Abstract: The Student Agreement Program is one of the oldest cooperative actions carried out by Brazil. Despite the longevity and breadth of it, there are no studies that examine the results of this program and clearly assess its relevance in the set of cooperative actions of the Brazilian government, or address the issue aiming to link it with the actions of foreign policy. This work lies in two activities: a) enlarge the history of this program creation; b) collect data on the number of students involved in it during the first 2000s decade – focusing specially on members of the Community of Portuguese Language Countries – as well as on its origin, training and returned to practice in their respective countries. It is expected to have a broader view on the specific operating conditions of the program (oscillations, setbacks, extensions) and do an initial assessment of effective collaboration that has been offered by Brazilian government through this initiative. The issue will be considered as an integral part of Brazilian foreign policy and its content of cooperation for development, taking into account the fact that Brazil has a long history of cooperation with different countries and international organizations.
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Introduction

The Student Agreement Program is one of the oldest cooperative actions taken by Brazil and is still ongoing. Despite the breadth and longevity of the program, there are no studies that examine their results and clearly assess its relevance in the set of cooperation activities promoted by the Brazilian government. Likewise, there is no research that addresses the theme in order to link it to the actions of foreign policy.

---
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This paper presents partial results of this ongoing research that aims to help fill the gaps of knowledge about a specific area of Brazilian cooperation. The proposed research lies in three activities: a) deepening the history of the program; b) collect data on the number and origin of students involved in the program during the specified period; c) check what careers have received and formed more students. The items b and c will only be completed after an intensive documentary research involving Foreign Ministry, MEC and all the participants HEIs. Thus, it is expected to have a wide view on its specific operating conditions (oscillations, retreats, extensions) and an initial approach in the effective collaboration that is being offered by the Brazilian government through this program. In this paper, we will discuss only the history of the Student Agreement Program establishing the points that bind to the Brazilian Foreign Policy and pointing out the inherent difficulties in the development of this type of research.

Since this is ongoing study, we do not intend at this time to exhaust the topic, but mainly to analyze results obtained and equip those interested in international cooperation and Brazilian Foreign Policy to encourage the expansion of the debate.

**The Brazilian Cooperation: general remarks**

Brazil has a long history of cooperation with countries and international organizations. Although there are different views on the meaning of the term *international cooperation*, the Brazilian government considers cooperation as a way to promote development through the exchange of information and experience in various fields of social and economic life of the countries receiving this type of assistance. It is also expected greater proximity between Brazil and its partners.

For the purposes of this paper we will use the idea of cooperation among developing countries\(^2\) (also called South-South cooperation), seen as a mechanism to promote internal development of receiving countries in a horizontal way, i.e., without restrictions or taxes related to differences in power between donors and recipients. The Economic Commission for Latin America (CEPAL, 2010) believes that South-South

\(^2\) There is little consensus regarding the most appropriate terminology to describe the different types of cooperative activities. This discussion, unfortunately, has no place in a work like this. However, we refer to the definition presented in Lopes (2008, p.21-25), which points the differences between *foreign aid* and *international technical cooperation*, considered by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and by the Brazilian government as a partnership between governments of developing countries to exchange and disseminate successful experiences for improving socioeconomic conditions of the countries involved.
cooperation has some advantages over the various aid modalities between developed and developing countries by providing:

i) ability to generate greater sense of ownership in the recipient country; ii) allows initiatives closer to the conditions and needs of the countries related; iii) allows greater sensitivity in specific contexts, the knowledge of reality and problems of development; iv) generates a 'double dividend', to encourage technical and institutional capacities of the parties involved; v) allows greater flexibility and adaptation to the changing conditions of the beneficiary; vi) faster in execution, not to be linked to conditions or obligations related purchases; vii) may occur at lower costs; viii) often intended to countries 'abandoned' by traditional donors; and ix) tends to preserve the diversity and cultural identity of the host country.

The Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC) was created in 1987 with the goal to "negotiate, coordinate, implement and monitor programs and projects of technical cooperation in Brazil, run on the basis of agreements signed by Brazil with other countries and international organizations\(^3\)\(^4\), since the Brazilian cooperation actions are carried out by different bodies attached to the federal government and state governments. Within the ABC, the actions of cooperation in health, agriculture, mining, education, energy and the environment are part of the technical cooperation for development, understood as

an important development tool, helping a country to promote structural changes in social and economic fields, including the performance of the State, through institutional strengthening actions. The programs implemented under its auspices permit transfer or share knowledge, experiences and best-practices through the development of human and institutional capacities, in order to achieve a qualitative leap of enduring character\(^4\).

\(^3\) [http://www.abc.gov.br/abc_por/webforms/interna.aspx?secao_id=133&Idioma_id=1](http://www.abc.gov.br/abc_por/webforms/interna.aspx?secao_id=133&Idioma_id=1) (last accessed on 10/03/2012).

Technical cooperation is then presented as an important element in the context of Brazilian foreign policy, as a way of putting into practice the principle of "partnership for development" in its present guidelines, sharing technical knowledge bases noncommercial and thereby to promote social justice among recipient populations and strengthening the ties between Brazil and its partners.

The Student Agreement Program (PEC) is one of the actions taken by the Brazilian government in the context of technical cooperation and is one of the oldest cooperative actions that keeps running. Moreover, it is also one of the most important cooperative actions of the Brazilian government because not only its longevity (the program is active continuously for nearly 50 years), but also its scope. With the number of countries that comprise it, almost all regions considered priority for Brazilian foreign policy are achieved: South America, Haiti, Latin America and the Caribbean, African countries (especially Palops\textsuperscript{5}) and countries of the CPLP\textsuperscript{6} (especially East Timor).

We further will make a brief history of the program in order to establish its connection with the development process of Brazilian foreign policy.

The history of the Student Agreement Program

The Student Agreement Program has two modes, one focused on undergraduate courses (PEC-G) managed jointly by DCE-MRE\textsuperscript{7} and SESu-MEC\textsuperscript{8}, and another focused on postgraduate courses (PEC-PG) in partnership between the DCE-MRE, CAPES\textsuperscript{9} and CNPq\textsuperscript{10}. For textual clarity, we will treat them separately.

Started in 1965, the PEC-G now involves countries in Africa, Latin America (the original target of the program) and Asia (Thailand, China and East Timor, recently included), and allows member countries to send students to attend Brazilian undergraduate institutions. The express purpose is to give opportunity for the training of human resources in various professional fields, thus contributing to the internal development of the countries.

The program is maintained by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs through the Division of Educational Themes (DCE-SRM) and by the Ministry of Education through

\textsuperscript{5} African Countries of Portuguese Official Language.
\textsuperscript{6} Community of Portuguese Language Countries.
\textsuperscript{7} Division of Educational Issues – Foreign Relations Ministry.
\textsuperscript{8} Higher Education Secretary-Ministry of Education.
\textsuperscript{9} Coordination of Improvement of Higher Education Personnel.
\textsuperscript{10} National Counsel of Technological and Scientific Development.
the Department of Higher Education (SESu-MEC), which perform the selection of candidates and provide their allocation in the participants Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Currently, 90 public and private Brazilian HEIs receive students of PEC, covering all regions of the country and offering undergraduate degrees in a variety of careers.

For MRE, the PEC-G was the way found by the Brazilian government to support the growing number of students from other countries resulting from

"the growth of the number of foreigners in Brazil in the 1960s and the consequences that this fact brought to the internal regulation of their status in Brazil, the need to unify the conditions of the student exchange, and the ensuring of similar treatment to students by universities."

Not coincidentally, it was precisely during the 1960s the Brazilian government adopted a guideline of more open foreign policy for Latin America and began his approach movement with African countries in the process of decolonization. Although Brazil's performance has been restricted in the first moment of the African independence movements (Bueno & Cervo, 2002), the Independent Foreign Policy, sponsored by governments Quadros and Goulart, emphasized the strengthening of South-South relations in general and with the new Africans countries in particular (Quadros, apud Bueno & Cervo: 301) and pointed the Brazilian government's willingness to recognize the independence of African nations and to support their claims in international forums on the issue of development (MRE, 1961). In addition to changes in trade policy and diplomacy (the most higher aspects of Brazilian international politics), the adoption of practical measures to insert foreign students in Brazil is part of this approaching movement. The first protocol of PEC-G in 1965 – and its reforms already in 1967 and 1973 – reflects Brazil's decision to expand its international operations space by offering cooperation, in the case, educational cooperation, to contribute to the development of poorer or newly decolonized countries (Leschini, 2008).

Throughout the 1970s, the Brazilian government has extended its relationship with the African continent prioritizing the growth of trade relations promoted by the travels of Chancellor Mario Gibson Barbosa to ten African countries (Ivory Coast,
Ghana, Togo, Dahomey, Nigeria, Cameroon, Gabon, Zaire, Senegal and Kenya) with which were signed many technical cooperation, scientific and cultural treaties, making room for the participation of students from these countries in PEC-G (Rodrigues, 1982).

Along the decades of 1970, 1980 and 1990, the program was expanded with the participation of an increasing number of countries, while the Protocol that regulates it has also been renovated, reaching its current version, published in 1998 (SESu, 1999). The modifications of the protocol are limited to the bureaucratic organization of the program, without achieving its central goal of forming frameworks that promote development in their countries of origin.

In the same period, there were a number of important changes in the orientation of Brazilian foreign policy, resulting from internal transformations of political and economic character. For example, if during the 1970 Brazilian international politics was marked by the expansion of political and economic partnerships, in the next decade begins a retraction of this performance due to the lack of resources caused by the acute economic crisis caused by external debts. Already in the 1990s, the policy advocated by the Collor government pushed Brazil away from its former African economic partners and made the country to abandon the old attitude of rapprochement with the so-called Third World (Leschini, op. Cit.).

So far, it is not possible to state categorically the effects caused by reorientation of Brazilian foreign policy, since no data are compiled in sufficient quantity. However, it is possible to observe a large variation in the number of vacancies offered in some of the major Brazilian universities participants, such as Unicamp (University of Campinas in São Paulo) and UFSC (Federal University of Santa Catarina), participating in PEC-G respectively since 1973 and 1975 and underwent a significant reduction in admission of students PEC-G during the 1990s, although the number of vacancies offered remained the same (Rodrigues, 2008; Kuhnen, 2008).

A particular mode: PEC-PG

The Student Agreement Program Post Graduate was officially created in 1981 in the same way that is applied to the undergraduate mode, in the wake of the consolidation of graduate courses in Brazil, encouraged by CNPq and CAPES (Ferreira & Moreira, 2001). Keeping consistency with its purpose of offering cooperation, the expansion of PEC to the level of postgraduate studies represented an important initiative
in Brazil's performance on the international stage that had begun to enter a stage of withdrawal for the reasons previously treated (Mourão, 1997).

The objectives of this program are not different from those of the PEC-G, since that also aims to train human resources that can contribute to the development of their countries of origin. However, those keep specific procedures from the selection of students to their maintenance in Brazilian HEIs because of the very nature of the postgraduate courses.

It is not our objective here to deepen in the development of the program between its creation and the period specified at the beginning of the text because of the lack of consolidated information on the entry and exit of foreign students since 1982 (the year he actually entered into force, with the entry of the first selected). Even so, it is noteworthy that in the specific case of the PEC-PG we must need to conduct the survey data on the passage of the foreign students through universities, since – more than in PEC-G – the information about these students are fragmented among different agencies that do not maintain systematized files on this topic.

The Program between 2000 and 2010

Made this deployment and recovery of the trajectory of PEC, we return here to discuss its current operation. The choice of the period of this paper was done according to the availability of consolidated data on the inflow of foreign students in Brazilian HEIs, but already pointed the need to expand this survey through primary research in receiver HEIs and the Foreign Ministry.

The numbers of PEC are interesting. From 2000 to 2010, 6149 students were received by Brazilian HEIs to attend undergraduate courses under the program, according to the DCE-MRE. In the same period, 1510 students of different nationalities enrolled in master and doctorate. In the latest report from ABC about Brazilian cooperation for development (IPEA/ABC, 2010), the PEC is among the most significant initiatives of this scope.

In a survey conducted by IPEA and ABC (op.cit, 2010), the volume of resources for granting scholarships to foreigners totaled R$ 284.07 million (almost 10% of all intended technical cooperation actions) in the period 2005-2009. However, there is not a clear distinction between the specific budget for the Program and other details.
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making it difficult to properly assess its importance in the context of Brazilian cooperation, since they are grouped funding for undergraduate, graduate, various training activities of technical and professional development, and administrative costs.

In the same survey, the MEC resources toward this Program reached 20% of total spending on grants to foreigners (U.S. $57,636,000) in the same period. However, the main cost here is the payment of tuition fees at courses frequented by foreign students in private HEIs that receive the transfer of MEC. Most students joined HEIs in the municipalities, states or federal system (that are free of tuition), and have no right to get financial aid, for example. Part of foreigner students obligations under the Protocol is provide guarantees of financial capacity before presenting themselves for admission in Brazilian HEIs (SESu, 1999).

Despite the apparent recognition of the importance of this program in several instances of the Brazilian government involved in their management, there is no more comprehensive studies on its development. In the MRE and MEC portals information on it are quite scarce and only recently has been published data on the origin and quantity of incoming students. By the way, the information available at the MEC site is restricted strictly about bureaucratic procedures to be followed by applicants.

According to data provided by DCE-MRE, from the set of students who entered via PEC-G between 2000 and 2010, most of them come from African countries, most of Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau and Angola, respectively, as can be seen in the table below:\(^{13}\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) The table above and all of the following were prepared by DCE-MRE and are available in http://www.dce.mre.gov.br/divisao.html.
In the case of Africa, there is a large influx of students from countries of the CPLP, which reflects the priority given by the Brazilian foreign policy to this group, especially in the last decade. Proportionally, Cape Verde is the country that sends more students abroad, reflecting the country's large emigration flow, constant from the period of colonization (apud Ferreira Costa, 2001). However, some non-Lusophone countries stand out with significant contingent: Democratic Republic of Congo, Nigeria, Kenya and Ghana.

These countries differ from others by having a university structure much more numerous and diverse. For example, Ghana has 13 public universities, 10 polytechnics, schools of business, nursing, education and many private institutions, totaling 138 institutions of higher education. In the other hand, Angola has just one public and 15 private HEIs.

Historical factors such as the different practices of colonizers (higher education was established in Angola in 1962, under the midst of the Independence War, while some of the English colonies already had institutes of higher education to the native population), the recent consolidation of their respective states and the insufficiency of higher education institutions that meet national needs can be added. We believe that such oscillations, albeit small, could also be better understood by comparing the development of Brazil's foreign policy actions and their effects on the program.

Next comes the students from Latin America, whose main representatives are Paraguay, Ecuador and Peru:

---

Among the Latin American countries, the influx of students to the PEC-G is very low despite their geographical proximity and the fact that the region be included as a priority in all of the shares of Brazilian cooperation. Even despite the constant Brazilian government’s search for catching up with the neighboring region since the 1950s, the educational cooperation at the undergraduate level does not have the same appeal observed among African candidates. Students from countries with education systems more consolidated as Argentina, Colombia and Chile have little interest in Brazilian HEIs. Even the regional champion, Paraguay, sent 5 times fewer students than Cape Verde.
Another factor should be highlighted: in accordance with the Protocol governing the PEC-G, participating universities should offer places on courses that only work in daytime or full time. In addition, also states that students applying the Program must prove economic capacity to pay for their expenses during the study period. These two requirements act as a major barrier for students from countries theoretically poorer than Brazil. Besides the cost of living is higher in large cities, there are also large expenditures with books and materials of some specific courses, such as “white kit\(^{15}\)” (Fonseca, 2009). The offer of places on daylight or full-time courses prevents that the student can work in Brazil as part under the assumption that it must devote himself entirely to study. Analysts of different areas have pointed out these facts as negative in the insertion of foreign students in Brazil – especially Africans – impacting Brazilian cooperation efficiency\(^{16}\).

Although the issues above have been discussed for a long time, it was only in 2003 that the Ministry of Education established the Promisaes\(^{17}\) (Milton Santos Project Access to Higher Education) in the first term of former President Lula. According to Promisaes, the Brazilian government offers scholarships worth a minimum wage for the current students of PEC-G, so they can pay their expenses in Brazil. Even more recently, the President Dilma Rousseff issued a decree on the PEC-G\(^{18}\), which increased the provisions of the Protocol and opened the possibility that HEIs can offer different types of aid for students in the Program. This is important because with the present Protocol text Brazilian HEIs not felt obliged to include foreign students in their mechanisms of student assistance as they should have the means of survival before coming to Brazil.

The implementation of the program involves so many other problems for students\(^{19}\):

\(^{15}\)“White kit” is the set of materials required for individual use in courses such as dentistry, ranging from uniform to surgical instruments.

\(^{16}\)On this issue, see the works of Fonseca (op. cit), Liberato (2012) and Desiderio (2005).

\(^{17}\)http://portal.mec.gov.br/sesu/arquivos/pdf/Promisaes/decreto4875.pdf


http://www1.pucminas.br/imagedb/documento/DOC_DSC_NOME_ARQUI20061212165704.PDF
a) Lack of access in their countries, to appropriate information on PEC-G, the HEIs (courses offered, professional profile) and socio-economic reality of each region;
b) Uncertainty on the part of officials of diplomatic missions of Brazil, in providing information on the clauses of the Protocol at the time of registration;
c) Lack of manuals in other languages;
d) Lack of a support scheme to welcome them on arrival;
e) Difficulties for rental properties and opening bank accounts;
f) Difficulties in meshing with the university community;
g) Slowness in the renewal process of obtaining a visa and RNE\textsuperscript{20};
h) Prohibition on obtaining new qualification, at night courses, concomitant to the original course and qualification;
i) Lack of access to Portuguese classes parallel to undergraduate courses;

Not surprisingly the lack of information on PEC-G figure as the first problem noted by students. Without adequate information about participant HEIs and careers offered, students have no parameters to choose a career. Similarly, without knowledge of the geography of Brazil, students may be selected for climates very different from those to which they are accustomed or even to regions where there is no host network formed by students previously selected, which further complicates the socialization of foreigners.

Beyond the issues of operational nature, students also report having experienced racism in the recipient institutions, which, according Liberato (2012, p. 126), frustrated their initial expectations of finding more acceptance in Brazil because of the ease of linguistic and cultural diversity resulting from the strong influence of African cultures in the country. According to the same author

Those who were in Brazil say however that this racism is not related to the fact that they are foreigners, who, according to those interviewed, "until we were better treated when they knew we were from another country, especially Portuguese" (G3 - female, 22 years old, licensed in Psychology). But because they are "black" because "the black [people] in Brazil is almost invisible" (G2 - male, 34 years old, graduated in Communication).

\textsuperscript{20} Document for Foreigner Identification.
The coordinators of the PEC-G in participant HEIs also reported their difficulties:

a) Lack of financial resources for student maintenance;

b) Incompatibility of the student’s high school curriculum with the college degree desired;

c) Problems of communication between students and teachers, due to linguistic and cultural differences;

d) Prohibition of supply of places in courses exclusively nocturnal;

e) Inflexibility of the Protocol with respect to applications for change of career and transfer (change of HEI in the same state etc.).

f) Low visibility of the Program in some institutions;

g) Not meeting deadlines, by students, for enrollment in HEIs;

h) Lack of rapport between the students themselves and the academic community.

For participating public HEIs, students of PEC-G represent additional financial costs, since pressing their student assistance programs. Moreover, the misunderstanding of the nature of the program by administrators, teachers and students hinders the connectedness of foreigners, leading to problems of low achievement and retention in subjects taken.

However, this situation is reversed when we look at the other part of the program, aimed at graduate students.

As we have previously dealt, the PEC-PG is the result of a partnership between the DCE-MRE, CAPES and CNPq, aiming to train professionals able to contribute to the development of their countries, along the lines of program for graduation. The PEC-PG also has a more complex management because it involves three institutions (in addition to the receptor HEIs), each responsible for coordinating and funding of specific activities of the program. Students are selected from research projects and they receive grants equal to those of Brazilian students of masters and doctorate for 24 or 48 months, and have a commitment to return to their home countries at the end of the period. In this mode, the Brazilian government pays the tuition at the HEI where the foreign students are enrolled (in the case of a private participant), pays the master or doctorate scholarship and the plane ticket to the students come and return to their countries at the end of the course.
The survey of ABC and IPEA (op.cit) shows that the PEC-PG receives 40% of CAPES resources to scholarships for foreigners, while 5% of CNPQ amount to scholarships are spent with this program. In the IPEA assessing, activities such as PEC-PG contribute to the expansion of scientific and technological competence of the participating countries. "The intensification of these activities can be demonstrated by the diversity of methods for fostering scientific production, ranging from actions of welfare assistance to cooperative activities in partnerships increasingly reciprocal" (op. cit.).

Currently, 55 countries are part of the PEC-PG21, 23 from Africa, 26 from Latin America and 6 in Asia. But, unlike the previous case, there is an inversion between Africa and Latin America with regard to participation. In the case of PEC-PG, students from the Americas are the majority of participants, occupying 2/3 of annual vacancies, while Africans and Asians are with others. Among Latin Americans, Colombians, Peruvians and Argentinians are the most numerous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

21 PEC-PG handbook.
It is noticed that if the graduation was less attractive to students from the region, the same does not apply to the graduate studies, in which the Latin American presence is much higher. One of the factors related to this increased demand concerns the Brazilian educational model, which has a large number of master and doctoral courses free of tuitions and offer scholarships for maintaining student during the course period. Moreover, during the government of former President Lula were signed several cooperation agreements that facilitated cultural exchanges of researchers between countries, and promoted the expansion of the PEC-PG\textsuperscript{22} in the region.

About evaluating of African participation in PEC-PG, see the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African Students selected by PEC-PG 2001-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. R. of Congo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{22} See, for example, the case of Honduras, whose agreement of cultural and scientific cooperation dates back to 1963, but that it was practically disabled: "Brazil and Honduras resume partnership in education" http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2199&catid=221.
In the case of African students, there is the case of Mozambique, which has specific agreements with Brazil for the training of teachers and doctors through the University Eduardo Mondlane. Then one sees Cape Verde, consistent with the mobility seen in the degree program, and finally Angola and Guinea-Bissau. Observe that as in the previous case the Portuguese-speaking African countries stand in relation to others. In this particular case, the demand for post-graduate courses does not seem to attract much attention even in countries with which Brazil has signed or renewed cultural cooperation agreements such as Cameroon, Ghana and Nigeria, for example.

The PEC in Brazilian Foreign Policy

Unfortunately, there are no studies that relate the PEC to the set of Brazilian foreign policy in Africa, Latin America or Asia. Part of the research objectives whose initial results is being disclosed now is to organize the data on the program, in particular, to establish a series of incoming and outgoing students of the program in the two modalities, so it will be possible to have a clearer view of its scope. The only way to know if the program is successful or not in its main objective to form higher-level personnel for other developing countries is when we are able to know how many professionals effectively graduated in Brazilian institutions and how many of them returned to their countries to practice their professions or act on functions that may influence the development process internally.

A second ambition related to this research is to verify the deeper meaning of the Brazilian cooperation actions. Can we consider that PEC functions as a type of vehicle to promote Brazilian soft power? Even though IPEA and ABC reports usually refer to PEC as cooperation for development, some Brazilian foreign policy documents refer to it as a program of cultural diffusion, which implies in completely different objectives.

---

23 "President Lula signed agreements for education in Africa”

24 Joseph Nye (2004) defines soft power as the ability to get others to want the outcomes you expect.
Historically, it has been observed how the educational process influenced the formation of political leaders who made the independence in America and Africa (Appiah, 1997). In the case of men like Kwame Nkruma and Simon Bolivar, the European education has been an important element in shaping their national construction projects, so, we can think about how this kind of cooperation can shape personnel sympathetic to the Brazilian view of the international relations, from there arises the question about the possibility of analyzing the PEC from this perspective.

Although the idea itself of soft power is not consistent with the principles expressed in Brazilian foreign policy of promoting relations increasingly less unequal on the international arena, as the concept presupposes necessarily unequal power relationship between two actors, the prestige gain should be considered.

Finally, given the two previous objectives, arises the question about the most appropriate methodological approach for the development of the issue in question and the sizing of the results of the PEC. Assuming that this program aims the internal development of the recipient countries, it is necessary to create a mechanism (or a combination of) to measure its effects. Are Angola, Cape Verde or Mozambique more developed socially or economically now, after been receiving the Brazilian cooperation for so many years?

**Final Remarks**

Brazilian actions in the South-South cooperation are showing a trend of expansion and diversification, which fortunately is not lost to researchers since the study of the principles and mechanisms of Brazilian cooperation are increasingly in numerous journals. However, actions such as the Student Agreement Program and their links with the Brazilian foreign policy are still virtually unknown.

The PEC can be evaluated by a strictly bureaucratic bias from the statements expressed in the documents of the MRE on your goals. Some passages sound naive, effusively to highlight the selfless character of Brazilian stocks cooperation. However, we believe that in the worst case such actions promote the prestige Brazilian with a group that shape or form the intellectual elite and potentially policy in recipient countries.

This study was an attempt to contribute to the debate on this aspect. By its description, it is expected raise questions that cause a deeper study of its meaning, successes and mistakes.
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