

1963

Junior College
Group Studies
Debt, Levies

FOR SOUTHWEST
College or Branch?
Both Considered

Brainerd Buys
Future Junior
College Site

Colleges
Plan Faces
Difficulty

Bill Asks
JC Board

AS EDUCATION DEMANDS GROW
Bills for Junior Colleges Face Battle

FOR 'U'

ARCHIVES
MOORHEAD STATE COLLEGE LIBRARY
MOORHEAD, MINNESOTA

Junior Colleges
Might Abate 'Flood'

**The Need For A Joint Long Range Plan
For Higher Education In Minnesota**
By
Dr. JOHN J. NEUMAIER, President
Moorhead State College
Moorhead, Minnesota

'U' Regents
Cite Junior
College Study

LEGISLATORS BIDE TIME ON BILL

Fight Sure on Mankato State
Switch to Engineering School

Bill Asks
Boost in
JC Aid

LEGISLATURE TOLD
Teaching Load Too
Heavy in Colleges

Junior College Aid
Bill Unrecommended

FACULTY WOULD BE PROBLEM

Educators Weigh Idea of Junior Colleges

THE NEED FOR A JOINT LONG RANGE PLAN
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN MINNESOTA*

by

Dr. John J. Neumaier, President
Moorhead State College
Moorhead, Minnesota

In an age of crisis, one hesitates to call attention to specific crises, since the public mind, I am sure, finds it somewhat difficult to absorb too many problems after decades of listening to the "perils" confronting us.

Still, there is a crisis in higher education in Minnesota. It is, of course, not the only crisis facing the citizens of Minnesota and the state government; it is not peculiar to Minnesota; and the crisis has been with us for at least two decades. Apparently, the old saying, "If you can't lick 'em, join 'em", has in this case been adapted to "if you can't lick it, get used to it". Even though the enrollment explosion is upon us, the reaction of the legislature, educators and the public at large can best be summed up by "Quo Vadis" -- Where do we go from here?"

While most of the answers to this question seem to be rather partial, in more than one sense of the term, there is no scarcity of proposals of what we should do next to solve the crisis of higher education in Minnesota. When I speak of crisis, I have in mind the problems of public higher education which are occasioned by the enrollment explosion, the limited legislative appropriations apparently available to meet institutional demands, the lack of consensus in answering the questions concerning the future development of

*Reprinted from a speech given by President Neumaier on April 15 to members of the Minneapolis Branch, American Association of University Women.

public higher education, and the variety of alternatives, frequently contradictory, of how to expand public higher education in the state.

Since I can't do anything to stop the population explosion, having just recently aggravated it, and because I feel little can be done to increase taxes appreciably, at least in the immediate future, let me illustrate the problems of higher education in the state in terms of current proposals for expansion of college facilities.

Junior Colleges: The proposals of the Liaison Committee on Higher Education included the establishment of additional junior colleges in the metropolitan area and Southwestern Minnesota. The merits of this plan include providing the University much-needed relief at the junior college level, and filling a higher education void in Southwestern Minnesota. Its most problematical feature is the reluctance of school districts individually or collectively to tax themselves for at least part of the cost of operating such colleges.

Another proposal, usually referred to as the Dunlap Bill, was introduced February 28 and provides for the establishment of nine new state junior colleges under a separate State Junior College Board. This bill calls for an initial appropriation of \$10,000,000. The bill also permits the absorption of existing junior colleges under the jurisdiction of the State Junior College Board. A companion bill was introduced by Rep. Sathre and others providing for the establishment of 15 state junior colleges and appropriating 5 million for an operating fund and 20 million for acquisition of land, buildings and equipment. The bill also asks for local advisory committees for junior colleges. The strength of these bills stems from the fact that they provide a workable plan for expanding college opportunities both from an economic as well as an educational point of view. Junior college enthusiasts feel that a possible weakness of the plan would be discontinuance of local participation and local control of these institutions. Others feel that yet another college board would

undermine the growing need for more centralized management of higher education in the state.

Another bill on junior colleges was introduced by Rep. Basset and others on February 26, authorizing the establishment and operation of regional junior colleges, and providing for regional junior college district boards under the supervision of the State Department of Education which now has de jure if not de facto supervision over the operation of Minnesota's 11 public junior colleges. The bill is in accord with several recommendations of the Liaison Committee even though this committee has also made favorable comments concerning the Dunlap Bill. The merit of the bill is that it attempts to overcome the practical difficulties of developing the public junior college system under the limitations of the present school district pattern. A new difficulty arising from this bill is the opposition to increasing the tax burden on property through the proposed taxing power of a new regional board of trustees.

Many other ideas on expanding our junior college system are current, but fortunately not all of them have been embodied in legislative bills.

State Colleges: New legislation has been introduced which affects not only higher education in general but Mankato State College in particular. Sen. Imm introduced a bill which would convert Mankato State College into the University of Southern Minnesota with a separate board of trustees looking out for its welfare (instead of the State College Board which now governs all five state colleges in Minnesota). The merits of this proposal have been discussed with enthusiasm by the people of Mankato, and with equal fervor but in opposition by spokesmen for the University of Minnesota and the former president of the Minnesota State College Board, Mr. Norman Nelson of Moorhead. May I suggest that with a little effort one can understand the temptation of a college to want

its own Board of Trustees or Regents, particularly when it has an enrollment of over 5,000 students. On the other hand, apart from the reluctance of the University to see another state university in Minnesota, there is no denying that the problematic feature of this bill would be the extent to which higher education in Minnesota can be decentralized and yet permit the legislature to plan as appropriately and as wisely as possible for all of the college youths of the state.

Southwestern Minnesota State College: Strong representations have been made for ^{an} the creation of/additional state college in Southwestern Minnesota, particularly under the advocacy of Senate Majority Leader, Mr. Zwach. This proposal has been justified both by citing the comparative lack of college facilities in Southwestern Minnesota as well as the low percentage of high school graduates entering college in that area of the state. The opponents of this proposal feel that a couple of strategically located two-year colleges would serve this less heavily populated area of the state better in the immediate future, and that the conversion of a junior college into a four-year college could come about as the need indicated. An alternative proposal for a four-year college in Southwestern Minnesota has been incorporated into yet another bill which seeks to establish a branch of Mankato State College in Southwestern Minnesota, and authorizes the State College Board to establish branches of other Minnesota state colleges as the need arises and in consultation with the president of the state college affected. The merits of this proposal are most obvious to those residing in the areas potentially affected. The demerits are more clear to those outside such areas.

Mesabi State College: The Iron Range has also entered into the competition for state colleges with a bill, sponsored by Sen. Perpich of Hibbing, for the establishment of the Mesabi State College. Although I have not discussed this bill with the author, I assume

that this college would take the place of some of the five existing Range junior colleges. The advantages of the bill appear to include the shifting of the tax burden from those citizens now helping to support the Range junior colleges, as well as the hope of stimulating growth on the Range. A possible problem is the question of whether or not there is a need for a four-year college in Northern Minnesota with at least two public colleges -- Bemidji State College and the University of Minnesota, Duluth -- serving the young people of this area. Defenders of the plan point to the now more than experimental efforts of the University to develop a four-year branch at Morris, only 90 miles from Moorhead. Opponents use the same example, but in a different way and throw in for good measure the possibility that Crookston be made another branch by the same token.

Now that we have briefly summarized bills involving the expansion of Junior Colleges and State Colleges, what about the University of Minnesota? Some observers feel that the University has not yet fully "digested" either Morris or the West Bank, and it is doubtful, therefore, that the legislature will be asked for any new expansion in spite of pressures from the Crookston area for a branch there.

I am sure you are aware that some criticism has been directed at the great number of divergent proposals. The fairest explanation, and to some extent the justification, for the number of seemingly unrelated legislative proposals, is the evident lack of coordinated and comprehensive long range planning for the expansion and organization of higher education in Minnesota. Indeed, proposals such as the bill of Sen. Dunlap, while concerned only with public junior colleges, constitutes an imaginative initiative for possible expansion of that segment of higher education in view of the lack of an overall plan.

LONG RANGE PLAN MUST CONSIDER
LOCATION, LEGAL AND FISCAL
CONTROL, COORDINATION

Since such coordinated long range planning is quite obviously of crucial importance to the future of higher education in the state, and, intimately bound up with the need for quality, responsibility, and the fact of competition, let me define what I mean by Long Range planning in this context. I mean by it a Master Plan for developing and expanding facilities and programs of higher education in the state over a period of 15 or 20 years. This plan should specify (1) geographic location of new institutions, (2) legal, fiscal and administrative control of institutions (including the determination of how many or how few boards should control what institutions), and (3) the coordination, or at least liaison, between institutions and boards. Such a plan, of course, should be developed in close consultation with appropriate representatives of state government and particularly the legislature, the secondary schools, private colleges, and citizens groups such as the American Association of University Women. Such a plan must spring from an educational philosophy that can crystallize such questions as what youths deserve an opportunity for higher education and what different types of curricula and educational resources should be available at various institutions, what kind of professors, etc.

The plan must be based on empirical research which takes into account not only population and demographic trends, the economic facts of life, including the ability to pay for added services, and the benefits accruing to the state from such services, but also the relation of higher education in the state to national interests and needs. Neither states' rights nor individual rights can be preserved unless we preserve the union which is the pre-condition of our open society and its opportunities.

Finally, a Master Plan for Higher Education requires imaginative, non-doctrinaire thinking which goes beyond the provincial confines of urban centers or rural areas, beyond

the limits of the smallest educational principality or kingdom as well as the larger educational empires. Such thinking must be sufficiently flexible to allow for the give and take that under the American tradition of checks and balances may be anticipated as the legislators seek to modify the plan in terms of practical exigencies and the varying points of view represented in the legislature.

EDUCATIONAL STATESMANSHIP MUST BE OUR CONCERN

This sketchy outline of the kind of planning that is needed might possibly suffice to explain why Minnesota has not as yet reached a consensus on a long range plan. Yet, in a way, it does not suffice. If we are to do better in the future than we have in the past, if we are to develop greater statesmanship and objectivity, we must be willing to take an honest look at how we got to where we are now. Indeed, much can be said about the wonderful opportunities for higher education which have been developed in the state. A century of academic growth of our land grant University was celebrated with justifiable pride only recently. Our private institutions, junior colleges and state colleges also have played a significant part in the great cultural progress of the state.

It should be understood, therefore, that it is not to minimize this progress that I would like to highlight at least some of the reasons why Minnesota's educational leaders have not come up with more intensive and extensive long range planning, in spite of the many surveys and much talk which have taken place. Rather, such a plan and such a possibly 'agonizing' self-examination are needed to maximize educational progress in the state.

LEADERSHIP HAS CENTERED IN THE TWIN CITY AREA

Without any intention of flattering you, it should be clear at the outset that the metropolitan area of Minnesota, the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, constitute

the cultural and educational center of the state. The intellectual center of this fast-growing metropolis, and indeed of the state, is undeniably the University of Minnesota. With due deference to you Minneapolitans, and apart from my sentimentality as a grateful alumnus, it is necessary to point out occasionally that in spite of the physical location of its main campus, the University is a State University in fact as well as in name. It serves and benefits not only the Twin City area but the whole State of Minnesota.

If we are to engage in statesmanlike planning, we must think like statesmen. This forces us to admit that whether we reside in the province of Clay County or the province of Hennepin County it is human to think provincially in either county. Worse than that, it is possible even for one associated with an institution of higher learning, be he at Moorhead State College, Mankato State College -- or the University of Minnesota -- to be guilty of provincial or ethnocentric thinking -- thinking and acting under the limitations of the cultural subjectivity of our immediate environment.

My first point, and perhaps my main point, is that the lack of more developed planning in higher education in this state is due in large part to a lack of educational statesmanship. I am not under any illusion that all of my friends in higher education will be eager to agree with me in this indictment. Indeed, some of my university friends got at least temporarily irritated with me when I did not subscribe to the last concentrated effort at long range planning which was made when the University declared its willingness in 1958 to absorb the State Colleges as branches of the University. One reason that I did not find this plan altogether attractive, even though it was undoubtedly for the long range, was that the plan suffered from a lack of prior consultation or coordination with representatives of the sister institutions directly affected. Besides, once such a step is taken, it would be difficult to reintroduce checks and balances

if such appeared necessary in the interest of some decentralization.

Various University representatives participated in exhaustive higher education surveys and major long range planning, as illustrated by the Governor's Committee on Higher Education of the 50's, and the efforts of the Minnesota Association of Colleges Committee on the Continuing Study of Higher Education. But what was needed at the minimum was the kind of inter-institutional representation and cooperation that we now have at the level of the Liaison Committee of Higher Education. I am sure that the reasons why no more coordinated planning was achieved in Minnesota during the last two decades are complex, and should not simply be laid at the door of the University. Nevertheless, a candid and exhaustive analysis can neither exempt that institution's leadership nor some of its supporters from a share of responsibility for the slowness in developing such inter-institutional cooperation and concerns as are now germinating in the Liaison Committee.

FACTORS DELAYING INTER- INSTITUTIONAL TIES

Let me cite some of the factors that may have had a bearing on this lack of developing strong inter-institutional ties. In doing so, I do not mean to detract from the many successful efforts which were made by the representatives of the University to further inter-institutional cooperation at the level of articulating curricular and extra-curricular programs. The fact remains, however, that in spite of occasionally excellent public relations, effective inter-institutional planning did not go nearly far enough.

A principal factor which played its part in delaying a more candid and effective approach to public higher education has to do with the very strength of the University as a center of learning and research. The University's legal autonomy, freeing it from the kind of dependence on other state agencies by which the State Colleges are regrettably limited,

permitted the genius of the University's leaders a relatively untrammelled course during the past century. Having become one of the great universities of the country with a prestige which goes beyond national boundaries, the University has been able to attract the kind of faculty, and the kind of resources which make it the pride and perhaps the envy at times of higher education in the state. The support given the University in its public, and particularly in its legislative relations, by the metropolitan area in which the main campuses are located, must not be underestimated when we take stock of the development of higher education in Minnesota. In the competition of public colleges for public attention and the tax dollars, the University most of the time came out so far ahead of the former Teachers' Colleges (now called State Colleges), and the Junior Colleges that for a long time 'competition' would have been an exaggerated term in the uneven clamor for fiscal support. Certainly, influential newspapers like the Minneapolis Star and Tribune deserve much credit for their unwavering support of the University. The physical proximity of University officials to the state's mass publication media and the legislative chambers must not be discounted as practically effective factors in the educational progress of the University. In addition to this external lobby, the University in the past has been able to count on a built-in legislative lobby in the persons of some of the University alumni in the legislature from both Hennepin and Ramsey counties, as well as those from the University branches and the agricultural station areas throughout the state.

Is it any wonder, then, that some of the influential University leaders of former years preferred to go it alone when it came to planning for future development and expansion? Not all of these leaders were a part of the academic administration of that institution, and you could almost hear it said when some of us pleaded for more coordination: "Why quit, when you are winning?" In the kind of horse-trading that precedes some legislative

decisions, the State and Junior Colleges could barter at most some ponies of dubious value. It is only during the last ten years that the State Colleges have been able to come up with some rather healthy fillies when the competition for the tax dollar became so sharp that all of a sudden in 1958 it was thought more wise to centralize all of higher education under the Board of Regents.

This is a rather prosaic way of looking at the way in which the citadels of higher learning are built, but believe me, the struggle for funds which ensues every two years is neither poetic nor romantic.

LITTLE ENCOURAGEMENT FOR LIAISON COMMITTEE

I am afraid that not only was there inadequate long range planning for the future of higher education during the years of complete preeminence of the University, but even a modest effort such as the Liaison Committee represented, received little encouragement. While such a committee had been advocated from time to time, and had been recommended as an alternative to immediate centralization of higher education, it was not established until 1959 by legislative resolution, after Senator Dosland of Moorhead took it off the legislative shelf. If I recall rightly, the clamor for such a committee was particularly strong on the part of some junior college and state college representatives. It is important to realize in this context, however, that representatives of these less powerful institutions suffered from the same partiality of outlook that was evident among representatives of the University. In spite of superficially pleasant public protestations and the slow but continuous progress in working relationships, first between the University and the Junior Colleges and later between all three types of public institutions, neither Junior College nor State College representatives

were actively engaged in helping the University obtain its legislative objectives. Indeed, in private if not in public testimony, occasional jabs at the University constituted the same disservice to the total interests of higher education in the state as the reverse kind of activity on the part of some University officials.

Surely, it is no secret to you that many University associates, whether on the faculty, in the administration or among the alumni, looked down on the "mediocre" State Teachers College. While the State Teachers Colleges in my opinion did suffer from mediocrity in some of their academic programs and personnel, this mediocrity, in all fairness, could not be overcome until the State Colleges obtained the greater measure of financial support and legislative attention which they have received during the last dozen or so years.

BETTER CLIMATE TODAY FOR JOINT PLANNING

Enough has been said to illustrate my point that the climate during the 40's and 50's did not encourage coordinated long range planning. The climate today, however, is far more conducive to such an undertaking. There are, I think, four principal reasons for a more encouraging outlook: (1) the higher academic quality of education in the State Colleges; (2) the acuteness of the fiscal problems facing the colleges and the state, in view of rising enrollments and out-of-state competition; (3) the hopes and encouragement provided by the newly-created Liaison Committee on Higher Education; and (4) the obvious need for institutional responsibility, inter-institutional unity and a sense of direction so as to maximize support and cooperation from the legislature. In discussing these four reasons I hope to show, at least through general guidelines, what role quality, competition and responsibility must play if we are to serve the higher education needs of the state.

HIGHER QUALITY IN
THE STATE COLLEGES

There has been definite progress in the academic quality of programs and faculties at the State and Junior Colleges. The University had achieved such quality in many of its departments for a relatively long period of time. The University, of course, has made even further progress during the last few decades, but the dramatic change at the University is in its enormous expansion.

Similarly, the best of our Junior Colleges have offered quality education for their students since the 1920's. Though the state's Junior Colleges cannot afford the kind of public relations that in America constitute almost a sine qua non for high prestige, their performance, as measured by countless empirical studies by University educators, has been consistently high in the Liberal Arts as well as in Engineering and allied fields. Junior College teachers for many years were paid better salaries than either State College professors or University instructors, and as a result some of the Junior Colleges were able to assemble excellent teaching faculties.

Shifting again to the State Colleges, a dramatic upgrading of instruction, research and scholarship has taken place in recent years. Again, a large measure of credit must go to the State Legislature whose members met the challenge of rising enrollments and a shortage of qualified staffs by improving salaries of State College faculties and appropriating funds for extensive and much needed building programs.

Another legislative change of considerable consequence took place in 1957 when the State Teachers Colleges were converted to State Colleges, acknowledging their new functions as multi-purpose institutions. I would like to illustrate briefly what these changes mean by referring to Moorhead State College. The enrollment at Moorhead today consists of 2,150 on-campus students -- a 126 per cent increase over 1958. Enrollment in the

Liberal Arts curricula alone has increased over 425 per cent since that time in contrast to a 73 per cent enrollment increase in teacher education. Moorhead State College has a faculty today which includes scholars with Ph.D. degrees from major universities in this country and abroad, including Harvard, Columbia, Cornell, Chicago, California at Berkeley, London, and in Germany, Gottingen and Friedrich Schiller. A rapidly growing number of our faculty members are publishing scholars and experimental researchers. I believe that it transcends a mere ethnocentric claim to say that Moorhead State College is a public Liberal Arts institution in fact as well as in name. This is extremely important not only for Minnesota, but more particularly for the nation, if the pursuit of excellence is not to be a treasured patent of the Ivy League and an empty slogan for millions of other American students.

But what has all this to do with a better climate for joint planning for the future of higher education in the state? Simply this: academically-respectable institutions must be taken seriously. Since they will have an even more significant role to play in proportion to their increased quality as well as quantity of service, their potential to compete for available resources grows correspondingly. An increasing number of State College graduates will enroll at the Graduate School of the University, and their preparation becomes a direct concern of the University. As influential and able legislators become more convinced of the kind of contribution that can be made by State and Junior Colleges, the apportioning of funds between these two types of institutions and the University becomes even more important. This in turn means that it is high time that the University and the State and Junior Colleges see to it that such apportioning is done equitably, instead of left to the changing political winds of differently-constituted legislatures.

FISCAL PROBLEMS TEND
TO AID JOINT PLANNING

This brings us to consideration of the second factor affecting the climate for more inter-institutional cooperation, namely the acuteness of the fiscal problems facing the colleges and the state. All of our institutions, public and private, are confronted with the rising costs of higher education. The University will not be able to retain its best teachers and research personnel unless the legislature enables the University administration to pay salaries which are at least comparable to those of the Big Ten universities. Junior Colleges with enrollments of 400 students cannot provide the kind of collegiate programs and atmosphere that greater equality of educational opportunity calls for unless and until they are housed in separate buildings. State Colleges, such as Moorhead, suffer severely today from an unfavorable student-faculty ratio which has been raised from 1-16 in 1958 to 1-20 at the present time. It is difficult, and in some academic fields impossible, to provide either depth or breadth in subject matter.

In a concern for academic excellence rather than academic luxuries, many more reasonable needs can be listed, even without mentioning the costliness of maintaining an up-to-date physical plant. Although legislators may be most sympathetic to these needs, there is no indication that appreciably higher taxation or new kinds of taxes will be available at this time.

Consequently, the temptation to compete for the limited resources is very difficult to resist, and, in spite of wholesome pronouncements by educational spokesmen on the need to work together and their recorded opposition to sin, the various segments of higher education are represented by lobbyists working hard for their particular share of the tax pie. Indeed, a little under-cutting is still taking place either by claims of economy per student cost, or by comparative, if not comparable figures, on requested student-faculty ratio. I have

already commented on the variety of bills and alternative legislative proposals by which various groups hope to achieve the necessary expansion of higher education facilities. To me all this points to one conclusion: the need to coordinate the requests for needed appropriations and for joint planning to meet institutional needs.

LIAISON COMMITTEE PROVIDES MEANS FOR PLANNING

As a third reason for my belief that a more conducive climate for college collaboration is emerging, I pointed to the hope and encouragement provided by the Liaison Committee on Higher Education. This committee has been criticized for having neglected to develop a comprehensive long range plan for higher education and for having directed its attention only to segments, not to the whole. At the Governor's budget hearing last December I pointed out in defense of the committee that it must be remembered that President Wilson has been in the state only for two years. While the University President, who is currently chairman of the Liaison Committee, is also expected to provide leadership for all of higher education in the state, it is too much to ask that he commit himself to a 20 year program for higher education after having been here for only a short time. As a matter of fact, however, under the leadership of President Wilson there has been great progress in the continuing approachment between various segments of higher education. He personally presided over some of the meetings when for the first time the representatives of various graduate programs of the state got together to exchange information and institute more formal programs of cooperation in the area of graduate education. He took a leading part in proposing the expansion of Junior Colleges in the Twin Cities and other parts of the state. He personally invited representatives of state colleges, junior colleges and private colleges to participate in various programs of common interest concerning joint benefits

from economic research, college extension programs and other cultural undertakings of statewide significance. I am singling out these activities of the University President, not to praise his public relations, but as an acknowledgment of his apparent interest, not only and narrowly in the welfare of the University, but in all of higher education in the state. Perhaps the day is nearer than former President Morrill realized when he expressed the hope that some day the Liaison Committee would consider coordinated budgets of all public higher education before the separate boards would submit them to the legislature. At any rate, representatives of the three public segments of higher education meet periodically at the conference table, maintaining liaison with the private colleges, and, under the increasingly mature leadership of the University, joint long range planning and ever closer cooperation are now more than remote possibilities.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY,
UNITY AND DIRECTION

My final reason for seeing a better climate for cooperation at all levels of the educational enterprise, including joint planning for the future, is the obvious need for institutional responsibility, unity and direction if we are to obtain maximum support and cooperation from the legislature. The results of a lack of integrated educational planning became painfully evident at this session of the legislature when numerous bills were introduced reflecting the interests of individual institutions and geographic areas. This is not to deny that several of the bills have merit. Nevertheless, veteran legislators have expressed their dissatisfaction with this piecemeal approach to the future of higher education in the state. Certainly, many educators have been frustrated by this approach. In the final analysis, however, we, the appointed leaders of the institutions of higher education, and our boards must take the primary responsibility for the lack of a comprehensive plan for

higher education. It is true that some take the position that it should be left to the representatives of the people to plan for and decide the expansion and control of public higher education. This view was expressed by a leading professor of education recently at a meeting of college administrators. I regard this view as much mistaken, as the opposite view which is so distrustful of the legislature that it insists that the planning should be confined to those engaged in higher education.

What we can agree upon is that those who inhabit the house of higher education must put their own house in order. It should be obvious to the least sophisticated observer that legislative log-rolling, horse trading and recourse to expediency or makeshift legislation and subjective institutional ambitions are in effect encouraged in the absence of an objective frame of reference, or a commonly accepted master plan. Indeed, unless there is agreement concerning budgetary allocations and expansion of facilities, the divided forces of higher education will strengthen the arguments of those opposed to any expansion or of those who want to economize at the expense of our college youths.

On the other hand, it would be arrogant, if not undemocratic, if educators were to insist that their thinking must be accepted without review and modification by those elected to represent the people of Minnesota. Even though the "Either-or" approach in planning and educational decision making must be rejected, the joint planning for the future of higher education will always and necessarily have to contend with various problems inherent in the checks and balances governing social forces in America. For example: What types of centralization would best ensure the growth of public higher education? Should all institutions be governed by the University Board of Regents or would this lead to an unwieldy and unresponsive educational bureaucracy? Should there be a superboard over the current boards or would this tend to level the present educational excellence of the University and tend to

jeopardize its constitutional freedom? Should there be an extension of voluntary coordination as begun in the present Liaison Committee, or is it too unrealistic to expect success from voluntary cooperation?

Other problems will involve alternate values and factual assumptions dealing with entrance requirements, semi-professional and vocational programs, further upgrading of professional education and a possible modification of its power structure, responsible extension of graduate degree-granting, greater efforts for the continuing education of women, etc.

In spite of the many problems besetting an affluent society, I am confident that a united community of higher education can meet the challenges of the future. How and what must be done would be a subject large enough for another talk.

I do want to reiterate my confidence in the Liaison Committee as a possible vehicle for bringing about greater mutual understanding. As it broadens its base of operations, it may become a two-way bridge of communication to public groups and to leading citizens in groups or individually. I fervently hope that a day will come when it will be appropriate for me as a state college president to defend, with understanding and conviction, the budget of the University before the legislature, and when the University president, as a matter of course, will be called upon to defend the budget requests of all segments of higher education.

Perhaps educational politics was an inevitable necessity of the past. I trust it is not Utopian to hope that it will be replaced increasingly by educational statesmanship. Let competition between institutions continue, but let it be more in the realm of ideas and less in the realm of devisive bickering for financial advantage one over the other. Institutional responsibility for the quality of all higher education in the state will ensure greater quality for each of our academic programs. The challenge before us is the triumph of our free and

open society over a closed and totalitarian society in which a few men through an omnipotent state suppress the individual.

May the Minneapolis Branch of the American Association of University Women continue to watch and influence the legislature and the colleges toward the end that women as well as men will be given the opportunity to learn not only the intellectual heritage of the West, but those ideas and achievements in Science, the Arts and Literature which liberate the mind from ignorance and help to make us productive, emancipated and most important of all 'human' in the classical sense of that term.