

# THE POLITICS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN LATIN AMERICA

*Iván Jaksic*

*University of California, Berkeley*

- LA UNIVERSIDAD LATINOAMERICANA: VISION DE UNA DECADA.* Edited by PATRICIO DOONER and IVAN LAVADOS. (Santiago de Chile: Corporación de Promoción Universitaria, 1978. Pp. 672.)
- THE LATIN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY.* Edited by JOSEPH MAIER and RICHARD W. WEATHERHEAD. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979. Pp. 237. \$5.95 paper.)
- SOBRE EDUCACION SUPERIOR.* By EDUARDO LATORRE. (Santo Domingo: Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo, 1980. Pp. 235.)
- IDEA Y DEFENSA DE LA UNIVERSIDAD.* By JORGE MILLAS. (Santiago de Chile: Editorial del Pacífico, Coedición Corporación de Promoción Universitaria, 1981. Pp. 154.)
- CRONICA DE LA AUTONOMIA UNIVERSITARIA DE MEXICO.* By BALTASAR DROMUNDO. (Mexico City: Editorial Jus, 1978. Pp. 218.)
- THE MEXICAN UNIVERSITY AND THE STATE: STUDENT CONFLICTS, 1910–1971.* By DONALD J. MABRY. (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1982. Pp. 328. \$24.75 cloth.)
- UNIVERSITY AND GOVERNMENT IN MEXICO: AUTONOMY IN AN AUTHORITARIAN SYSTEM.* By DANIEL C. LEVY. (New York: Praeger, 1980. Pp. 174. \$22.95.)

Numerous events corroborate the view of the Latin American university as a highly politicized institution. The Córdoba university reform movement of 1918, the students' role in the overthrow of dictatorships in the 1920s and 1930s, and the Tlatelolco tragedy of 1968 in Mexico, to mention only some of the major events of the twentieth century, all underscore what seems to be a pattern of political unrest in the region's institutions of higher learning. Particularly during the 1960s, vigorous scholarly attention brought this pattern to the status of a predominant view. The Latin American university is, by almost all accounts, largely political in nature.<sup>1</sup>

Although the volumes under review concentrate on the most political aspects of the Latin American university, it would be deceptive to conclude from them that this perspective will remain prevalent. Hav-

ing explored the themes of politicization, student unrest, and major university crises, authors are beginning to suggest new themes that conspicuously move away from an exclusive emphasis on the high degree of politicization of the Latin American university. Common sense would indicate that universities are not simply political institutions and that they continuously graduate scientists, professionals, and intellectuals who have contributed to the development and functioning of their nations. Yet scholarly patterns of research are not necessarily dictated by common sense, and they are also hard to break.

Latin American universities are not exclusively political institutions, but they do play a fundamental political role in their societies. Many of the largest and most prestigious are part of the national system of education and are thus continuously adjusting to or challenging government policy in such matters as the budget, admissions, and the aims of education. This relationship to the state makes them politically significant. Their political importance can also be seen when university graduates are recruited into high government positions. Undoubtedly, other instances exist in which the political role of the university can be distinctly perceived. But the study of Latin American higher education has tended to concentrate on politics at the expense of other, no less significant areas in the field.

The volumes under review pay due homage to the predominant view, but they also contain elements of an emerging trend of scholarly interest. Some volumes are intended to provide an overview of higher education scholarship in the region or to show the complexity of the subject and serve as an introduction to the topic. Others are eyewitness accounts of significant developments in the contemporary history of the Latin American university. Still others are representative examples of the best scholarship produced to date.

Beginning with the volumes that serve as an introduction to the field, Patricio Dooner and Iván Lavados's *La universidad latinoamericana* stems from the activities of the Corporación de Promoción Universitaria, a Chilean private organization that has concentrated on the study of educational issues, especially at the higher education level.<sup>2</sup> In this volume, the editors have collected the articles they view as the most representative on the subject of Latin American higher education during the period from the height of the student movement in 1968 until the collection was published in 1978. The twenty-six articles by thirty scholars are divided into four parts, each preceded by an introduction. These parts deal with theoretical and methodological issues, general perspectives on the Latin American university, country case studies, and the relationship between the university and science and technology. Although most of the articles were written during the 1970s,

they use analytical tools and comment on events and data from the 1960s. While the volume may at first glance seem outdated, it serves the major purpose of providing a general overview of issues concerning higher education by many leading scholars in the field within one major publication.

In keeping with the variety of issues, institutions, and countries covered, the corresponding views of the authors vary significantly from essay to essay. In this respect, Dooner and Lavados are to be commended for bringing together such diverse outlooks on Latin American higher education in a single volume. But a corollary of such wide selection is the uneven quality of the articles. Several were extracted from books, which sometimes makes it difficult for readers to understand them outside their original context. Some were written by rectors or other higher education officials whose contributions have more historical than scholarly value. Still others are abstract and general enough to make the volume less appropriate as an introduction to the topic.

The shortcomings of the collection, however, are outnumbered by its merits. Representing a variety of academic disciplines and countries (although most contributors are Chileans and sociologists), *La universidad latinoamericana* highlights some outstanding essays. Among the most significant is the article by Ernesto Schiefelbein and Aldo Solari, which views Latin American higher education as something of an oddity in the context of both the rampant, growing illiteracy rate of the continent and the wider educational system, with which it has little connection. Paul Sigmund's piece on the Latin American student movement contributes operational categories to classify the disparate literature on the subject. The articles by Carlos Huneeus, Jorge Graciarena, Fernando Cepeda, Orlando Albornoz, and Francisco Sagasti provide interesting perspectives on the modernization and democratization of the Latin American university. The Cepeda and Sagasti pieces in particular raise some sobering arguments about how antithetical these two processes can be in the Latin American university. Thus even if reading almost seven hundred pages of unequal quality may prove too cumbersome for most readers, the collection will be useful as a consultation source.

Joseph Maier and Richard Weatherhead's *The Latin American University* is sharper in focus and shorter in length. Also an anthology, this collection approaches the university as an institution in the same category as the church, the state, and the army, and it features major essays on the students, professors, and administrators. The articles selected for this publication reflect more clearly the views of the editors than do those comprising the Dooner and Lavados collection. Maier and Weatherhead view the Latin American university as an institution still strug-

gling to overcome the legacy of its ecumenical past, as one highly ideological and political in nature, and as an important influence on national culture.

Six of the nine articles deal with the major themes outlined in the editors' introduction: the tension between ecumenical and modern institutions in Latin American society and the resulting political and ideological character of the Latin American university. Mario Góngora and Anisio Teixeira analyze the evolution of the university in Latin America (including Brazil) in terms of broad "philosophies" that have defined the institution during different historical periods. Such "philosophies" have been the product of larger social and historical forces and have consequently subjected the university to the dilemmas and crises affecting society in general. This view is carried one step further by Hanns-Albert Steger, who places the Latin American university in the context of the European university models that were transplanted to the region to guide the institution in different periods of its history. Thus Steger views the Latin American university as a reflection, if not a "province," of its European counterparts. He chronicles a succession of university models that have been at odds with the needs of the region, which he identifies as being the modernization of Latin American society. Orlando Albornoz also focuses on "models" of the university, as if to emphasize the malleable nature of the institution. But he classifies these models not so much by their philosophical underpinnings as by their public or private character. Here he introduces an important distinction and suggests that the growth of private universities is significant enough to challenge the near monopoly of public universities on higher education in the region. The public universities nonetheless retain a near monopoly on politicization. This public politicization is underscored by José Luis Romero as well, who discusses what has become the symbol of the Latin American student movement: the Córdoba university reform of 1918. He finds the significance of this movement to lie not so much in the academic changes it advocated as in the entrance of students into the arenas of both university and national politics.

The remaining essays in *The Latin American University* also emphasize the political importance of students, professors, and administrators (mainly rectors), especially students and rectors. The authors scarcely approve of this situation; in fact, they blame politicization for many of the problems of the Latin American university today. The articles by Luis Manuel Peñalver and Gino Germani, however, suggest how difficult it is for administrators and professors to avoid the dangers of politicization because of the overwhelming pressures emanating from students and society in general. At the same time, in a welcome shift of emphasis, the Germani piece stresses the many institutional constraints that professors must face to perform their work adequately, such as the

lack of library and research facilities, the part-time nature of their contracts, low salaries, and similar hindrances.

Perhaps underlining the political significance that most authors attach to Latin American universities, little information is presented on university budgets, population, and government allocations to higher education. The Germani article is the only one in the collection that provides tables and figures, although unfortunately only up to 1968. Conclusions seem dated even in some of the most general articles, such as Peñalver's views on the political role of the university rector, which cannot be readily applied to the Latin America of the 1970s. In addition, many worthy themes are touched upon in various articles but do not receive the attention they deserve. The distinction between private and public universities, for instance, demands an examination of its own, as do such issues as university autonomy, budget allocations, and university-government relations. Nevertheless, *The Latin American University* serves as an introduction to the study of the topic and is particularly appropriate for classroom use.

Some of the questions raised in the anthologies can be answered, at least partially, by other volumes under review, particularly those written by Latin Americans who are or were rectors, professors, and students. Eduardo Latorre's *Sobre educación superior*, for instance, could conceivably answer some questions on Latin American private higher education. Latorre is the Rector of the Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo (INTEC) in the Dominican Republic, a private institution concentrating on technical education. In this work, Latorre describes the genesis and consolidation of his institution rather than its inner workings. The result is a rather repetitive and unorganized collection of conference papers and annual reports that nevertheless provides a rare glimpse into the obstacles such institutions face in a largely public system of higher education. The most important obstacle is the hegemony of the national university. A school like INTEC must take care not to challenge the national university's standing and must concentrate instead on providing those services that the national university cannot or is not ready to provide. As Latorre frequently points out, the statutes indicate that INTEC is a "complement" to the national university system. This role results in INTEC's emphasizing graduate and continuing education. Although enrollment figures are small at the graduate level, INTEC offers training in fields of particular relevance to the local economy, such as agricultural economics. It also renders services to industry and offers nondegree courses for professionals.

The aims Latorre outlines for INTEC are more grandiose than the statutes would suggest, however, and even statutes often exaggerate. In effect, Latorre defines the institution as a "Third World university" that not only is trying to solve the development problems of his

country, but is also attempting to provide an “integral” education for its population. This claim is made to underscore the legitimacy that Latorre ascribes to INTEC in relation to the public universities. In reality, Latorre himself acknowledges the desperateness of the problems of funding the institution, thus clearly suggesting that the priority in this case is to obtain contracts with the private sector. *Sobre educación superior* shows that legitimacy is also among the highest priorities.

Latorre’s emphasis on the stated aims of the institution leaves room for little, if any, information on his funding sources. For this data, the reader is advised to consult other publications.<sup>3</sup> Many other such fundamental matters are not emphasized, and those that are addressed lack cohesiveness. This work is not a scholarly text designed to provide an overview of Dominican higher education, nor even of INTEC, but rather a statement on the feasibility of private institutions in a largely public system of higher education. By Latorre’s account, INTEC has been successful in this respect, and it may well represent a significant Latin American trend for small, private, technically oriented universities and institutes. Such a trend could provide an alternative to a national university system that many view as extremely vulnerable to politicization.

Voices against the politicization of universities have been heard from the national universities themselves. Such is the case of the Universidad de Chile and the late Jorge Millas, whose *Idea y defensa de la universidad* contains his most representative articles on the subject from the last twenty years. Millas, a professor of philosophy at the Universidad de Chile and the Universidad Austral de Chile, held numerous administrative positions at both institutions and was a renowned philosopher who enjoyed an international reputation. Early in the 1960s, Millas utilized various public occasions and conferences to let it be known that in his judgment, student political activism was extremely pernicious to what he considered the “essence” of the university: its role as a haven for the cultivation and dissemination of reason. He viewed the politicization of the students and the support they engendered in many faculty members as a threat to the very survival of the university as an institution. As the six articles comprising the first part of the book demonstrate, Millas pointed out many of the most dangerous effects of politicization but dwelled little on its causes. He strongly disapproved of political activity in an institution that he believed was, or should have been, committed to the higher aims of reasoning. During this period, Jorge Millas not only questioned the legitimacy of bringing politics into the university but also put forth views opposing the calls for the democratization of the institution.<sup>4</sup>

The military coup of 1973, which was intent on eliminating all partisan political activity in the country, did not restore the tranquility

that Millas wanted for the university. To his dismay, what little peace was attained was only an artificial calm tightly controlled by the military regime. This policy also threatened the cultivation of reason that was basic to his understanding of the *raison d'être* of a university. Consequently, a reluctant and apolitical Millas became active in the very politics he disliked in order to confront publicly the military authorities' policy toward the universities. The five articles comprising the second part of *Idea y defensa de la universidad* attest to the courage and passion with which he proclaimed the dangers of military intervention in the universities, dangers that he came to realize were far worse than those inherent in the highly politicized university atmosphere of the pre-1973 period.

These views caused Millas to be dismissed from his administrative and teaching positions; they also made him a prominent figure in opposition circles. Yet his views on the proper role of the university remained remarkably unchanged from those he had expressed during the 1960s: the university should be an institution that for its own sake as well as that of society remains free from any sort of outside political pressures in order to carry out its mission.

Millas's aims for the university, however, were the product of a philosophical conception that fails to acknowledge the specific demands that the state has made on the institution since its inception. A public university, except in a few remarkable cases, is by definition at least partly accountable to the state. Millas not only challenged that relationship with the state, but he suggested that the university, by virtue of its cultivation of reason, should provide the norms for the rest of society to follow. Neither a democratic nor an authoritarian Chile could or would heed Millas's advice.

Although the dangers of political activity within the university became the theme of Millas's thinking on higher education, he failed to propose any means to manage these dangers. He idealistically believed that as a result of his proclaiming what he viewed as the proper role of students and professors, the university would come to its senses by itself. When not even the suppression of political activity under military rule helped the university attain what Millas thought best for it, he had no choice but to turn against the military regime. He eventually concluded that military rule of the universities was another form of politicization, perhaps the most dangerous confronted by the institution so far. The collection of essays in *Idea y defensa de la universidad* illustrates well the evolution of Millas's thinking on the university and its problems, thus providing an invaluable source for studying reactions to the National University's critical last two decades.

Managing political activity at universities in general and student activism in particular appears impossible if judged by Baltasar Dromun-

do's *Crónica de la autonomía universitaria de México*. Written fifty years after the events described, Dromundo's *Crónica* celebrates what he views as a major student accomplishment and attempts to set the record straight that it was exclusively a student accomplishment. Dromundo's major contention throughout the book contradicts the suggestion by the former president of Mexico, Emilio Portes Gil, that the autonomy law creating the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) in 1929 was a gracious grant to the students rather than a concession to their demands. Dromundo's rebuttal is based on the argument that university autonomy was a long-standing student demand in Mexico, preceding even the famed 1918 Córdoba reform movement in Argentina. Something more than historical record is at stake here. Given the tradition of student activism in Latin America since 1918, Dromundo interprets any criticism or doubts regarding its successes, particularly in relation to the 1929 movement, as not only an attack on the significance of the student movement as a whole but a threat to his own place in history. Because Baltasar Dromundo was a student leader at the time, he is clearly unwilling to have his position challenged. This kind of point of view, of which Dromundo is a good representative, suggests how significant such events are for some Latin American student leaders—so significant that not even a fifty-year period is sufficient to assuage the passions that fired the students into activism in the first place.

Dromundo's *Crónica* is valuable not because of its attempts at clarification but because it provides a vivid account of the dynamics and psychology of the student movement on the eve of the Mexican autonomy law of 1929. It provides neither a balanced nor a thorough account of the events it describes. But Dromundo does not attempt to be scholarly, and it is fair to say that he regards his book as a chronicle rather than a history. Still, one could certainly expect more from a writer who has the advantage of fifty years to reflect on the issues and who was as centrally involved as Dromundo. The book contains some excerpts from official documents and statements by student organizations that may prove valuable to the scholar of student politics. The book also contains in many sections full paragraphs listing the names of the participants in the student movement of the 1920s. Historically valuable as this information may be, it does not make for easy reading. A section of photographs at the end of the book compensates for this density with interesting captions on the events and participants in the student movement of 1929.

A good example of how scholarship can help clarify many of the issues so vehemently discussed by Dromundo is Donald Mabry's *The Mexican University and the State*. This study makes clear that there was



much more to autonomy than Dromundo would like us to believe. Confronted with a list of demands that could not be satisfied without compromising the credibility of the government, President Portes Gil granted autonomy to the university in order to channel student pressure away from the government. It was a “political masterstroke,” as Mabry terms it, because the government still retained a great deal of influence over the appointment of rectors and the budget. UNAM, as the National University came to be called, was the product of myriad political factors, of which student pressure was but one element.

Belying the broader implications of its title, Mabry’s book is a history of student-state conflicts in Mexico from 1910 to 1971, specifically between UNAM students and the state. He traces the rise of the student movement as a political force back to the Mexican Revolution and follows its development through decades of confrontation and accommodation with the state. The major landmarks of his history are duly documented, and they suggest that while the students amassed and retained a tremendous capacity to disrupt, the state developed a variety of means, some of them unorthodox, to keep campus unrest under control. The most significant of such means, which emerged during the 1940s, has been the government’s reliance on rectors to manage politicization at the university. Rectors who were unwilling or unable to heed the state’s demands for stability quickly found their government support withdrawn and their positions lost. Student activism has nonetheless proven impervious to complete control by either government or university officials and has shown itself capable of openly challenging the state, as was demonstrated by the tumultuous events of 1968.

Mabry reconstructs the major events of his history in detail, but he fails to address the broader issues raised by *The Mexican University and the State*. The organization of the book attests to his chronological, rather than conceptual, approach to the subject. Although a historian is certainly entitled to leave philosophical questions to others, evidence can be rendered meaningless without at least some indication of how it is to be interpreted. In discussing the period between 1910 and 1929, for instance, Mabry gives little indication as to why students moved beyond their narrow concerns on academic policy to an interest in national politics, a crucial issue for understanding the nature of student activism in Mexico and elsewhere. Similarly, other problems arise when certain concepts are used but are not defined. In effect, what does the “modus vivendi” that Mabry refers to say about the nature of the state? How is one to understand the “coexistence” between university and state beyond the reciprocal interest in avoiding confrontations between students and the government? How can the leading university collaborate with the state and still be autonomous? These questions are merely

raised, leaving the reader wishing that Mabry had taken at least a temporary leave from his historical labors to address these relevant issues more thoroughly.

In contrast, Daniel Levy's *University and Government in Mexico* is primarily devoted to discussing such questions. Of the books examined here, Levy's book has been the most widely reviewed because it challenges the popular conception of the Mexican regime as authoritarian. Considerable attention has consequently been paid to his findings in this regard, which were previewed in this journal.<sup>5</sup> Although his conclusions on the nature of the state are significant, they are only a corollary of his study of university autonomy. Public university autonomy is consequently the key research issue to be addressed. Its possible implications for understanding the state can be approached only after autonomy has been recognized as a research problem and subjected to empirical analysis.

To this end, Levy distinguishes (for the first time in the literature on Latin American higher education) three major components of autonomy in order to establish to what extent either the university or the government determines policy. The components he identifies and utilizes are the appointive, academic, and financial aspects of autonomy. University autonomy is to be defined by university control over each of these components. Conversely, regime control of these areas would support evidence of the authoritarian nature of the Mexican government. Levy's examination finds that the university has more control over each of the components than does the government. Making extensive use of statistics, government documents, and interviews with government and university officials, Levy concludes that the Mexican university, especially UNAM, enjoys a significant degree of autonomy. He suggests that the selection of rectors and the politics of the budgetary process are probably the areas where the state has the greatest degree of influence, but not enough to destroy autonomy. As Levy defines it, autonomy is not absolutely synonymous with independence but includes a measure of government control. He views such control as limited, by Latin American standards, and modest in comparison with other social and political areas where the Mexican state exerts far greater control. The latter he considers to be the basis for the scholarly view of Mexican authoritarianism. Levy's study nevertheless suggests that university autonomy is substantial and, more importantly, that it can be gauged.

Having gauged university autonomy by its three components, Levy proceeds to analyze the kind of university-government relations that allows this comparatively high degree of autonomy. Levy suggests that the university and government exist in a situation of mutual dependency, which has forced them to develop a *modus vivendi* whereby

the government supplies funds and allows the considerable autonomy of the university in exchange for legitimacy, stability, and educating the nation's needed professionals. Although this *modus vivendi* may break down at times, as happened during the events of 1968, Levy views such critical situations as extraordinary indeed. Hostility is quickly replaced by reconciliation, a concept that Levy thinks could be used to define the nature of the Mexican regime in the field of higher education and perhaps in other policy areas involving privileged constituencies.

This notable lack of a strong government policy for higher education ultimately works against the government. The regime foots the bill for much extravagant spending and makes little effort to introduce some form of government planning, or at least to regulate admissions policy. Indications of increasing governmental attempts at control in these areas, however, can be seen as a result of the recent economic crisis. But up to the time that Levy published his study in 1980, he found that the government was allowing student demand to regulate admissions and career choices, producing patterns that are detrimental to the manpower needs of the government. Levy suggests that while the regime looks at such developments with displeasure, it can do little to get its way with the university because it views the costs of intervention as too high. Levy observes that the state has tried to bypass UNAM by creating smaller institutions that are more responsive to its needs. That policy has not been too successful thus far, however, and the government, in keeping with its reconciliation posture, seeks accommodation with its leading public university. Such accommodation is often achieved by means of a series of "nondecisions," as Levy calls them, which allow both sides to steer away from confrontations. Such nondecisions include lack of planning, lack of manpower policy, and lack of admissions and tuition policy. While such results are not exactly desirable, both institutions achieve most of what they want: autonomy for the university and stability for the government.

Although rich in scope and research findings, *University and Government in Mexico* is rather short. The central theme of the work is thoroughly explored, but readers interested in Latin American higher education may wish that Levy's references to other countries had been expanded somewhat. Nevertheless, Levy's successful Mexican study promises much for the development of the field by showing how the study of autonomy can shed much light on Latin American universities and the kinds of regimes under which they function.

The volumes under review move away from an exclusive emphasis on the politicization of the Latin American university, yet they maintain a strong focus on the political role of the institution in Latin American society. The works by Dromundo and Mabry demonstrate that the politicization of the university still attracts significant attention. The re-

maining volumes, however, address many issues that seem to indicate the direction of future research. Few scholars doubt at this point the key role of the university in Latin American society as well as the paramount cultural importance of the institution. But the relationship of the university to the state, the distinction between public and private universities, and the contributions of higher education to regional development are just beginning to receive serious scholarly attention.<sup>6</sup> While such issues still fall under the rubric of politics, they open significant avenues for the study of Latin American higher education well beyond the problems of campus unrest.

As a group, the volumes considered here highlight many ramifications of the study of higher education in the region. Much can be learned about Latin American society, they seem to suggest, by focusing on various aspects of university life in the region. Millas's book tells a great deal about the nature of military rule from the standpoint of higher education policy in Chile. The same can be said about Levy's findings in connection with the Mexican regime. Somewhat more modestly, the Latorre piece raises significant questions about the status of small private universities in a largely public university system. The two anthologies illustrate well the impressive variety of issues related to Latin American higher education. There is, of course, much more to be said about individual systems of higher education and about the areas of research outlined above. But it is already clear that scholars are no longer willing to limit themselves to the sole emphasis on the politicization of the Latin American university.

#### NOTES

1. Another recent review essay examines some of the volumes reviewed here and dwells on the relationship between political and academic activities at Latin American universities. See Simon Schwartzman, "Politics and Academia in Latin American Universities," *Journal of Inter-American Studies and World Affairs* 25, no. 3 (Aug. 1983):416–23.
2. Some relevant publications by the Corporación de Promoción Universitaria are: *Hacia una conceptualización del fenómeno de los movimientos universitarios en América Latina*, edited by Patricio Dooner (1974); Ernesto Schiefelbein and Noel McGinn, *El sistema escolar y el problema del ingreso a la universidad* (1975); *Cooperación internacional y desarrollo*, edited by Iván Lavados (1978); *El rol de la ciencia en el desarrollo*, edited by Ataliva Amengual and Jaime Lavados (1978); and *Universidad contemporánea: antecedentes y experiencias internacionales*, edited by Iván Lavados (1980).
3. For budget data, see Rafael Marion-Landais, *INTEC: primera década (1972–1982)*, *Documentos* 7 (Santo Domingo: Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo, 1982).
4. I have discussed Millas's views vis-à-vis others in relation to the aims of Chilean higher education in "Philosophy and University Reform at the University of Chile: 1842–1973," *LARR* 19, no. 1 (1984):57–86.
5. See his "University Autonomy in Mexico: Implications for Regime Authoritarianism," *LARR* 14, no. 3 (1976):129–52.
6. In addition to some of the volumes reviewed here, the following publications concentrate on these issues: Centro de Documentación Legislativa Universitaria, *Planea-*

*ción y regulación en la educación superior* (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1981), which focuses on higher education planning and coordination in Mexico. Daniel Levy has published a major exploratory essay on the distinction between private and public universities, "Universidad privada y universidad pública: definiciones, metodologías y estudios de casos," in *Universidad contemporánea*, edited by Iván Lavados, pp. 115–52. On the question of regional development and scientific research, two books deserve mention: OEA/CINDA, *Universidad, gobierno y empresa regionales* (Santiago de Chile: Talleres de CPU, 1981); and *Universidades e Instituições Científicas no Rio de Janeiro*, edited by Simon Schwartzman, Coleção Estudos de Política Científica e Tecnológica no. 6 (Brasília: Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico, 1982).