

Our colleges and universities have now multiplied their courses and in many cases the training received enables the recipient to command a higher salary as well as to render a greater service to the public. Conditions have altered without shifting the point of view of many who are responsible for the financial policies of education. A large proportion of the public does not as yet see the changed purpose of a higher education. The young man who enters a law school, medical school, school of journalism, or school of business is no longer actuated solely by the philanthropic motive, but hopes to make more money and thus to "cash in" on his investment in his education. Those who hold the view that society collectively owes the coming generations a higher education at a nominal cost are evidently not aware of the changed circumstances. They argue that no cash value can be placed on an education since it is a legacy which we have received from our ancestors, the value of which cannot be estimated. They further hold that since we have received such a legacy, we in turn should pass on a like one to posterity. The trouble here lies in viewing higher education as a whole rather than examining it in the light of the various purposes for which it exists. They do not recognize the three major purposes of all colleges and universities. No institution, faculty of learning or individual course has only one aim or purpose, but rather combines all or part of them in varying ratios depending upon the type of information expounded. Only in proportion as a branch of learning serves each purpose does the present generation owe this education to posterity. It should be recognized that certain forms of training and varying proportions of other training are of primary importance to society and that society should pay for them. There is a failure to allocate costs in proportion to benefits. Higher education is available for a large number of people with a variety of aims. Those who seek it are increasing in number more rapidly than are the financial resources of colleges and universities. The philanthropic sources are far from sufficient to keep pace with the new demands, so that public institutions must be supported by taxation. Under this view the tax burden for higher education will constantly have to be increased or higher education will go bankrupt, unless endowments can be raised to take care of the surplus students. It is obviously unfair that the poorer classes, which are only remotely benefited by some branches of higher education, should bear the burden of its support. If these institutions can show that they are serving all persons, the present state of affairs must not be disturbed. But few of them are able to do this and so the view under discussion is constantly being abandoned by the more progressive elements which are striving to adopt policies that will allocate cost in proportion to benefit. It is not equitable that the young man be educated at the expense of those to whom