

from Australia, "and we know that if it succeeds in conquering southeast Asia and Indonesia, we are doomed." In a future that may lie only several decades ahead, he warned, Indonesia and New Guinea might be used as springboards for an Asian-Communist invasion of Australia. But long before this came about, he pointed out, the entire strategic position of the free world would be gravely compromised if the forces of world communism held control of the whole Pacific littoral, from the Bering Straits to Singapore, and of the southern island chain from Sumatra to New Guinea. For if this ever came to pass, the Communists would, in effect, have cut the world in half.

The Communists are inciting and supporting the Indonesian agitation for West New Guinea because they do look far ahead, because they do have long range strategic aims, and because they are confident that the time is not too far distant when the hammer and sickle of communism will fly throughout the lands of southeast Asia and the islands of Indonesia.

For the moment, the Indonesian Government takes the stand that its claim extends only to West New Guinea, and not to the eastern portion of the island which is a non-self-governing territory under the Commonwealth of Australia. In fact, President Sukarno has gone out of his way to assure the Australians that Indonesia has no pretensions of any kind to East New Guinea. But the Australians are skeptical about these assurances; and who can blame them for being skeptical?

It is in the interest of the free world, it is in the interest of the people of New Guinea, it is in the ultimate interest of the United Nations, that the people of New Guinea, after an appropriate period of preparation, be given the right to determine for themselves what form of government they wish to have and what political affiliations they wish to enter into.

To deny this right to the people of New Guinea would be to abandon the cardinal principle on which the United Nations is based; the right of all peoples everywhere to determine for themselves the form of government desirable to them.

To accede passively to the hysterical demands of the Indonesian Communists and nationalists by surrendering New Guinea to them would gravely imperil the future of Australia and the Philippines and of all the free world's positions in the west Pacific.

Many people have been disturbed by the fact that we have taken no action and made no protests when the Indonesian Government has flouted the United Nation's Charter by its repeated public announcements that it planned to take West New Guinea by force, if it were not ceded peacefully.

They have been even more disturbed by the fact that when our Dutch NATO allies sought to transport troops to New Guinea in order to defend a non-self-governing territory of which they are recognized as the legal administrators by the U.N. against a threatened invasion in violation of the U.N. Charter, we reacted to this situation by denying our NATO allies the right to land and refuel their transport planes at American Pacific bases.

But they have been most disturbed, by the persistent reports that we are endeavoring to persuade, or perhaps I should say, to pressure our Dutch NATO allies to cede West New Guinea to Indonesia without a fight. Only last week, the Washington Star carried an AP story which spoke of a reported U.S. proposal that the administration of West New Guinea be switched from Dutch to Indonesian control over a 2-year period. According to this story, the reported proposal met with stiff opposition from The Hague, which still insists that self-determination under U.N. auspices is the only proper way to dispose of the fate of the Pa-

puan people. According to the same story, President Sukarno told a cheering crowd in South Sumatra that he holds to his pledge to put his government in control of the disputed territory by the end of the year. "Who said I want to accept a 2-year condition?" he asked rhetorically.

I earnestly hope that these reports, at least as they relate to the attitude of the U.S. Government, are in error.

I earnestly hope that we are not endeavoring to appease Sukarno and his Communist supporters at the expense of our NATO and SEATO allies.

I earnestly hope that we will not seek thus to ingratiate ourselves with Sukarno, Nehru, Nasser and Nkrumah, despite the fact that this action would break the hearts of our staunch allies in Australia, the Philippines, New Zealand and Thailand; despite the fact that it would place further serious stress on NATO; despite the obvious peril it would create to the free nations in the area and to the strategic position of the free world.

I earnestly hope that in any action we take with regard to West New Guinea, we will be guided above everything else by considerations of morality and by the basic principles on which the United Nations is founded. For in this situation, as in so many other situations, the path of morality coincides with the enlightened self-interest of the free world.

Since the United States first achieved its own independence, it has remained a staunch friend and supporter of the cause of national liberation and of every nation, young or ancient, seeking freedom from foreign bondage. In the post World War II period, the moral influence of the United States has played a role of central importance in bringing about the peaceful liberation of the great majority of the colonial countries. The colonial countries have had no better friend than the United States: our record in this respect is something of which we have every reason to be proud. But having supported the colonial countries in their struggle for independence, we can not be indifferent to the new and infinitely greater danger of Communist colonialism which now threatens many of these countries. Nor can we, out of our long-standing sympathy for the national aspirations of these countries, permit or assist these newborn countries to establish their own systems of imperialist and colonial subjugation in neighboring territories.

In approaching the dispute over Netherlands New Guinea, we should say these things frankly but firmly to our friends, to our enemies, and to the recently liberated neutralist nations, some of whom, unfortunately, are not prepared to concede the same right to other peoples that they demand for themselves.

EXHIBIT 2

[From World Marxist Review]

UNITY IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COLONIALISM

The delegations of the Dutch and Indonesian Communist parties to the 22d Congress of the CPSU exchanged views on questions of interest to both parties and the peoples of their countries and adopted a joint statement.

They expressed the view that the settlement of the West Irian question would signify the complete abolition of colonialism in what was called the Netherlands East Indies. Such a settlement, however, has been fiercely opposed for more than 10 years by the Dutch reactionaries, despite the protests of the Afro-Asian peoples and the U.N. resolution on the complete liquidation of colonialism.

The two parties, the statement says, resolutely reject the shameful policy of the so-called self-determination for West Irian through the mediation of the U.N., as sug-

gested by the Dutch Foreign Minister Luns. This is a barely disguised attempt to use the United Nations as a cover for the U.S.-Dutch colonization of West Irian. The two delegations reaffirmed their conviction that the way to settle the question lies in the immediate and unconditional transfer of West Irian to Indonesia.

If the Dutch reactionaries persist in their refusal to do this, they will deliberately provoke a war with Indonesia over West Irian. In the event of war breaking out this would be for the people of Indonesia a just war of liberation which would complete the struggle for independence started by them on August 17, 1945. This war would, doubtlessly, get much greater support from all the anticolonial and progressive forces, including those of the Netherlands, than was the case in 1947 and 1948. For the Dutch imperialists it would be a colonial war, a hopeless adventure which would shock the whole of mankind, a protracted and hard war in which the blood of both Dutch and Indonesian people would be shed. The two delegations stressed that the danger of such a war and its consequences should not be underestimated.

The two parties declared that they would do everything to consolidate and rally the progressive forces of their countries in the struggle for the transfer of West Irian to Indonesia and that this would be their contribution to the cause of preserving world peace.

EXHIBIT 3

[From U.S.S.R. International Affairs, Mar. 9, 1962]

DEMISE OF AUSTRALIAN COLONIALISM SEEN
(Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia,
Feb. 23, 1962).

(Lev Armasov commentary: "The Approaching Storm")

Dear listeners: I am quite certain that not many among you have heard of an island called Buka. It is located in the Solomons group, which belongs to East New Guinea and is placed under Australian trusteeship. At present, the name of the island is frequently quoted in the press. What has happened there?

Due to their heavy burdens the Buka islanders refused to pay extremely high taxes. Since then, Australian authorities decided forcefully to (collect taxes?) from the islanders. For this purpose the police were strengthened considerably. The police took firm action against resentful citizens and arrested them. In defiance, several thousand islanders, armed only with spears, hatchets, and rocks, resisted the colonialists. The Australian authorities then started to use firearms. Bloodshed followed. Nevertheless, the Buka islanders refused to surrender and continued their struggle. The administrator of Papua and New Guinea, Cleland, has stated that the crisis on Buka has taken the form of a real war.

The events on Buka are not (restricted only to that island?). The events reflect the awakening of the national freedom movement even in the most isolated regions still under colonial oppression. East New Guinea has arisen from the long darkness of the disgusting colonial regime established there by Australia in violation of its international obligations. The anticolonial movement in that region has been largely influenced by the growing national freedom movement in neighboring West Irian, where the Dutch feel as if they were sitting on a volcano.

People in East New Guinea and the nearby islands, who are witnessing the approaching moment of the unavoidable downfall of Dutch colonialism, are intensifying their struggle against the Australian colonialists for complete independence and freedom of their country. The West Irian people's

struggle for reunification with the Indonesian Republic and the struggle of those in East New Guinea for freedom are both anticolonial movements. The Dutch colonialists and their friends in Australia, in their colonial plundering, look with great fear at the approaching storm; they have pledged mutual solidarity and support.

Responsible Australian leaders have intimidated Indonesia. For instance, Australian Defense Minister Townley has stated that the Australian armed forces were never as ready for combat as they are at present. He also stated that the Australian armed forces are ready to take action together with those of its allies firmly and effectively. The Australian bourgeois press has launched an anti-Indonesian campaign and asks not to let a possible enemy enter New Guinea. In Canberra people hold the view that if West Irian frees itself from Dutch colonialism and eventually joins the Indonesian Republic, the freedom movement in East New Guinea will spread with more interest. Australian administrators may then have to pack their belongings and leave the territory.

The loss of the territory will be a great blow to colonialists of the Australian bourgeoisie. In that region, Australian monopolists have produced gold, platinum, silver, bronze, oil, copra, lumber, and other valuable raw material. By cruelly exploiting cheap manpower, every year they make extraordinary huge profits.

Most of mankind has approved the declaration, introduced by the Soviet Union, on granting freedom to colonial nations and countries, including trust territories. Those who refuse to honor the declaration and act in contradiction to the wish of the people will certainly lose. People in the colonial territories and trust territories will achieve their independence and freedom.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 30, 1962]

SUKARNO TAKES CREDIT FOR COMMUNIST GAIN

JAKARTA, INDONESIA, April 30.—President Sukarno declared today he had brought respectability to Indonesia's Communists because he is convinced they are beneficial to this young nation.

Mr. Sukarno, who is trying to establish a socialist state, told the closing session of the Communist Party Congress: "I am very happy to have removed the Communist phobia from the minds of our people. Two years ago communism was regarded as satan and devil by the majority of the Indonesian people."

Some people in Indonesia still discriminate against Communists, Mr. Sukarno said, but added: "There is general acceptance now of the role they should play."

Indonesia's Communist Party claims 2 million members.

Mr. Sukarno said the Communists have become strong because of their opposition to imperialism and their full backing of Indonesia's claim to West New Guinea now held by the Dutch.

"You may say I give room to Communists and that I encourage them," Mr. Sukarno said. "But I have often emphasized I am serving the people's interest."

Mr. Sukarno called on the Communists "let us go ahead together to complete our revolution."

Resolutions adopted by the Communist Congress were critical of government inaction in the worsening economic situation. The congress also called for the ending of martial law, promised by Mr. Sukarno more than a year ago.

The party also urged full implementation of Mr. Sukarno's political manifesto of 1959 which provides the Communists a share in governing.

EXHIBIT 5

UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPORT,
Bridgeport, Conn., April 23, 1962.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DODD: I heartily endorse your recent demand that hearings be held on American policy in the Dutch-Indonesian dispute over the future of West New Guinea. The threat of Indonesia to the aspirations of the people of West New Guinea is also a threat to the safety and leadership of the United States in the entire South Pacific area.

I would greatly appreciate receiving from you the text of the memorandum addressed to the Far Eastern Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in which you urge that an inquiry be held into the policy of the United States in the West New Guinea dispute.

I have for many years been professionally engaged in the study of the West New Guinea problem and in Indonesian affairs. Herewith I include some recent publications of mine on the subject in the hope that these will be of some interest.

Sincerely yours,

DR. J. M. VAN DER KROEF,
Associate Professor of Sociology and
Political Science, University of
Bridgeport.

THE SENATE,
COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA,
Sydney, April 19, 1962.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for your opposition to the Indonesian claim to West New Guinea. I completely agree with you.

Unfortunately, my only chance to influence policy is to say what I think privately to ministers and to members and to state the case against Indonesia in the Senate in rather academic terms. * * *

I was recently in the United States. Both at Washington and St. Louis I tried to persuade the many good friends I met that Sukarno's claim was unjust and spurious, that it means "imperialism" and "colonialism" and that Holland's administration of West New Guinea was a genuine new deal for the natives. (I have visited the Netherlands New Guinea and found their civil service, and especially their education service, excellent.) I was told that the policy of your Department of State was to build up Indonesia as an anti-Communist bastion and that New Guinea was the price. The policy of our government is to place the American alliance first and I fully support this. But I feel that on this issue we should have stood firmly by the Netherlands.

Your statement gives me great hope that an opportunity of a change in policy may come.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN A. MCCALLUM,
Senator for New South Wales and
Member of Parliamentary Committee
on Foreign Affairs.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION NEW TOOL TO HELP ENLIGHTEN MAN- KIND

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, May 1, 1962, will one day appear in U.S. history textbooks as the date President Kennedy signed Public Law 87-447, legislation designed to expedite the utilization of television facilities for educational purposes.

It is proper, I suggest, that the educational television bill should have been

signed on May 1. In the countries whose rulers would destroy the free world, displays of military might were paraded before the populace even as part of that populace starved or rotted in prison camps.

In the United States on May 1 children exchange May Day baskets of flowers, and this year the Nation's President placed his written approval on S. 205 which provides the tools to help educate mankind.

Television might be, as able Federal Communications Chairman Newton Minow dared to observe last year, "a wasteland."

Television can be a wonderland—opening wide the doors of learning to all mankind. It is a medium of communications whose maximum good is as yet unknown, untested, and untried.

I am confident that the tools provided in S. 205 will help television to face and meet the challenges this century has hurled at it. As Mr. Fred Hechinger, education editor of the New York Times, has written:

"The place of TV in education should be the same as that of books. Bad books are of no help in education. Bad teaching is magnified many times over on TV. By the same token, good teaching is not only magnified by TV, but becomes contagious.

When my good friend and able colleague, the Senator from Washington, the chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee [Mr. MAGNUSON], reported S. 205, the written report submitted March 14, 1961, stated:

Through education television great teachers can fire the imagination and kindle the desire to excel in thousands of students simultaneously and the thoughts of these teachers can be instilled permanently on tape. The greatest minds of our time can share their knowledge with pupils all over the country and eventually all over the world. Their skill, their knowledge, and their experience can be brought to the small schools located thousands of miles away through the medium of television.

America and the world can be grateful that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] had the determination and foresight to fight for the legislative tools which will give educational television the assistance it needs to be utilized properly. Let us hope each State avails itself of these tools which he sought to provide during the 85th and 86th Congresses.

I am proud that it has been possible for me to support educational television legislation since I have been a member of the United States Senate.

We of the West have not been asleep. Thirteen Western States have an interstate compact establishing the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. It is popularly known as WICHE. Alaska is a member of the Commission which has as one of its goals that of promoting an exchange of college television teaching and assisting in promoting interstate cooperation and higher education in graduate professions, technical fields, and in health provisions.

I will not dwell at length on the need for educational television—ETV—because we have recognized that need.

Obviously, when only 62 educational channels of the 273 reserved for this purpose by the Federal Communications System 9 years ago had been used there was a need. The new legislation ought to go a long way toward taking care of the needs of schools and colleges in this vast new field of education.

And I believe my good friend the capable junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] was correct when she remarked on this floor April 17 that:

Educational television promises the most fundamental advance in educational methods since the invention of the printing press 500 years ago.

Public Law 87-447 amends the Communications Act of 1934 to provide Federal matching grants, up to the limit of \$1 million per State, for the acquisition and installation of transmission equipment for educational television facilities. This assistance will, I hope, be helpful to the nine television stations in Alaska.

Alaska's terrain is vast. Its mountains are high and its population either concentrated in a few cities or sparsely scattered throughout its 586,000 square miles. Many Alaskans cannot come to the bigger cities because there are no roads today which make such trips possible. One day I am hopeful that this condition will have been corrected. A positive step is contained in Senate Joint Resolution 137 which I sponsored and has been reported by the Senate Public Works Committee and contains funds with which to make road surveys beyond those at present provided in the State's program. But pending roads development Alaskan educational needs in outlying areas are, because of the lack of transportation, unique. So ETV programs can, in part, expand tremendously in educational opportunities in Alaska.

Public Law 87-447 authorizes 50 percent matching grants for initial construction of a facility plus 25 percent of the cost of an already constructed facility for expansion of that facility, up to a limit of 75 percent of the cost of the expansion.

The law provides:

Sums appropriated pursuant to sec. 390 which provides for matching grants shall remain available for payments of such grants for projects for which applications, approved under section 392, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1968.

The money shall be used to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs. It will be of importance to Alaska's schools.

In States having educational television agencies applicants for construction grants must first notify such agencies. Otherwise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has been designated to administer the program.

The House and Senate conferees wisely agreed that "under no circumstances should the ETV program be subordinated to or tied in with other Federal programs in the field of education." The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was given the responsibility for the execution of the program so that the program could immediately get underway.

Other help is available immediately through the Federal Communications

Commission which has established in its Broadcast Bureau an Office of Research and Education which is to assist educational broadcasters in their efforts to expand and improve educational broadcasting.

To whom may grants be made?

The law provides that construction grants may go to "any nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association, which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting and which is eligible according to the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in effect on April 12, 1962, to receive a license from the Commission for a noncommercial educational broadcasting station."

And, of course, applicants may be:

First. An agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof.

Second. The State educational educational television agency

Third. A college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues.

Regrettably, Mr. President, even today, after the successful fight to expand the vistas of television in education, too few Americans are familiar with educational television because their communities do not have educational television stations. The matching funds available under Public Law 87-447 should correct this blackout.

Education is a formidable weapon against the forces of tyranny of any age. If we are to know "why," we must know "how."

The Senate in 1961 passed S. 1021, the administration's education bill, which provided funds for public school maintenance and construction and for teachers' salaries. I strongly supported this measure, after securing an amendment which by a change of formula increased Alaska's participation, for the bill would have been helpful in all States.

Now it appears that a desirable bill or similar legislation will not be reported by the House Rules Committee in this Congress. Thus, other means must be used to promote education.

Under the terms of the public law which makes possible matching grants for educational television purposes the States can apply aids to plug at least a part of the gaps now facing educators. Millions of Americans own television sets.

Many of these sets are in Alaska.

In Alaska there is no direct tie-in with the television networks of the lower 48 States. This truth always appalls those who hear it for the first time. It seems incredible that this situation exists in the 20th century. But it does, and Alaskans, as well as Hawaiians meet the challenge in the best way they can.

Our television stations use tapes. We see the programs a week later than most other viewers, but we see them on film tapes.

Education television can be utilized in the same fashion. But we do need the help provided in Public Law 87-447.

Our isolated communities oftentimes have the services of a single teacher, a teacher

who may be overworked and underpaid. The assistance available through educational television channels cannot be weighed in dollars.

Of course, we will face obstacles. But men have crossed mountains before.

Education is on the march. As I have often had occasion to remark, education and democracy are one and inseparable. We move ahead with education television. We can move forward more rapidly if ETV is implemented with other tools such as those provided in S. 349, introduced by my capable and good friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and now pending on the Senate Calendar. I have cosponsored S. 349 because it would give veterans who served in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963, the educational benefits received by those who served in the Korean war. Some people have called this the cold war GI bill. I doubt that anyone would argue that this is not a time of cold war. We need every weapon available to win this battle. Education is available if we but avail ourselves of the opportunity.

Television is a powerful and vital medium. It should be so used. In our Nation today live nearly 8 million adult Americans who are illiterate. This is shocking and unnecessary. Adult education programs on television can help us correct this situation.

THE LAND-GRANT TRADITION IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the University of Minnesota—a land-grant college and university—held a formal convocation to celebrate the centenary of the Land Grant Act. The president emeritus of the university, Dr. J. L. Morrill, addressed the convocation; and I think his remarks are worthy of the attention of my colleagues in the Senate. Dr. Morrill is one of the truly great educators and educational administrators. I should also like to point out a fact which has great significance for me. Dr. Morrill states in his address that the author of the Land Grant Act was Justin Smith Morrill, U.S. Senator from Vermont, and that he has always wanted to believe that there is a family relationship, although he has never been able to prove it. Let me simply say that, in my opinion, if Senator Morrill could be with us today, he would be happy to claim relationship to this educator who has done so much for the State of Minnesota and for our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that this significant address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAND-GRANT TRADITION IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

(Land-Grant Centennial Convocation address by J. L. Morrill, president emeritus, University of Minnesota, Apr. 13, 1962, University of Minnesota)

Mr. President, members of the university, regents, faculty and staff, students and alumni, distinguished official guests and friends, ladies and gentlemen, speakers often begin by saying, "It's a pleasure to be here,"

and sometimes you have the feeling that they "say that to all the girls."

In Norway and Sweden some years ago—where any Minnesotan finds warm welcome—I was the special guest at a university dinner. This was not long after the World War when the traditional friendly relations between the two countries were a bit strained. Sweden had escaped the tragedy of the Nazi occupation of Norway, and this made a difference.

When I said goodbye to the rector of the university that night—and I won't say whether it was a Swedish or Norwegian university—he remarked with some feeling: "I'm glad you came to our country first on your visit. You will receive elaborate courtesy when you get to the other country, I'm sure. The difference will be that we mean it."

Well, it is a pleasure for me to be here today—and I do mean it. To stand in this great hall again, among so many with whom I lived and worked, brings a wealth of rewarding remembrance. Like Antaeus of old, to touch again the ground of this campus renews my strength and inspiration.

For here were spent the most important years of my life, associated with others, on and off the several campuses of this great institution, sharing the endeavor to build a university worthy of the confidence, the support and the finest aspirations of the good people of Minnesota.

I envy President Wilson his succession to that responsibility. I share what I know must be your respect for the high intellectual and administrative competence and deep sense of commitment that he brings to it. I congratulate the university upon the good fortune of his leadership.

We celebrate in this convocation the centennial of the congressional enactment 100 years ago of the so-called Land-Grant College Act—an educational emancipation act signed by President Abraham Lincoln, different to be sure from that great man's emancipation of the slaves, yet worthy of comparison with it in its impact on the American destiny.

For it was more than an act. It was an idea—the idea, as Chancellor Deane Malott of Cornell has said, of "the future in the process of being born." Defined in one way it was just the idea that the Federal Government would join hands with the States to establish a system of higher education in this country different from any in the Nation then, or in the world.

The author of the act, its unremitting congressional sponsor—Justin Smith Morrill, U.S. Senator from Vermont—stated his purpose quite simply: "I would have higher learning more widely disseminated," he said. This great university of ours and the 67 other land-grant colleges and universities (at least one in every State) are one result of his aim.

But there were other outcomes. The land-grant idea has penetrated and influenced American higher education, both public and private, in all of our 2,000 colleges and universities. Along with America's invention of the 4-year liberal college, it has been one of this country's two contributions to the whole tradition of higher learning in the Western World.

I wish I could claim to be a direct descendant of Justin S. Morrill. I like to think—but have never been able to prove it—that there is a family relationship because my paternal grandparents came from Massachusetts, where he was born, and from Vermont where from early childhood he lived and worked and died.

He rose to eminence from early New England hardship, the son of a blacksmith, with no formal schooling beyond the age of 14. He was largely self-taught by reading. His youthful yearning for books he never forgot. The great Congressional Library in Washing-

ton today, with its 12 million volumes, is also a monument to his senatorial labors. It was just a national reading room when his persistence converted it to what has now become one of the world's great libraries.

Great men and minds have struggled to conceive, in their time, the meaning and mission of universities. We remember the celebrated Cardinal Newman's book, "The Idea of a University," and his often-quoted statement that "if, then, a practical end must be assigned to a university course, I say it is that of training good members of society."

We recall Thomas Jefferson's letter to George Wythe in 1786 in which he wrote: "I think by far the most important bill in our whole code is the diffusion of knowledge among our people," and his founding of the University of Virginia for which he hoped to be longest remembered.

In his thoughtful book on "The University in a Changing World," Prof. Walter Kutschig wrote many years ago that "the character of a university is determined by the idea of knowledge which it professes to advance, by the type of man it purports to produce, and by the economic, social, and political community in which it finds itself."

This I remembered when I heard President Wilson of this university say to a distinguished group of North and South American educators in Rio de Janeiro last month that national aims and needs should not only control the aims of education but that education must also help to shape these aims as a prime instrument of social change.

This philosophy, let us look back and remember today, was at the heart of the Land-Grant Act of 1862, which provided and I quote, for "the endowment, support and maintenance of at least one college in each State where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific or classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts * * * in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

That was it: the crux of the charter for what has been described as "the most comprehensive system of scientific, technical and practical higher education the world has ever known"—for what former President Frank P. Graham of the University of North Carolina has declared was "one of the most creative developments in the history of democracy in the world."

It broke the mold of higher education in that early day, widening its limits to comprehend not only classical and traditional liberal education, but also the practical purpose of knowledge for use. It brought workaday agriculture and the mechanic arts into the academic environment, gaining dignity and academic acceptance and the methodology of science and scholarship thereby. It added the challenge of useful relevance to a concept of higher education too remote from the needs of the Nation a century ago.

It opened far wider the doors of educational opportunity, not only for men but for women. Its requirement of military training was the forerunner of the ROTC which years later led Gen. George C. Marshall to say that the ROTC program speeded mobilization for World War II by 6 months of precious time. More than half of the officers thus available came from our land-grant campuses.

The Federal endowment, provided in the act, of 30,000 acres of federally owned land to each State for each of its Representatives in Congress, was the touchstone of the enterprise. At the University of Minnesota, this became the nucleus of one of our sources of support which yields only a little more than \$1 million each year toward the multimillion dollar budget of the university. Thus, the 1862 act was the encouraging catalyst for the generous legislative support which, increas-

ing over the years, has built this institution to its present eminence and integrity.

In these days of legislative and taxpayers association debate over the relation of public revenues and public responsibilities, let us remember and revere the vision of the Congress 100 years ago and of the pioneer State legislature of the Minnesota Territory in 1851.

For it was in that year, 1851, that those pioneers in what was then, as Dean Theodore C. Blegen has described it, "a land of lonely lakes and rivers"; that these men—struggling to maintain the barest kind of elementary education—dared to dream of founding a great university which their descendants have brought into being. The institution they founded was designated by the State legislature 16 years later as the Land-Grant College of Minnesota.

And it was the Nation's Representatives in the Congress a century ago, as Mr. Russell I. Thackery, executive secretary of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, has written, who, "in a country torn by internal dissension to the point that its very existence was threatened (by civil war), bankrupt and dependent upon printing press money, had the courage to give away vast areas of the public domain in the faith that the education of young people was a better investment by far than the hope that a huge land speculation might sometime balance the budget."

With what result? What is the measure of the land-grant century?

Who can measure the impact upon society of trained intelligence at work in the myriad pursuits and professions of life, in the advancement of knowledge for use, and the never-ending search for new truths?

The statistics of the moment are these:

Sixty-eight land-grant colleges and universities in 50 States, with 100,000 teachers and researchers and extension workers, and with 600,000 students, one-fifth of the Nation's higher education enrollment.

These institutions confer approximately 105,000 degrees annually in 160 fields of study, granting 22 percent of all bachelor degrees conferred, 25 percent of the masters and 30 percent of the doctorates, with far higher percentages in agriculture, technology, mathematics, and the sciences. Twenty-one of America's living Nobel Prize winners studied in land-grant colleges.

By throwing far wider open the door to educational opportunity these institutions led the way in harvesting the talent and brainpower of the Nation on a scale nowhere matched in the world today.

In one of the papers prepared for the conference at Rio de Janeiro which President Wilson and I attended, this sentence occurred: "No institution can escape its past. And none can escape its present or its obligation to the future."

New occasions teach new duties. Education and the social institutions to carry it forward—the schools and colleges and universities—require reappraisal, reorganization and redirection to meet the challenge of time and change. The Land-Grant Act 100 years ago was itself the result of that requirement.

It was not the colleges of that day which were the inspiration of that reform, it must be said. Most of them, indeed, were hostile to the establishment and support of the land-grant institutions in their States: the cow colleges as they called them. For it is always hard to see outside the system in which we find ourselves.

The early land-grant college, with its special concern for agriculture has long since lost its original identity. It ranges today into almost every realm of knowledge. It has fulfilled the ancient admonition to find itself by losing itself.

But deep in that identity was the determination to pioneer; to break new ground;