

Among the former will be the possibility of raising the general level of academic standards, of bringing adequate support to our greatest national centers of learning so that they may hold their positions of international leadership, of providing access to higher education for many thousands of talented young people who would otherwise not have it, of enabling our colleges and universities to serve the continuing education needs of our citizens of all ages, of meeting our full national manpower needs, for example in the health field, and, finally, of enabling our institutions to play a full part in meeting the nation's international responsibilities.

Among the dangers in the new era the greatest, of course, will be the possibility of a decline in institutional autonomy and institutional initiative. To some degree this may happen. On the other hand, it would be painting a rosy picture indeed to suggest that either autonomy or initiative have prospered universally under our past system. For many institutions better funding within the context of a set of national policies may actually offer new hopes for independence and experimentation.

A paradox of the new age, as we seek a way to reconcile order and independence, or if you will, direction and freedom, within a set of agreed national policies, will be that in their relationships with the federal government our colleges and universities will have to be subject to both a less restrictive and a more restrictive concept of public accountability for the large sums of public money they will be spending. On the one hand, if they are not to slip gradually into the status of virtually government controlled institutions, appendages, as it were, of Washington bureaucracies, they will have to be freed of many of the federal accounting and report-in procedures which they now endure procedures which are on the whole more restrictive than anything suffered at the hands of state governments and which are demeaning, many university people feel, because they amount in effect to punching a time clock.

On the other hand, the colleges and universities, as their *quid pro quo* for greatly increased federal support and the greater degree of trust placed in them, will have a strong obligation to improve their efficiency and increase their productivity. The very use of the words seems antithetical to the nature of the academic enterprise and is bound to raise the hackles of academic man. But there *will* be possibilities for keeping costs down without sacrificing quality, and the acceptance of massive federal support will entail a recognition of this responsibility.

A special problem as we develop a national policy framework, and as the federal financial role becomes ever larger, will be how to prevent a rapid drying up of state and local contributions and private gifts. Will other sources want to put money into institutions which increasingly are becoming the responsibility of a dominant central funding source? Initially, I believe, it should be possible to devise forms of federal support which require a maintenance of previous effort by other sources. Over the longer range, however—and here is a really heretical thought—I would guess that the financing of higher education will, like the support of agriculture, more and more come to be regarded as almost exclusively a federal responsibility, freeing state and local funds for other pressing purposes and freeing private funds, either for special uses in higher education, such as experimentation or the provision of unusual amenities, or for other fields, such as the arts and recreation. This, however, may lie a long way in the future, perhaps around the year 2000, of which we have been hearing so much lately.

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE ISSUE NOT CENTRAL

You must be wondering why I have said almost nothing about how the development of a set of national policies may affect the respective interests of public and private institutions. I do not, in fact, regard the public/private issue as being in itself of central importance. The central issue is the one I have touched on: how can we build a coherent set of national policies for higher education while at the same time preserving as much as possible of the freedom of all institutions, public and private. The question of public versus private is, I would submit, a side issue, and those who allow themselves to be diverted by it are going to miss the main issue and their chance to have a say in its resolution.

It is conceivable that private higher education as we have known it in the past will gradually disappear and we will end up with a system in which some institutions historically have their roots in the government sector and some in the private sector, but all are, in a general sense of the word, public institutions,