

Governor Scott Endorses Heard Report

Editor's Note: Following is a half-hour interview with Governor Robert Scott. The interview took place in Scott's Raleigh office in late August.

The Daily Tar Heel's Managing Editor Rod Waldorf conducted the exclusive interview, the first granted the paper by a North Carolina governor while still in office.

The interview, which is printed in its entirety, covered a wide range of topics from student dissent to the Umstead Act.

Scott, who was elected governor in 1968 after serving four years as Dan K. Moore's lieutenant governor, comments on the prospects for this fall on state's campuses and predicts that if there is any trouble it will be in the high schools.

UNC Student Body President Tom Bello and NCSU's Cathy Sterling both took strong action on their campuses last spring in protest of the Cambodian invasion, and Scott agrees with their action.

The governor also endorses the findings of Dr. Alexander Heard in his report on student unrest which the Nixon administration rejected earlier in the summer.

Also in the interview, Scott comments publicly for the first time on the actual process followed when trouble arises on a college campus, saying the National Guard will always be sent in only if the State Highway Patrol does not have the necessary manpower.

He also says that if the Guard is sent onto a campus they will not load their weapons until ordered to do so by their commanding officer.

DTH: How do you feel about the coming year in light of what happened last spring with the incident at Kent State and the reactions on the State and Chapel Hill campuses and how do you think that will affect North Carolina colleges in general?

SCOTT: Well, first of all, I guess I'm kind of an optimist, and I remain that way as far as any kind of disruption in any of our school systems, in our high schools, our universities or colleges.

I, at this point, have no reason to be apprehensive about any disruption at any level of our educational system. On the other hand, one never knows when something might come along to cause some type of violence, or, certainly, a disruption of normal activity in any of these institutions of learning.

I cite, as a good example, what happened last year at Kent State. Here we were going along fairly well in our state with no real problems.

All of a sudden something happened in another area of the country over which we had absolutely no control and nothing to do with, and it caused problems here as it did in other sections of the country, or course.

So to say that we don't anticipate anything happening; that's true, we don't anticipate it, but who knows when it might occur?

I find that there doesn't seem to be the tension in the air that there was the year before last, spring before last I should say. I noticed this as I went

around to the various schools for commencement exercises this year, this past spring. The air was much more relaxed. There was no hostility to me or to other officials and more like you kind of think of graduation exercises as being, you know, a time for happiness and a time for everybody enjoying themselves.

The year before, of course, we had the problems on the campuses at A & T (State University in Greensboro) and the University, and generally over the state, and there was a great deal of tension; you could sense it and feel it.

So hopefully, the situation we had this past spring will carry forward into the coming year. I will go one step further and say that I feel that if there are problems to develop, that they are most likely to occur in the high schools.

And the reason for this is the uprooting of many of our school children from their traditional neighborhood schools and moving them into new schools where they are thrown together, not with so much people of another race, but other students whom they have fought tooth and toenail, perhaps in athletic programs, you know, and here all of a sudden they are in class. And the learning environment is not very good in many of our high schools because of this transferring of students.

So, initially, particularly in the fall, this would be true there (the high schools) until they got accustomed to each other and kind of settled down.

The pattern, in looking back, in our colleges and universities, seems to be that their problems come in the spring. I guess the old pantie raid which always occurred in the spring is being supplanted now by concerns for their fellow man, and they express these concerns in rather active ways.

DTH: What exactly is your personal reaction to the situation last spring where the student body presidents on two of the major campuses of the Consolidated University called for a total student boycott of classes and where thousands of students rallied on the campuses during the daytime and so forth?

SCOTT: Well, I look upon a student body president as being a political figure. He got elected to his office, and if he's going to remain popular he's got to do the things students want him to do. And he's got to make a show of force and say things and take leadership.

Maybe they did it for expediency. Maybe it was a good way to drain off the emotionalism, and the strong deep feeling that the students had which had not been able to express itself in some way, say in a boycott, could lead to things far worse. A good student leader would recognize this and say to himself or in consultation with other student leaders, "Maybe this is the best way to handle it in view of the situation."

It's hard for me sitting here to judge what might happen there. This is the way I would like to think that they are thinking... believe that they are thinking, that they honestly feel that this is the best way to handle their particular crisis. And rather than the student leaders taking the initiative to call for a boycott when the situation really was not that

volatile on the campus and indeed adding fuel to the fire instead of trying to keep it cool.

I don't know personally all the student campus leaders in the state, but many of them I have met and talked with them, and by and large I've been impressed with them. I think they're sincere people who recognize their responsibilities of leadership, and they know that there's a certain amount of responsibility on them, not only from the students themselves, but indeed from the public that is looking at them.

And the public looks at them and is saying, "What are these student leaders saying? Is this the institution we are supporting in our alumni giving and in our tax dollars? What are they doing over there?" And a good student leader will recognize this factor, too.

Again I choose to think or believe, that most of them are doing this out of what they consider the vest for the institution.

DTH: Along this same type of thinking, the student body president at Chapel Hill, Tommy Bello, and the student body president at State, Cathy Sterling, are compared to their predecessors, rather unusual individuals to hold that office—they are active, they are doing something. Be it controversial or not, they are not the laissez-faire type of student body president we have had in the past. What kind of feelings do you have towards this and towards a president that might induce to use a bad word—incite the student body? I'm not necessarily implying violence or demonstrations or anything else, but a student body president that just doesn't sit in the office and dig the title. If you know what I mean.

SCOTT: I'm a hundred per cent behind this type of individual. I like to think of similar characteristics in people in government. If a man's going to hold an office and do a job, he ought to be a little innovative and have some new approaches. Otherwise you don't have a lot of progress, you just try to do the old things a little better. So it is, I suppose in a position as president of the student body, that a person who can give imaginative leadership is a person that, I think, is a true leader.

I guess a person also has to watch that he doesn't get too far out in front and lose his followers, you know this can happen, particularly in politics.

Incidentally...if you have occasion to read the foreword to Theodore White's book, "The Making of the President," he compared the leader with the wagonmaster in a wagon train going across the west. That's always been a very striking example to me. But getting back to the point, I feel that this should be the case, and I feel students will follow somebody like that more, and then when the time of crisis does come, the student body president, because he is an activist, so to speak, will be able to wield more influence and say, "No, we mustn't go the route of violence. We can express our concerns through this means."

And I think a lot of our people in this state, and harking back to the Kent State time, situation, don't realize, really, the contributions to keeping it cool given by these two student presidents. I really think that. Some of us who've had reason to work with it recognize what they did.

DTH: What kind of alternative, or would you offer an alternative, to the demonstration tactic of expressing concern. It's kind of gotten to be a fad now. Ten years ago, in 1960, the demonstration had a lot of effect, but now it's gotten rather old. And, although it is the easiest non-violent thing to do, what suggestions would you make to people like Miss Sterling and Tommy Bello, who indeed are in some sort of an authoritative position to handle something like this rather than a self-appointed activist leader? What type of activity would you suggest that they pursue to express their concern this way?

SCOTT: I don't have an answer to that question. I haven't really given it any thought, and therefore, I really don't have an answer to that right at the moment.

DTH: The biggest reason I asked is because a lot of people — citizens, taxpayers, you know, say, "Those students are in the streets again. Why aren't they in school?" kind of thing. And being up there (at UNC) there are many occasions when we've gone to the streets, speaking as a student, and I totally disagree, I couldn't see any point to it. It was just another street thing, you know, whereas, there were some times when I felt strongly.

SCOTT: Well, you're right the impact of demonstrations as a means of protest has worn...well, it doesn't have an impact, the impact is much less than it used to be. It doesn't have a shock effect. In fact, I guess the public generally when something comes along, they say, "Well, we can expect another demonstration." As long as it doesn't get violent or out of hand, they don't get too upset about it. It's just another factor to deal with today. So I wish I could give a suggestion or two, but really I haven't given it any thought, and I'm not prepared to answer that question.

*** This is very much an opinion thing. Dr. Alexander Heard has given his report to the President after serving as the advisor on campus unrest during this spring, and the White House received it very coolly. And Dr. Heard cited such things as governmental policy and a

misarrangement of priorities and so forth, as the primary motivation for campus unrest, and President Nixon disagrees and says that it is the usual administrative-student tension of lack of communications. This was the kind of thing that he felt had at least as much if not more to do with the student frustration.

Here in this state, and especially with the Consolidated University, what do you think is perhaps the prime motivation (for student unrest) just from your observations?

SCOTT: I would have to, as far as North Carolina is concerned, agree generally with Dr. Heard, that is, if we are to believe what the students are saying. The student leaders I've talked with tell me, you know that...when you ask why, they cite many of the things Dr. Heard has in his report — the order of priorities, the domestic problems, the war, all these things, you know, and they're concerned that the administrations — and I think this is not necessarily political. It would be true under Johnson and now Nixon, or whoever the next fellow may be — and the failure to be able to resolve these things satisfactorily and rather quickly. And so, because of this, they demonstrate and other forms of protest.

All right, perhaps, I think the student-administration communications gap, or student-government

understanding of what is expected of them and how far they can go and so forth. The president of the University does, and we know what we expect of them.

Because, going back to 1969, because there was not this understanding, then my office almost had to take a direct hand and say, "You must do so and so because..." And I don't much blame them (the University administration).

They didn't want to do things that they were not sure where they had the authority to do it or not, so we had to be a little firm from this end. Hopefully, this will not be necessary in the future. The chancellors will say, "All right, we will take it one step further." This is for a novel violation, and so forth.

Let's suppose that things got so bad that there was the occupation of a building or the actual disruption of a classroom and it got beyond the capabilities of the chancellor to cope with it through the mechanism we've established.

Then our procedure is that we, upon the request of the... Well, first of all, the chancellor works with his campus security people and the... in the case of Chapel Hill, the Chapel Hill police, in the case of Raleigh, the Raleigh police... in working with them for additional security forces.

Then if that's apparently not enough

actually on the campus and there was a problem in the cafeteria. And the state legislature being in session, they were all there where they could talk about it. And so they had a situation where, you know, that they actually voted on the budget about that time and it wasn't too good, quite frankly.

Now this spring in 1970, the Kent State situation, here the students were expressing a form of protest for the most part off-campus. And I think a whole lot of them watched it to see what happened. In fact, it was orderly. They marched to the capitol to express their concern. I think that most everybody agrees that this is a legitimate form of protest. Now to be honest about it, I haven't talked to enough of them to really know but I would guess that they didn't worry too much about what happened this past spring — that type of situation — because I believe everybody, any enlightened individual in this day and time abhorred what happened at Kent State. It was a tragedy any way you tell it. And certainly they get upset about it.

Some may have questions. You know, why did they come to the Capitol when it happened at Kent State? But I knew why, of course. Many of them were concerned and didn't like it when I sent the telegram to the President, do you see... on

The Daily Tar Heel

Section C September 15, 1970 Editorials And Commentary

communications gap is almost a secondary effect of this. Because the students are expressing their concern over the world situation and the domestic situation and so forth, then they express their concerns through demonstrations. Then we see that there is a gap in trying to cope with it. I believe students, when they say why they are out; they're not out there demonstrating because there's a failure in communications between the government and the students or between the administration and students. Once they're out there demonstrating they find this is true and there is that problem to be dealt with, but that's not the reason why, in my opinion. So I would have to side with Dr. Heard, frankly.

DTH: Harking back again to Kent State, what can and would you do as governor of this state to avoid violence on a campus — if it looks, you see, it's right on the fence — short of answering violence with violence? Such as using the National Guard or the state patrol with their helmets and billy clubs?

SCOTT: What can be done? Hopefully, we have improved our line of responsibility and who's to do what in situations of tension and unrest. Let me go back and background this just a moment.

When we had the problems of unrest on the campuses in the spring of 1969, which was during my first year in office, the problems were acute, and there was violence. To be honest about it, the state had not had to deal with this kind of situation before. We had nothing, no experience, on which to decide how best to handle the situation. It was a new ballgame with the state, obviously new to me because I'd just been in office, but also new to the people who had been around before. I had been there. I'm talking about the career people in the state government. It was new to the administration at the University, and no longer were we a quiet, southern university campus, you know, and so forth, with everything going along nicely. So everybody was uptight. This office was. The administration at Chapel Hill; students, faculty. Everybody was uptight about the whole deal.

And nobody knew exactly whose responsibility was what. There had been no clear set procedures outlined in how to deal with this situation.

All right, so by trial and error, we took several steps, and, of course, history has shown us what happened. I don't think that we made any mistakes in light of the situation at that time and what we knew at that time. There were some awfully unfortunate things that happened, and I am talking primarily about the A&T campus situation, which really got rough.

The tension got real tight at the University campus, but it was more or less a confrontation without any actual physical violence occurring.

All right, since that time, as I say, and in a more calm atmosphere, there has been a lot of discussion among the University Trustees, this office and the University administration about what ought to be done.

"What if...?" You know. And so this is what the debate has been all about, about this new disruptions policy of the Trustees. We have had some student input. We have had faculty input. We have had administration input. And the Trustees themselves have reviewed all of this.

to handle it, in terms of manpower in keeping down the violence itself or it's getting kind of mean, then we, being a state-supported institution, we're of course, working real close with them, agree that the state patrol will be sent in.

The highway patrol is always sent in first because these men are full-time officers. They are trained. They have... in other words, they are more mature. They are not likely to get excited under a tense situation. And normally, 99 per cent of the time, they take care of any problems. There is just no need for going any further. Then if, just by sheer numbers the highway patrol, and they're limited in numbers, are not able to control crowds then we would send in the National Guard.

Now our policy is that, as far as the National Guard is concerned, the men are issued live ammunition, but they do not have this ammunition in their weapons. And they only put it in their weapon upon the command of their unit field commander who is there at the time and knows what the situation may call for. And we, through the adjutant general, who heads the National Guard, urge every restraint possible. They don't just go in automatically with loaded weapons.

DTH: When you said that you would send in the highway patrol first because they were more mature, more experienced and much better trained, and are not likely to get nervous or excited or anything else in a tense situation, then this to imply that the National Guard, being younger people, part-time people, might indeed cause the same type of fault and this is the same kind of thing that we are trying to avoid, in other words?

SCOTT: Yes, this is my personal view because I know many of these boys. They are college age students themselves, many of them. They are citizen soldiers. They train every other week on weekends. I believe it is. And of course, they are getting more experience along this line, not but...

DTH: It's not like an every day contact...

SCOTT: That's right.

DTH: There's not contact — people working with people.

SCOTT: Well, you've got a highway patrolman out here who's 40 years old, 45 years old, he may have a son or daughter this age. In other words, he might have one over there on the campus somewhere. And these men are professionals and they're not to be going off half-cocked. And not only that, if their commanding officer tells them not to do something, they're not going to do it.

DTH: How do you think the activity last spring struck the state legislature?

SCOTT: In '69?

DTH: Well, no. In '70. The aftermath of the Kent State thing.

SCOTT: Well, I would say they weren't too happy in 1969 because it was a more violent type of protest. They were

Vietnam, not the Kent State thing, but it all happened about the same time.

DTH: Do you think that the state legislature will react in any way such as, you know, a reduction of funds?

SCOTT: No, no. I don't believe this. I think that our legislators, while some of the violence itself is distasteful and they don't like it, their reaction would take form in stricter legislation with respect to the conduct of students and what can or cannot be done and admission requirements rather than funds to the University. Because all of us know the needs of the University. They are bigger than this. They aren't going to penalize the University because of it. I am convinced of that.

DTH: Just one more question. The Umstead Act is becoming more and more of a problem as far as the students are concerned, such as the Student Stores on campus at Chapel Hill for example, have to meet the prices in Chapel Hill, according to the act. Therefore, it doesn't do any good to have a student store because they can't get anything cheaper there than in Chapel Hill. Do you see this as a problem with students, as something that is not in the best interest of the students, and do you foresee any possibility of this being changed in some way or in any way?

SCOTT: To be honest about it, this is the first time I have heard about it. I mean the first expressed concern about it. I am aware of the act, although I am glad you refreshed my memory as to exactly what it said, but I have not had this particular question brought to me.

DTH: The Student Stores can't compete with the merchants, and this is the problem.

SCOTT: Yes, I assume this applies to all campuses rather than just to the University. I know the barbershops... The reason I happen to know about this is I was talking to the fellow who cuts my hair. He has a barber shop on Hillsborough St. (in Raleigh) right across from the N.C. State campus, and they complain because the barbers at the student union are 50 cents below them. And they want to know if I couldn't do something to make them raise their prices. I told him now, I wasn't going to mess with it. But, anyhow... No, I would be honest about it, I think that would be a rather difficult thing to change, because the tenure of the legislature is, well, they always get this hue and cry about free enterprise — "You're competing."

The state does compete in other ways, and I would guess the feeling of the legislature would be the student supply stores are really there to provide services that are not readily available in the community at the convenience of the students.

In other words, they are not there to subsidize the students, but rather they are there to fulfill a need which cannot be found in the community itself.

Inside This Section

The Daily Tar Heel editorial page makes a move this year. This and other format changes are explained on Page 6.

Gary Pearce, a new member of The Daily Tar Heel staff and a student at N.C. State, takes a look at that campus on Page 5.

A committee is looking for a new chancellor for the Chapel Hill campus, and Associate Editor Rick Gray examines the possibilities on Page 4.



Governor Robert Scott