

UC Split on How to Handle Reagan

BY WILLIAM TROMBLEY
Times Education Writer

University of California regents and administrators are sharply divided over the strategy to employ in dealing with Gov. Reagan.

Interviews with regents, chancellors and other university administrators since last week's puzzling Board of Regents meeting at UCLA indicated the existence of two schools of thought, each with powerful supporters.

One group believes it is necessary to get along with the governor at all costs, that he is gradually moderating his attitude toward UC and in the end he will turn out to be a good friend of the university.

But others believe efforts to get along with Reagan have done nothing but damage the university, that he is unalterably hostile to the institution and no amount of appeasement will change his mind.

Both sides agree that the 14-7 vote against the governor's proposal that the regents "adopt tuition as the policy of the university" was a political defeat for Reagan, but that he regained much of this lost ground when the regents approved a new and undefined student "charge."

Presses Hard for Tuition

During the morning session in the steaming UCLA faculty center last Thursday Reagan pressed hard for tuition as such, insisting it would be "patently unfair" and "hypocrisy" to raise fees instead.

"The first thing that has to be decided is yea or nay on the principle of tuition," the governor stated. "If the vote is nay, I guess the meeting is adjourned."

The vote was nay, decisively so, but the meeting did not adjourn because the governor immediately reversed himself and moved for "a

charge against the students, the specific uses to be determined by the regents."

Details of the face-saving compromise were worked out at lunch by Reagan, aide Lyn Nofziger, Regents Chairman Theodore R. Meyer and board members Edward W. Carter and Edwin W. Pauley. Another participant in the luncheon huddle was H. R. Haldeman, a Reagan political supporter who completed a year as alumni representative on the Board of Regents July 1.

Amount Yet to Be Determined

As finally approved, the compromise resolution called for a student "charge" of unspecified amount, "to finance a program of student aid, faculty enrichment and or other uses," to be determined by a special regents' committee.

Regents who voted no on tuition but yes on the new "charge" were Pauley, DeWitt A. Higgs, William U. Hudson and Laurence J. Kennedy Jr. Meyer and Carter, who abstained on the morning tuition vote, also approved the "charge."

Regents voting in favor of both tuition and increased charges were Reagan, Lt. Gov. Robert H. Finch, State Supt. of Public Instruction Max Rafferty and regents Philip L. Boyd, John E. Canaday, Allan Grant and Mrs. Randolph A. Hearst.

Eight regents were opposed to both tuition and new charges. They were Assembly Speaker Jesse M. Unruh (D-Inglewood), Mrs. Dorothy B. Chandler, William K. Coblenz, Frederick G. Dutton, William E. Forbes, William M. Roth, Norton Simon and Acting President Harry R. Wellman.

Mrs. Edward H. Heller and Einar O. Mohn did not vote at all on the final compromise. Both are opposed to tuition but not necessarily to a

small increase in fees if all the money is used for student financial aid.

Those who believe in a conciliatory approach toward Reagan were happy about the compromise because, as one chancellor said, "The regents avoided slapping the governor in the face a second time."

"Those who oppose this strategy thought the compromise a mistake. "I was utterly revolted by what happened in the afternoon," said another administrator. "All we did was create doubt that the regents know what they stand for and what the university stands for."

The case for conciliation was summed up briefly by one regent: "You can't pick a fight with the governor," he said. "He can hurt you in a hundred ways."

Regent Offers Counter View

The opposing point of view was stated by another regent: "Even making one's bow to the absolute necessity of getting along with the governor, I don't think you can allow him to use the university as a personal political arena."

The conciliators argue that Reagan will soften his harsh stand toward UC because he wants to run for President or Vice President in 1968.

"He recognizes that he erred," a member of this school of thought said. "In the budget fight he

Please Turn to Page 6, Col. 1

UC Regents Split Over Attitude Toward Reagan

Continued from First Page

acquired an anti-academic look that was hurting him in terms of his national ambitions.

"Reagan was pretty heady when he came in," this regent continued. "He found out that complaints about Berkeley were a good campaign issue and he rode that pretty hard. But it seems to me progressively this is disappearing."

The "you've got to get along with the governor" camp cites this evidence of a Reagan change of mind:

1—He has not pressed his campaign promise to conduct a full-scale investigation of university affairs.

2 — Reagan's tuition proposal, which began as a revenue-producing measure, ended up as a plan to provide more student financial aid.

3—The governor supported restoration of the agreement calling for the university and the state to share equally the millions of dollars generated annually by UC's administration of federal research contracts.

Equal Division Restored

The regents agreed to turn over all of these funds for 1967-68 and the Legislature voted to make this a permanent policy. However, with Reagan's support, the 50-50 agreement apparently has been restored.

Further, the conciliators add, the governor's "general attitude" is better. "He doesn't go around any more making cracks about the university 'subsidizing intellectual curiosity,'" said one regent. "Reagan is beginning to have some pride in this university and I believe he'll turn out to be a real friend."

But others think not. They point out that the regents made an important concession to the governor by



Gov. Reagan

reducing their 1967-68 spending plans by some \$23 million and by turning over another \$20 million in regents' funds for 1967-68 use. They say Reagan's feelings were also an important factor in the January decision to fire President Clark Kerr.

"All of this has gained us nothing," said one critic. "The natural consequence of this policy is to give the governor everything. If that's it, why don't we just ask the governor what he wants from the university and start from there?"

Credit Given to Legislators

Followers of this school of thought say Reagan has not called off his proposed UC investigation, though it is temporarily in abeyance. They say he modified his tuition proposal only when it became apparent the regents would not even consider the plan unless it contained substantial assistance for student financial aid.

They say legislators, in particular State Sen. George Miller Jr. (D-Martinez), were more responsible than Reagan for restoring the 50-50 agreement on federal overhead funds.

Although Reagan has met informally with regents and chancellors a number of times in recent months, "he is no more comfortable with us than he was when he was elected," said one participant in several of these meetings, "and he certainly is not comfortable on our campuses."

Although the conciliatory strategy prevailed again at last week's meeting, the number of regents opposed to this approach increased substantially.

In February only a handful fought the \$23 million budget concession, but last week 10 regents voted for a key motion by Regent Chandler to refer the entire matter of student fees to a regent study committee. Eleven regents voted against the motion and two abstained.

These 10 regents are, in one degree or another, opposed to the strategy of conciliation, whose most enthusiastic champion is Regent Carter. They are, in addition to Mrs. Chandler, regents Coblenz, Dutton,

Forbes, Mrs. Heller, Mohn, Roth, Simon, Speaker Unruh and Acting President Wellman.

"I think Ed Carter is going to have to produce more of a quid pro quo pretty soon," said one of them, "something more than 'I think the governor is coming around.'"

The critical test of the Carter strategy will be the governor's handling of the university's 1968-69 budget request.

A request for state support of about \$305 million—about \$75 million more than the state supplied this year—will be presented for regental study at the next board meeting Sept. 20-21 at UCLA and is expected to be acted on one month later.

This budget will be constructed from a workload base of \$264 million, not the \$251 million the university finally was granted for 1967-68. It will include additional money for an expected enrollment increase, for new and improved programs and for projects deferred in 1967-68.

Gov. Reagan will not present his 1968-69 budget until next January, but there should be indications before then of how large an appropriation he will support for UC.

"If Reagan comes up with a reasonable budget for faculty salaries, for a strong library program, for solid support of the university's organized research activities, then I would say the Carter strategy has been justified," said one chancellor. "If he doesn't, then Carter and everybody else will have to say, 'all bets are off,' and the cooperative spirit will come to an end."

Other regents and administrators are troubled by this "pragmatic" approach.

Start Emphasizing Principles

"Every time we play the role of politician we get clobbered," said another chancellor. "We had better start telling people what the university stands for, not what we think the governor wants to hear."

An administrator who has had experience at other state universities said about last week's session, "I have never before attended a meeting where people argued basic educational policy questions in terms of what would be acceptable to the governor."

He said Reagan's proposal that some of the student "charge" money be used to hire professors who would concentrate on undergraduate teaching instead of research, was "a fundamental change in the philosophy of this university" and that many regents had made up their minds not on the basis of the important educational question involved, but on the basis of the governor's personal reaction.

"Our dim reading of Reagan's wishes cannot possibly be the basis for university policy," this man stated.

A veteran regent said the board has become "completely politicized" since Reagan took office.

"Perhaps it has not been intentional, but the university has been thrown completely into the political arena," the regent said.

"The governor is popular, he comes to all the meetings, he becomes the focal point and everything that is said gets picked up and put into a political context."

The situation is aggravated, in the opinion of this regent, "because we do not have a strong president of the university nor a strong chairman of the board."

Acting President Wellman has chosen to play a noncontroversial role since he took over from Kerr. Board Chairman Meyer tries to remain neutral on controversial issues, searching for regent consensus, though his rulings from the chair have, in the opinion of some, tended to favor the governor and his supporters on the board.

Politicians Take Leadership

"With the president and the chairman defaulting their leadership, it has been taken over by the politicians and particularly the governor," the regents said.

The intense politicalization of the board in recent months has caused a few regents to question the wisdom of having politicians on the board as ex-officio members.

The governor, lieutenant governor, state superintendent of public instruction and Assembly speaker are ex-officio members, along with the president of the State Board of Agriculture (Grant), the president of San Francisco Mechanics Institute (Meyer), the president of the university and the president of either the UC Berkeley or the UCLA alumni association (formerly Halde-man, now Hudson).

The regents' only real hope to escape from an endless series of bitter and frustrating political encounters would appear to be to follow the advice of one regent and "get a strong president and get out of his way and let him run the university."

But performances like the "triumph of ambiguity," as one administrator called the compromise reached at UCLA last week, make it more difficult to find such a man.