

in the fact that the alternative in achieving national policy through education lies in a centralized ministry of education along the lines of the European model. Federal aid, especially of a project or *ad hoc* nature, is conducive to the preservation of diversity and personal initiative responsive at the local level to the will of the people, while at the same time achieving the national purpose through the democratic processes of choice and the decision to participate or not to participate. The central ministry, on the other hand, has often resulted in a monolithic educational structure moulded to the national goal with little or no direct response to the people. A recognition of federal support for education as an instrument of national policy should result in a strong reaffirmation of the basic principle underlying it as both necessary to and compatible with the democratic nature of American society. At the same time, it should provide the philosophical framework within which guidelines can be constructed for evaluating both policies and programs.

In general, there has been a strong tendency in the United States with certain notable exceptions, to avoid *permanent* programs of federal aid to education. This caution stems from an assumption that federal support will result in the long range in federal control that will be restrictive upon academic freedom, experimentation, innovation, and local initiative. Experience with the Smith-Hughes Act and similar programs indicates at least partial justification for such an assumption. Therefore, great care should be used, in those instances where programs of a relatively permanent nature appear to be indicated, to build into such programs careful and effective safeguards for those elements of diversity and initiative that lend strength to American education. It may well be these very elements that have enabled education in this country to achieve those successes that are in such spectacular contrast with education elsewhere in the world.

The need for federal support for higher education should, therefore, be predicated upon the national goal. Matters that bear upon that support, such as inequities in educational opportunity, projections of expected enrollments and facility needs, teacher preparation, and relatively untapped pockets of largely unrealized potentialities, have been adequately reported elsewhere and need not be dwelt upon here. There is widespread agreement that national maturity in higher education will require increased and continued federal support beyond the capabilities of the states and the individual institutions.

The value of higher education and its relation to national purpose is evident in the education given to an increasing number of Americans, in the increase of scholarship and research, in the expansion of the use made of knowledge in business and government and other areas of society, in the moves to consolidate new areas of information and activity and to relate them to new trades and professions sharpened and sanctioned by introduction into college and university programs, and in attempts to apply its own tools and insights to its own domain. The result is increased education in knowledge and sensibility, expansion of knowledge, expansion of meaningful services to society, and preparation of new practitioners for our increasingly upgraded manpower needs, as well as increased tax benefits from graduates whose incomes without the benefit of college or university education might not be as large.

The national outreach of higher education is evident not only from the recognition being extended by federal legislation but also from the several ways in which most of the major universities and colleges already have a "national" character, in the diverse backgrounds of their faculties and students, and in the way their graduates go into all corners of the nation, and indeed of the world.

The national service provided by higher education is indicated by the resources now available in the populations of institutions of higher education, in the resources available in the present and emerging facilities of colleges and universities, in the products and activities, in tasks performed such as the international undertakings of Southern Illinois University, in the effect upon the educational level of the American people, and in the importance of the principle that the society which does not value trained intelligence is doomed.

Federal support of higher education is an essential and valuable instrument of national policy. It is itself highly diverse in its many aspects. And, even though institutions may feel increasingly compelled to accept it in order to meet the challenges placed upon them by the complex and changing larger society or simply in order to meet their "competition," their choice to participate or not, or to selectively participate, is and must continue to be preserved.