 282–295.  
1968 Student Politics in a Chilean University. *Daedalus*. 97: 99–115.  
1968 Chile. In: *Students and Politics in Developing Nations*. Donald K. Emmerson, ed. New York.
- GOLDRICH, D.  
1961 Radical Nationalism—the Political Orientations of Panamanian Law Students. Michigan State University Press, East Lansing.  
1964 Reform or Revolution in Latin America, Leftism and the Students. *Challenge*. 12: 13–16.
- GOMEZ, RAFAEL  
1963 Ideología y política en el ambiente universitario internacional. *ARCO: Revista de las areas culturales bolivarianas*. 5: 184–190.

## RECENT RESEARCH ON LATIN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

GOODSELL, JAMES N.

1969 Mexico: Why the Students Rioted. *Current History*. 56: 31–35, 53.

GROMPONE, ANTONIO M.

Universidad oficial y universidad viva. Mexico, D. F. No date.

HAMILTON, WILLIAM L.

1968 Venezuela. In: *Students and Politics in Developing Nations*. Donald K. Emmerson, ed. New York.

HANS, NICHOLAS

1961 Comparative Study of Latin America. *Comparative Education Review*. 5: 17–26.

HARRISON, JOHN P.

1961 Confrontation with the Political University. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 334: 74–83.

1964a The Role of the Intellectual in Fomenting Change: The University. In: *Explosive Forces in Latin America*. J. TePaske and S. Fisher, eds. Columbus, Ohio.

1946b Learning and Politics in Latin American Universities. *Academy of Political Science Proceedings*. 27: 331–344.

HAVIGHURST, ROBERT

1961 Latin American and North American Higher Education. *Comparative Education Review*. 4: 174–182.

HENNESSY, ALISTAIR

1967 University Students in National Politics. In: *The Politics of Conformity in Latin America*. Claudio Veliz, ed. London.

INGLESE, JUAN OSVALDO, DORIA, YEGROS, and CARLOS, L.

1965 Universidad y estudiantes. Buenos Aires.

INSTITUTO DE ESTUDOS SOCIAIS E ECONOMICAS

1963 Student Study. Sao Paulo, Brazil.

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

1960 University Reform in Latin America, Analyses and Documents. Leiden.

1964 A Study of Opinions of University Students in Mexico. Mexico City.

IZAGUIRRE DE CAIROLL, INES

1965 Estratificación y orientación profesional en la Universidad de Buenos Aires. *Revista latinoamericana de sociología*. 1: 333–363.

LAPALMA, MARIA MONSERRAT and RIVAS, ELISABETH MARTHA

1964 Youth in Argentine Politics. Presented to Sixth World Congress, International Political Science Association, Geneva.

LE-ROY Y GALVEZ, LUIS FELIPE

1960 La universidad de la Habana: síntesis histórica. La Habana.

LIPP, SOLOMON

1959/60 Attitudes and Opinions of Guatemalan University Students. *Sociology and Social Research*. 40: 335–344.

LIPSET, SEYMOUR MARTIN

1964 University Students and Politics in Underdeveloped Countries. *Minerva*. 3: 15–56.

1965 The Political Behavior of University Students in Developing Nations. *Social and Economic Studies*. 14: 35–75.

1967 Student Politics. New York.

## *Latin American Research Review*

LITIG, DAVID

- 1965 Latin American Student Affairs. United States National Student Association, Washington, D. C.

LOUSTEAU HEGUY, GUILLERMO A.

- 1964 Values, Beliefs and Political Behavior of Argentine Youth. Presented to Sixth World Congress, International Political Science Association, Geneva.

LOVE, JOSEPH

- 1967 Sources for the Latin American Student Movement: Archives of the United States National Student Association. *The Journal of Developing Areas* (Macomb, Ill.). 1: 215-226.

LYONETTE, KEVIN

- 1966 Student Organizations in Latin America. *International Affairs*. (London). 42: 4: 655-661.

MAC-LEAN Y ESTENOS, ROBERTO

- 1956 La crisis universitaria en hispano-america. Mexico, D. F.

MANTOVANI, JUAN

- 1962 Idea, forma y misión de las universidades en los países latinoamericanos. *Política* (Caracas). 21: 39-46.

DEL MAZO, GABRIEL

- 1956 Estudiantes y gobierno universitario. Buenos Aires.  
1957 La reforma universitaria y la universidad latinoamericana. Resistencia: Universidad Nacional del Nordeste.  
1964 La nueva crisis de las universidades latino-americanas. *Panoramas*. 2: 95-111.

MCNELLY, JOHN T. and FONSECA, EUGENIO

- 1964 Media Use and Political Interest at the University of Costa Rica. *Journalism Quarterly*. 41: 225-231.

MENDIETA Y NUÑEZ, and ROBLEDAY, JOSE GOMEZ

- Problemas de la universidad. Mexico, D. F. No date.

MERA, JORGE ALBERTO

- 1962 La participación estudiantil en el gobierno universitario. *Estudios*. 535: 351-358.

MILLS, C. WRIGHT

- 1963 *Power, Politics and People*. New York.

MYHR, ROBERT O.

- 1968 Brazil. In: *Students and Politics in Developing Nations*. Donald K. Emmerson, ed. New York.

NASATIR, DAVID

- 1964 University Education and Political Orientation: The Argentine Case. Presented at Sixth World Congress, International Political Science Association, Geneva.  
1965 Student Action in Latin America. *Transaction*. 2: 8-11.  
1966 University Experience and Political Unrest of Students in Buenos Aires. *Comparative Education Review*. 10: 273-281.

NEWTON, RONALD C.

- 1966 Students and the Political System of the University of Buenos Aires. *Journal of Inter-American Studies*. 8: 633-656.

PATCH, RICHARD W.

- 1958 *Politics and the University*. American Universities Field Staff Report.

## RECENT RESEARCH ON LATIN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

POERNER, ARTHUR J.

1968 *O Poder Jovem: Historia de Participação Política dos Estudantes Brasileiros*. Rio de Janeiro.

QUESADA, FRANCISCO MIRO

1960 *The University South and North: The University and Society*. *Americas*. 12: 2–5.

RABOTNIKOV, ABRAHAM

1963 *Panorama de la universidad latinoamericana*. *Cultura Universitaria*. 83–84: 82–101.

RENDON, SILVIA

1965 *Formas de asociación voluntária entre estudiantes universitarios*. *La Palabra y el Hombre*. 2: 295–303.

RIBEIRO, DARCY

1967 *Universities and Social Development*. In: *Elites in Latin America*. Seymour Lipset and Aldo Solari, eds. New York.

RIQUELME, MARCIAL ANTONIO

1963 *Student Movements in the United States and Latin America*. United States National Student Association, Washington, D. C.

ROTLAT, MIGUEL

1961 *The Latin American Student Movement*. *New University Thought*. 2: 29–36.

SANCHEZ, LUIS ALBERTO

1962 *The University in Latin America: University Reform Movement*. *Americas*. 14: 13–16.

SCHEMEN, RONALD L.

1963 *The Brazilian Law Student, Background, Habits, Attitudes*. *Journal of Inter-American Studies*. 5: 333–356.

SCHERZ-GARCIA, L.

1967 *Public and Private Universities*. In: *Elites in Latin America*. Seymour Lipset and Aldo Solari, eds. New York.

SCOTT, ROBERT E.

1968 *Student Political Activism in Latin America*. *Daedalus*. 97: 70–98.

SHAPIRO, SAMUEL

1960 *The Argentine University*. *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*. 46: 373–376.

SHILS, E.

1960 *Intellectuals in the Political Development of New States*. *World Politics*. 12: 329–368.

SILVERT, KALMAN

1964a *The University Student*. In: *Continuity and Change in Latin America*. J. Johnson, ed. Stanford.

1964b *The Social Origins and Political Commitment of the Latin American University Student*. Presented to Sixth World Congress, International Political Science Association, Geneva.

SILVERT, KALMAN AND BONILLA, FRANK

1961 *Education and the Social Meaning of Development—A Preliminary Statement*. New York.

*Latin American Research Review*

SOARES, GLAUCIO ARY DILLON

- 1966 The Active Few: A Study of Ideology and Participation. *Comparative Education Review*. 10: 205–220.  
1967 Intellectual Identity and Political Ideology among University Students. In: *Elites in Latin America*. Seymour Lipset and Aldo Solari, eds. New York.

SPENCER, DAVID

- 1965 The Latin American Student Movement. The National Student Association, Washington, D. C.

STEIGERWALT, A. K.

- 1963 Student Tyranny in Latin America. *Michigan Quarterly Review*. 2: 221–232.

SUCHLICKI, JAIME

- 1967 El estudiantado de la universidad de la Habana en la Política Cubana, 1956–57. *Journal of Inter-American Studies*. 9: 145–167.  
1968 Cuba. In: *Students and Politics in Developing Nations*. Donald K. Emmerson, ed. New York.

THERRY, L. D.

- 1965 Dominant Power Components in the Brazilian University Student Movement Prior to April, 1964. *Journal of Inter-American Studies*. 7: 17–48.

UNITED STATES CONGRESS

- 1961 House Committee on Education and Labor. *University in Latin America; Argentina and the Alliance for Progress*, Washington.

UNITED STATES NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

- 1965 *Readings on Latin American Student Movements and the Rise of the Latin American Left*. Philadelphia.

VOCOS, FRANCISCO J.

- 1962 El problema universitario y el movimiento reformista. Buenos Aires.

WALKER, KENNETH N.

- 1965a La socialización política en las universidades latino-americanas. *Revista Latino Americana de Sociología*. 2: 200–219.  
1965b Determinants of Castro Support Among Latin-American University Students. *Social and Economic Studies*. 14: 88–105.  
1966 A Comparison of the University Reform Movements in Argentina and Colombia. *Comparative Education Review*. 10: 257–272.

WALTER, RICHARD J.

- 1968 *Student Politics in Argentina*. New York.

WASHINGTON, S. W.

- 1959 Student Politics in Latin America, the Venezuelan Example. *Foreign Affairs*. 37: 463–473.  
1966 Student Political Activity in Latin America. In: *Latin American Politics*. Robert Tomasek, ed. New York.

WEDGE, BRYANT

- 1969 A Case Study of Student Political Violence: Brazil, 1964, and Dominican Republic, 1965. *World Politics*. 21: 183–206.

WILLIAMSON, ROBERT C.

- 1962 El estudiante colombiano y sus actitudes Bogotá.  
1964. *University Students in a World of Change: A Colombian Sample*. *Sociology and Social Research*. 48: 397–413.