

## University of California: Political and Financial Woes

By most of the traditional indices of academic excellence, the University of California remains firmly entrenched as the outstanding public system of higher education in the country. Despite years of internal disruption and external attacks, the university has continued to grow and prosper—thus giving the lie to the numerous premature obituaries which have been cranked out in recent years by overeager journalists. In a speech to the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco last 29 May, University President Charles J. Hitch ticked off the evidence that the university has not yet gone into a serious decline because of campus unrest. In the 5-year period following the eruption of the Free Speech Movement in 1964-65, he said, the university system launched three entirely new general campuses, established three new medical schools, boosted its instructional staff from 6700 to 9100 ("a staggering record of recruitment and retention in a period of sharp competition"), and received a steady increase in private gifts and endowments. Nor is there evidence of a deterioration in quality, Hitch said. The nine-campus university system still boasts record numbers of Nobel Prize winners, National Academy of Sciences members, National Merit Scholars, and Woodrow Wilson Fellowship winners, and it even claims to be "the nation's outstanding producer of Peace Corps members." Hitch expressed a belief that the university's Berkeley campus remains "the best balanced distinguished university in the country"—an accolade that was bestowed on Berkeley in 1966 by a study conducted by the American Council on Education.

### Threatened with Mediocrity?

Yet as the fall term approaches there is again apprehension that the university may be heading for a serious decline. Writing in the July-August issue of *Change* magazine, Steven V. Roberts, Los Angeles bureau chief of the *New York Times*, states bluntly that "California's system of higher education, once a model of excellence, is threatened with mediocrity." And even

President Hitch, when he is not trying to stress the upbeat, acknowledges that the university is "in serious trouble." In a speech to the Academic Senate last 15 June, Hitch warned that "the people of California, who have historically been proud of the university and willing to support it generously with public funds, are increasingly critical of the university and skeptical or even hostile about providing the funds the university needs to do its job properly." Hitch said it is "essential" that faculty members "must come to realize, far more clearly and forcefully than they now do, the intensity of public displeasure with the university. . . . Those who think it is confined to a small cabal of reactionary politicians are deluding themselves."

The extent of public displeasure is evidenced by the fact that the last two attempts to win referendum approval for bond issues to finance university construction were defeated even though the second bond issue was deliberately limited to health facilities in hopes that the public's fondness for improved medical care would overcome its antipathy to the university and to increased taxes. Similarly, the state legislature, in a move that was rather openly punitive, refused this year to grant a proposed 5 percent pay increase to faculty members at the university and at the state colleges while approving such an increase for other state employees. The legislature also sharply cut the budget of the university's Academic Senate.

The chief threat to the university is posed either by radicals from within or by reactionaries from without, depending on your point of view. Those who see the chief threat coming from the Right generally point to Governor Reagan and the Reagan-dominated board of regents as the prime villains, with the Republican-dominated legislature a close contender. Reagan was first elected in 1966 on a promise to "clean up the mess at Berkeley" and he has since seldom failed to seek political mileage by attacking the "kooks, Beatniks and radicals" on campus and the allegedly weak-kneed administrators and faculty who tolerate their antics.

At one point Reagan even publicly suggested that a "bloodbath" might be needed to quell student dissidents, though he later retracted the statement.

Reagan is accused not only of inflaming public attitudes against the university, but also of attempting to subject the university to political control from the Right. The governor is an ex officio member of the university's 24-man board of regents and while he does not always get his way at board meetings, he has made enough personal appointments to the board to bring the board close to his way of thinking. There is a widespread feeling among faculty and administrators that the board's role has shifted under the Reagan administration. Whereas the board was once considered a buffer that protected the university against attacks from unfriendly politicians, now the board seems to be in the vanguard of those who want to bring the university under greater control.

### Meddling in Personnel Matters

The regents have increasingly concerned themselves with detailed administrative matters on the university's nine campuses, thus undercutting the appointed administrators and causing fear and anger in the campus community. One of the regents' pet peeves is the alleged failure of administrators to curb dissemination of pornography and of extreme left-wing political views in student newspapers. But the actions of the regents that have caused the greatest concern involve interference in the promotion and appointment of faculty members. Reagan and some of the conservative regents have long complained that the university faculty is unbalanced toward the left. At a regents meeting last March Reagan even charged that some conservative faculty members have been forced to quit because of pressure from their leftist colleagues. Reagan also claimed there are cases of students who were failing until they began to write papers "from the viewpoint of a left-wing radical and then they went to a B average." Now, in what appears to some worried campus observers as an effort to insert their own bias into the appointment process, the regents have intervened directly in a number of personnel cases.

Over the past 2 years the regents have fought the reappointment of Herbert Marcuse, the New Left philosopher, to the faculty at the San Diego campus; have ruled that academic credit

could not be given for an experimental course at Berkeley in which Eldridge Cleaver, the Black Panther leader, gave guest lectures; and have refused to reappoint Angela Davis, a black activist and an avowed Communist, as an acting assistant professor of philosophy at UCLA despite strong support for Miss Davis from UCLA campus and administration. (The Davis case, which is being fought in the courts, has been clouded by the fact that she is now on the FBI's Ten Most Wanted List because of an alleged involvement in a courthouse shootout in San Rafael, California, on 7 August.)

#### Resumption of Tenure Authority

Even more significant than the merits or demerits of any particular personnel matter has been the willingness of the regents to assume an active role in hiring and firing. To discharge Miss Davis, the regents had to assume final authority over the case from the office of the UCLA chancellor where it normally would have been handled. And last year, in the wake of the Marcuse controversy, the regents took back authority they had previously delegated over tenure appointments and promotions. Thus far the regents do not seem to have blocked any tenure appointment recommended by the administration, but that such action is a strong possibility became apparent at the last regents' meeting in July. The regents temporarily blocked the promotions of two left-leaning faculty members (David B. Kaplan, an associate professor of philosophy at UCLA, who had strongly supported Angela Davis, and Reginald E. Zelnick, assistant professor of history at Berkeley, a leader in the Free Speech Movement) while recommending a bigger-than-asked-for pay raise for Edward Teller, the "father of the H-Bomb," and discussing the possibility of granting an unsolicited pay raise to Hardin Jones, assistant director of the Donner Laboratory on the Berkeley campus and an outspoken campus conservative.

The regents who engineered the temporary blocking of the promotions of Kaplan and Zelnick, according to press reports, were John H. Lawrence, retired head of the Donner Laboratory, and W. Glenn Campbell, director of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University—both Reagan appointees. They are said to have been joined in their objections by Mrs. Catherine Hearst, of the Hearst publishing empire. Campbell, in a press interview, later insisted

he did not act out of political motives though he added that he has long felt there was a need for "balancing the faculty" by bringing in more conservative professors. Lawrence, in a prepared statement, said he had merely requested further information to determine whether the "extensive political activity" of one of the candidates (presumably Zelnick) had adversely affected his teaching and research performance. Lawrence affirmed his belief that the regents "should not consider political point-of-view in their appointments" and said he was merely seeking information about "academic performance." As it turned out, both Lawrence and Campbell later reportedly withdrew their objections, and Kaplan was advanced to full professor while Zelnick was granted tenure as an associate professor.

Lawrence, meanwhile, has denied charges that the large raise given Teller and the raise proposed for Jones were motivated by "friendship and political views." Lawrence says Teller's salary (reportedly \$34,000) is justified by merit and by comparison with the remuneration given other faculty members of comparable seniority and achievement—a view with which the majority of the regents and many university administrators concur. And Lawrence contends that his close colleague Jones is "long overdue" for a raise because "he has been recommended with good reason for advancement through regular channels for many years" but "those recommendations have been consistently denied."

Is all this meddling in appointment matters an ominous sign? Some campus administrators take an optimistic view and think not. They regard the Cleaver and Davis cases as aberrations and note that Kaplan and Zelnick were not, in fact, denied tenure. "The regents are dealing with appointments in a more detailed way than they have in the past," one administrator told *Science*, "but only in very isolated instances. If they continue to meddle they might impair the quality of the faculty, but you can rationalize that what they've done so far has not had great influence." Another administrator suggested it was unusual for the regents to delegate authority over tenured appointments in the first place, so taking back the authority was "not really abnormal." "What matters is how they exercise their power," this administrator said. "They haven't refused to accept a recommendation on a tenured

appointment that I can recall." Still, in the eyes of many observers, some regents have clearly shown a desire to punish leftists and reward rightists. San Francisco attorney William Coblenz, one of the small band of liberal regents, regards the regents' resumption of appointment powers as a "Damoclean sword" hanging over the university. "The power is going to be exercised," he predicts.

Another major threat to the continued excellence of the university is financial. To hear the Reagan administration tell it, the university has been treated with reasonable generosity. A statement issued by the governor's office says that while the administration has cut some budget requests submitted by the university, it has increased the actual dollar support granted each year, and has boosted per-pupil expenditures above the level of the previous Democratic administration. Over the past 4 fiscal years, the state's contribution to the university's operating fund has gone up almost \$100 million—an increase of 40.8 percent—compared with an enrollment increase of only 25.9 percent. The increases have been substantial but are still far below what the university has asked for. For 1970–71 the state contribution to operating funds will be \$330.3 million, a slight boost over the previous year's figure of \$329.7 million. President Hitch has described the new operating budget as "austere" but "manageable."

#### Capital Budget Depleted

The major financial concern stems from the lack of construction funds. When the university's budget ultimately emerged from successive parings by the governor and the legislature this year, according to Hitch, "the capital budget was cut almost beyond recognition." The university regents had originally requested almost \$83 million in state funds for capital construction but the university ended up getting only \$11.8 million, of which \$9 million consisted of reversions from previous appropriations, leaving a net gain of only \$2.8 million in new money. Hitch also said the legislature's decision to eliminate a proposed faculty salary increase would damage the university's competitive position in the academic marketplace.

Many left-leaning faculty members view the budget stringencies as further evidence of a determination by the Reagan administration and the state legislature to "punish" the university. But, except for the legislature's obvi-

ously vindictive decision to eliminate a pay raise and to cut the budget of the Academic Senate, this seems to be an overly paranoid interpretation. As one campus administrator told *Science*: "The Reagan administration has made budget cuts in everything. It's not easy to prove that the university has been singled out for discriminatory treatment."

#### University Blamed for Own Woes

Although campus liberals regard Reagan as the biggest threat to the continued excellence of the university, the Reagan administration itself claims the major threat comes from the university's failure to police its own ranks and uphold its standards. This was the view expressed in an interview with *Science* by Alex C. Sherriffs, a former vice-chancellor at Berkeley who is now the governor's chief educational adviser and who is almost as unpopular as the governor in campus leftist circles. Sherriffs was particularly harsh in denouncing abuses that took place at Berkeley and other campuses when courses were "reconstituted" during the period following the Cambodian invasion. "The minute my colleagues use the classroom to push their own biases and give grades for services rendered to their own particular beliefs, the minute they give 46 credits to one student in one quarter [15 is usual], the minute they start saying, 'This system is so lousy I'm going to give you all A's or let you grade yourselves because it doesn't matter anyway,' the net result is that we lose academic freedom and the

university deteriorates," Sherriffs says.

As Sherriffs sees it, Reagan is not inflaming public opinion against the university but is actually protecting the university from vigilante attacks by an increasingly hostile public. Sherriffs says that in a 10-day period during the Eldridge Cleaver controversy the governor got 77,000 letters, overwhelmingly in favor of his position, but most of the letters were reasonable in tone. Then when the Angela Davis case came up, he says, a tone of impatience crept into the letters, and when radicals burned down a bank in Santa Barbara, "suddenly people started talking about taking the law into their own hands—that's what worries me." Sherriffs suggested that if the public didn't regard Reagan's attitude toward the university as "tough," they would have moved against the university some time ago. Sherriffs also claimed the administration gets about 100 letters a week from faculty members, many of them saying, "We don't agree with you, Governor, but you're the only one who can save us from this idiocy."

Sherriffs insisted that the popular image of Reagan as anti-intellectual is false. He said Reagan had appointed more Ph.D.'s to the board of regents than any other governor and had provided "a larger dollar increase to higher education than previous governors." Although it is true that the university hasn't gotten all the money it asked for, Sherriffs said, this is partly because "the university upped its requests when they saw Reagan coming."

As the fall term approaches, univer-

sity administrators are devising plans—certain to be controversial—to curb possible academic abuses and lessen some of the faculty's power in hopes this will give the administration greater control over the campuses and thus ward off attacks from the regents and politicians. The mood on the campuses seems filled with distrust. President Hitch and other administrators are suspected by the regents of being apologists for the faculty, and suspected by the faculty of being lackeys of the regents. Roger Heyns, chancellor of the Berkeley campus, is back at work after suffering a mild heart attack, but he is said to have been marked for purging by some of the conservative regents. The Los Angeles *Times* even reported that Reagan himself sharply criticized Heyns and other campus heads and discussed the possibility of ousting them at a "secret meeting" last June with about 30 conservative faculty members.

Where it will all end nobody knows. Institutions have a way of surviving indefinitely, so it is premature to count the university out at this point. Optimists believe a solid majority of the regents, faculty, and administration are sincerely interested in maintaining the university's preeminence and they suggest that good will ultimately prevail. But regent Coblenz is not so sure. "I'm not very sanguine about it," he says. "The university is caught in an economic and political pinch. There has been no appreciable drop in quality yet, but the sands are drifting out."

—PHILIP M. BOFFEY

## Campus Unrest: Which Tack for President's Commission?

The President's Commission on Campus Unrest was created by President Nixon on 13 June, after the slayings of students at Kent State University in Ohio and Jackson State College in Mississippi. It was the latest in a long line of study groups, stretching back to the Johnson Administration, which were charged with examining campus disorders. With almost unvarying consistency, however, the reports presented by these groups have been ignored by

the White House. There is little reason to believe that the fate of the Commission's report, scheduled to be completed by mid-September, will be different.

The President does not lack recommendations about what he can do to curb campus disorder. Time and again he has been told what to do: end the war in Vietnam, ask Vice President Agnew to restrain his speech, show some concern for people, especially

black, poor, and student people. The two most recent reports that contained these recommendations were issued last June. One was by Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, and the other by James Cheek, president of Howard University. It has been reported that these studies met with an icy reception at the White House. Nixon and his advisers were reportedly furious because the reports placed so much blame for student unrest on the Administration and so little on students.

Yet the main cause of campus unrest does, indeed, lie with Mr. Nixon. His decision to invade neutral Cambodia triggered campus violence across the country and led to the deaths of the students at Kent and Jackson State. His law and order rhetoric has given some