

University of California has a significant impact on education as well as influencing socio-political controls of the entire state. A good example of the University's influence on education in California is revealed in the faculty handbook.

The State Education Code designates the University as the primary State supported academic agency for research. The University has exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education over instruction in law and over graduate instruction in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and architecture. It has the exclusive authority in public higher education to award the doctoral degree, except that it may agree with the State Colleges to award joint doctoral degrees in selected fields. The Code provides for the use of the University's libraries and research facilities by qualified members of the faculties of other State educational institutions.

The students, Regents and citizens have various concepts about the function of the University and its educational responsibilities to California residents. In view of these differences it would be informative for all parties concerned to examine the stated purpose as quoted from the faculty handbook.

The function of the University is to seek and to transmit knowledge and to train students in the processes whereby truth is to be known. To convert, or to make converts, is alien and hostile to this dispassionate duty. Where it becomes necessary, in performing this function of a university, to consider political, social, or sectarian movements, they are dissected and examined--not taught, and the conclusion left, with no tipping of the scales, to the logic of the facts.

The University respects personal belief as the private concern of the individual. It equally respects the constitutional rights of the citizen. It insists only that its members, as individuals and as citizens, shall likewise always respect--and not exploit, their University connection.

After examining the function of the University it may be helpful to review the latter structure and the Regents' responsibilities. Under the State Constitution the government of the University resides in a corporation known as the Regents of the University of California, which with full powers of organization and government, is charged with administering the University as a public trust. The board is composed of twenty-four members, sixteen appointed by the Governor who serves as president of the Regents.

As constituted thus far members appointed to the Board of Regents do not represent a cross-section of California residents. Thus far members of the Regents consist primarily of "BIG BUSINESS" executives and representatives of corporate wealth. Several years ago approximately one half of the Regents were officials in 400 of the largest business enterprises in the United States. Yet, the Board should represent the various classes and groups in this state. Students have questioned why the Regents are not more representative of California's population. From the point of view of many students the absence of democratic election of Regent members plus the lack of broad representation of all groups in the state has resulted in the creation of a Board of Regents responsible only to "BIG BUSINESS." This select body has isolated itself from the general population of California. Through closed meetings and apparent indifference to public concern the Regents establish controls which cannot be debated by California citizens (students) before they go into effect. It is paradoxical that the Regents should be allowed to impose controls undemocratically in a tax-supported university in a free society.

However its members are selected, the University Administration should function within legal limits specified by the United States Constitution. The latter stipulates certain democratic rights for all citizens. University students--no less than other Californians--are citizens. Regents of the University of California system must recognize the citizenship of students; it should recognize that students have the same rights as other citizens. It is felt that the University has particular responsibility to California citizens because of the large number of students involved in the educational process and also because of the millions of dollars of taxpayers' money invested in the University. The investment in human and material resources is great. In fact, the student enrollment for the Fall semester 1964-65 was 27,431 in Berkeley and 71,267 total for all the campuses. The budget income for the academic year 1964-65 was \$173,742,113 State funds, \$92,404,533 University funds, gifts and grants (the smallest amount), and \$314,634,153 Federal funds (the largest amount). This is a grand total of \$580,780,799.

As most of you already know, the University of California's campus has been in turmoil since the beginning of the Fall semester 1964. The subtle contradiction between the cross values of affluent Regents, politically appointed, and the democratic ideals of students "seeking that process whereby truth is known" have produced a major confrontation. The Regents expressed their brazen contempt for libertarian views through University administrators. In sum, students charged the administration with infringement of their Constitutional rights and refusal of fair redress procedures for student grievances.

In September 1964, the officials of the Administration ruled that:

1. there should not be solicitation of political party membership
2. there should not be any organizing of political and social action on campus
3. that no funds are to be solicited on campus for such action
4. and that students are not to receive funds to aid projects not directly concerned with an authorized activity of the University.

This inflexible response to legitimate student demands provoked a showdown situation between the administration and the students. The students began testing the rules of the administration by advocating their causes and carrying out regular campus activities. This led to a series of campus demonstrations involving thousands of students driven to defend their legitimate rights. The student drive for political freedom culminated in the Sproul Hall sit-in, and the subsequent mass arrest of approximately 800 participants.

No one of good faith has seriously questioned the legitimacy of student demands. The faculty resolution of December 8th supported their libertarian stance. Though the position of the Regents was clearly tyrannical, they continue to harass students and faculty. The Regents have continued to call for the suppression of civil liberties of students because students lead a civil rights movement which demands of "BIG BUSINESS" that they reform their hiring and firing practices. "BIG BUSINESS," however, replies to these demands by instituting official pressure through lackeys in the Democratic Party. Neither the latter nor "BIG BUSINESS" should run the University of California. In a democratic society, all classes and groups should share in the control of its institutions. In order for the University to establish a broader democratic base for students and create an atmosphere in which administrators and faculty can work in harmony, it will be necessary to effect a change in the composition of the Board of Regents. When analyzing the Regents' policies and power we must be objective but must never lose sight of this incontestable fact: The policies of public institutions must reflect the will of all the people. Only in this way may basic constitutional rights be extended to all citizens whether they are students or non-students! NO STATE UNIVERSITY SHOULD BE EMPOWERED TO DENY STUDENTS THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

With these demands in mind we submit to California citizens the following recommendations for major educational reforms in the University of California. We trust these recommendations will serve to re-establish student morale and to bring harmony and tranquillity to higher education in California:

1. We demand the appointment of Regents from different socioeconomic classes and racial minority groups.
2. We strongly recommend a study be conducted to determine means of electing rather than appointing members to the Board of Regents.
3. We demand reduction in tenure of Regents from 16 to 4 years.
4. We demand all Regents' meetings be open to the public.
5. We demand the publication of a financial statement disclosing all the University's administration assets, investments, real estate, contracts, and other business transactions in order that the public can more readily assess its operations. In this regard, the people should conduct a thorough investigation of Regents' business transactions with the University in order to dispel possibilities of conflict of interest in the areas of real estate, building construction, equipment and supply contracts.

IS THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA A PRIVATE BUSINESS CORPORATION DOMINATED BY THE REGENTS ?

Howard P. Jeter  
Seventh Congressional Democratic Club  
2140 Woolsey Street  
Berkeley 5, California