

Last but not least, I would note that the program has also served to bring forth a myriad of new ideas and new techniques focused on the educational problems presented by ill-prepared but motivated students and on the economic and administrative problems indigenous to the small, underdeveloped college.

To be sure, all of these are still in the testing stage, but it is exceedingly doubtful, in the absence of title III funds and concepts, that the energies of the staffs of either the developing or so-called coordinating institutions would have been marshaled so quickly, so efficiently, or in the same degree.

Looking specifically at the experience to date, I would estimate that despite the minimum funds appropriated, from one-quarter to one-fifth of all of the Nation's 4-year colleges, in addition to the numerous junior colleges, have been touched by the act. More than 60 percent of the predominantly Negro colleges have received funds.

Indeed, true to the original thrust of the legislation, more than half of the funds available to 4-year colleges have gone to the predominantly Negro schools.

Finally, of the approximately 60 grants of more than \$100,000 in fiscal 1967, 51 have been made to such institutions.

This is all to the good. But what lessons have we learned, and how best might we now proceed?

Given the rapidly rising costs of higher education, I start with the assumption that not only the development and maintenance of quality education but the very viability of many of our smaller 4-year colleges and universities are ultimately dependent on direct State and Federal financial support.

Title III is the first step in this direction, and I therefore applaud it. I do not wish to waste your time on the philosophical issues connected with Federal aid to higher education—the specter of Federal control—because I believe that men, not programs, are the final determinants in the concrete instance.

The only relevant concern is commitment to the basic function of our institutions of higher education as centers of independent thought. I would like, however, to remark on a number of aspects of the philosophy and administration of title III which should be considered in the development of any amendments to the act.

I believe that title III should not be broadened out as a single title to bear the major burden of direct Federal aid to higher education. Rather, it should be more realistically and actively oriented to its original concept: cooperative programs which do, in fact, draw on the resources of our best schools or involve clear-cut economies and upgradings of existing educational programs among consortia of developing institutions.

I do not believe there is much profit in the blind leading the blind as far as new programs are concerned.

Correlatively, it seems to me that the Office of Education should immediately undertake an analysis of the self-defined needs and problems of the smaller developing institutions as these have been revealed by the proposals for funding under title III.

In fact, an increasing number of these proposals have involved no real cooperative plans or any element of drawing on the resources