

and other funds from private sources cover one-half of current expenditures. The Commission states that this substantial reliance on private funds must be continued. It is a key factor for the preservation of diversity and autonomy in American higher education. The Commission's federal aid proposals are designed in many instances to draw forth additional private funds. In the Commission's view, the private contribution to higher education must more than double from \$9 billion in 1968 to \$21 billion in 1976 to maintain its current one-half share.

The states and local communities will find it more difficult to expand their contributions. The state share has been falling, and the Commission expects it to continue to fall from the present 27 percent to 17 percent of the total \$41 billion in 1976.

Between 1967 and 1976 expenditures for higher education will be more than doubled (from \$17.2 to \$41 billion). During the same period, growth in the economy will almost double our gross national product (from \$763 to \$1400 billion). Thus the necessary expansion in funds for higher education can be met by a relatively modest increase in percent of GNP used for higher education — from 2 percent in 1967 to 3 percent in 1976.

The nation as a whole has a growing stake in strong and vital colleges and universities. Benefits from rising levels of education, from greater equality of opportunity, and from advances in knowledge do not stop at state boundaries. Moreover, because of their different tax structures, growth in GNP leads to greater increases in federal revenues than in state revenues. The federal government thus has greater ability than the states to increase its share of higher education expenditures. The Commission estimates that its proposals would take about one-seventh of additional available federal revenues in 1976 for new programs.

WHAT ABOUT THE PERIOD BEYOND 1976?

The Commission believes that

growing financial pressures on higher education require immediate short-run solutions. These short-run proposals cover the period to 1976 and of necessity are based on the present structure of higher education and built on existing patterns of financing. The Commission is hopeful that some longer-run solutions to financial pressures may be found through new kinds of support programs and through innovations in structure and function and more efficient uses of resources. Also, financial problems in the period after 1976 will be less severe. The heaviest costs of expansion will be met by 1980. After that pressures from expanding enrollment will decrease.

For the period up to 1976, the Commission believes that a much greater federal investment is essential "if the growth of higher education is not to be curbed at the very time that the national need demands our best ideas and intellectual skills and the broadest possible extension of equality of opportunity."



Dr. Kerr, who serves as chairman and executive director of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, was formerly president of the University of California. He earned his B.A. from Swarthmore College, his M.A. at Stanford University, and his Ph.D. in Economics at the University of California. He is the author of Uses of the University and other books and articles on education as well as on labor economics and industrial relations.

Commencement Address Given at St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri, May 31, 1969

by

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.
President, University of Notre Dame

*"Your young men see vision and
your old men shall dream
dreams." (Joel, 3,1)*

One has little choice in the subject of a commencement address this year. There is one overriding concern which will undoubtedly be voiced at hundreds of commencement exercises. It is difficult to avoid this concern, nor should we. It has many names and you have heard them all, many times over, maybe too much: student unrest, the generation gap, the alienation of youth, participatory democracy, S.D.S., black power, new facism, legislative backlash, the end of university freedom and autonomy, thunder from the new left, over-reaction from the right, administrative spinelessness or hawkishness, law and order, faculty defection, presidential fatigue, revolution of the young, the new barbarism — and so many other names that express different facets of the same national and, indeed, international concern regarding the university and young people today.

We have all seen and heard the story, and have all experienced our own version of the total phenomenon so many times that one wonders whether anything new can be said about it, whether the problem will get better or worse, whether anyone really understands what is happening, whether it may pass away, hopefully with Vietnam or, if not, what we should do about it besides waiting, worrying, and hoping.

I strongly believe that the concern needs much more than the kind of peripheral attention that we give to it as a nation. We are too caught up in techniques that are improvised here and there to deal with this or that particular manifestation of the problem, as it emerges in different forms,