

Before You Cast Your Ballot . . .

Ford, continued from page 1  
make him more conscious of possible ramifications the proposal would have in other areas. Second, there is a far greater precedent for Presidents with legislative backgrounds than for those with gubernatorial experience.

Jimmy Carter brings few "Presidential qualities" to the race. He has a truly frightening penchant for demagoguery, appealing to the electorate to "trust" him while never giving them substantive reasons for its bestowal. Having enunciated his promise never to tell a lie on numerous occasions, he nonetheless has been caught stretching the truth from Los Angeles to Plains in discussing everything from his academic experience to his record in Georgia. The man is not what he would have the electorate believe.

Before turning to specific issues, an elaboration on the conditions surrounding Ford's term as President is in order. In addition to the unique position in which Ford was placed in being the first appointed President of the U. S. the widespread anti-White House sentiments held by the electorate placed him in an unenviable position. Faced with three major priorities at the outset of his administration, Ford acted in the soundest manner possible within the constraints of Presidential powers and public opinion.

The top priority was the restoration of domestic stability following Watergate. He gambled by pardoning Nixon, hoping to focus public attention on other problems facing the nation, a course which he deemed more productive than continued concentration on Watergate. In terms of the cost of continued national obsession with the course of criminal proceedings against Nixon and the nature of the problems facing the nation both domestically and internationally, the gamble was probably a sound one, despite the public outrage over the pardon.

The second priority, the withdrawal from Vietnam, was accomplished with a minimum of costs within a short period of time, leaving only the problem of energy independence to be solved. There was little that Ford could do on the energy front without Congressional appropriations. He did formulate an energy conservation program, coupled with

a proposal for increased gasoline taxes and an R & D priority list. It was at this point that he encountered the last of the oddities of his administration: a "Crazy Congress."

The Congress elected in 1974 was one of the youngest and least experienced ever, one which was determined not only to reorganize the organizational structure and power structure of the House, but one which was determined to reassert itself to a position of dominance in national affairs. Given the political climate in which it was elected, the 94th Congress saw 1975 as the year of Capitol Hill and was jealous of any initiative emanating from the White House. In this climate, any President would have had problems getting legislation passed, much less one who was appointed to succeed the first president to resign in disgrace. Hence the charge from the Carter camp that Ford took no action on energy: Congress refused to pass Ford's proposals. Considering the circumstances, Ford can hardly be blamed for "inaction."

The phenomenon described above is but an extreme case of a problem confronting all Presidents: they can only fulfill their campaign promises on domestic issues if Congress passes the bills they introduce. It is on this premise that Ford and Dole base their contention that tax laws, economic policies, and bureaucratic inefficiency, are directly attributable to 22 years of control of Congress by the Democrats. With the realization that another egotistical Congress will hinder whomsoever is elected in November from instituting their programs, let us examine the course of action that each candidate would pursue, Congress and the electorate willing.

On the still unresolved question of energy policy, Ford takes a very realistic stance in advocating the use of nuclear power. He has obviously examined the facts concerning the relative safety and usefulness of nuclear generation instead of being swayed by the mass hysteria which characterizes anti-nuclear forces. Some of these "facts" include the high improbability of a nuclear accident causing death (1 in 5 Billion reactor years), the lack of empirical evidence to link low level radiation to any increase in malignancies or morbidities and the existence of evidence that low level radiation emissions

Neal/Mizell,

continued from page 1

national groups. The Republican National Committee has given Mizell \$5000 and a full-time staff member, while the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee has donated \$2000 to Neal's cause. Mizell has received \$1000 from the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress and from the American Conservative Union. Neal hasn't raised quite so much money from out-of-state groups, but his polls could compete with anyone's — they are being conducted by the Democratic Study Group, a Washington research group.

So keep an eye on the local congressional race on election night — Carter and Ford may not be the only ones who have a suspenseful race.

★ ★ ★ ★

from nuclear generators are less concentrated and less harmful than either x-rays or background radiation from the sun. His rational approach to the issue exhibits not only sound judgment but also the ability to resist hysterical claims.

His priorities in R & D expenditures are a further indication of the rationality of his policy judgment: nuclear power development, breeder reactor development, fossil energy development, nuclear fusion research and development, solar energy and geothermal energy development. The low rank of solar energy in the President's priorities reflects the true insignificance of solar energy to U.S. energy needs: it can provide a maximum of 15% of our total energy needs by 2000 if we cover the western desert regions with collectors.

Carter, on the other hand, stresses the increased use of coal in generating plants along with massive research and development funding for solar energy. In the first debate, he responded to queries about the increased pollution levels related with the use of coal by advocating the increased use of low-sulfur coal by power generators. While claiming to be such an expert on energy matters, Carter has apparently failed to realize the true identity of low-sulfur coal in the market place: its other name is metallurgical coal and it is the primary ingredient in the coking process for making steel! If power companies followed Carter's advice, they would bid the price of the coal up to a point where one of two things would occur: either the steel industry would continue to purchase the coal and thereby create an exorbitant increase in costs resulting in devastating cost-pull inflation throughout the economy, or the steel industry would be priced out of the market, having to rely on lower quality coal, increasing production costs, decreasing steel quality and causing inflation.

The increased usage of high sulfur coal, while safeguarding the steel industry, would drastically increase deaths caused by sulfur dioxide poisoning and other less noxious pollutants. Either option entails risks which are avoided with the increased use of nuclear power. Though Carter may claim to be a "nuclear physicist", his criticisms of nuclear energy point only to his true ignorance of the situation and the extent to which he is influenced by hysterical claims unsubstantiated by fact.

Turning to the economy, one finds additional indications of Carter's ineptitude and Ford's sound judgment. The Democrats are using unemployment as their primary issue in the campaign, trying to hold Ford and the Republicans responsible for it. Carter promises to decrease unem-

# VOTE on Nov. 2nd

ployment to 4.8% overall through a number of measures. In so doing, he fails to consider two major factors in the economy. First, he apparently fails to realize that the only times in the last 28 years when unemployment was at or below 4.8% were during the two periods of American involvement in military conflict, 1951-1953 and 1965-1969, and during part of Eisenhower's administration, 1955-1957. It is interesting to note that it took a war for the Democrats to achieve "full employment" while the Republicans were able to accomplish it during peace. It is a widely accepted fact that war decreases unemployment. When coupled with the end of the draft in 1973, the resulting decline in college enrollment, and increase in the labor force, the contention that a "break-out of peace" caused the current unemployment situation gains credibility. Additionally, because of the increasing educational level of the labor force, unemployment became the rule rather than the exception, forcing those with little or no skill out of the labor market. Apparently a problem exists within the economy which neither "make-work" programs nor rhetoric can solve.

That problem is the second factor in the economy which Carter chooses to ignore: the severe capital shortage facing the nation and the world today. When capital reserves are low, investment is more difficult and less encompassing. Investments mean jobs. Therefore, unemployment is an inherent characteristic of any economy facing a "Capital Crunch." The economic policies suggested by Carter would not only help the capital situation, they would most likely exacerbate the problem. The programs he suggests would combine a significant hindrance to capital accumulation through the decrease in personal and business deductions for investment, with increased government spending primarily in the area of trans-

fer payments. The results would be demand-pull inflation, hurting all persons in the U.S. not just the unemployed, and a long delay in increased production and investment.

Ford's policies would attack the problem at its heart by cutting taxes on corporations, thereby allowing for greater accumulation of capital reserves which would be used for investments in new and expanded facilities, creating jobs all along the line. Additionally, he would cut individual taxes to place more money in the pockets of consumers for spending as they see fit. The importance of this aspect is consumer satisfaction: one gets greater satisfaction from spending \$100 on what he wants than from hearing that the government spent an equal amount of money on something which has little direct affect on that consumer.

The areas of energy and the economy have been viewed by many as Carter's strongpoints and Ford's weaknesses. The preceding analysis of the two issues should demonstrate that Carter's strength lies solely in rhetoric while Ford retains the true strength of reason. If Ford's reasoning capabilities and sound judgment can show through Carter's muddling of the issues in domestic affairs, then it can be deduced that, despite Ford's misstatement about East Europe, Ford's margin over Carter in terms of true significance of issues and policies in foreign policy and defense, Ford's area of expertise, is overwhelming.

In view of the personal attributes of the two candidates, their respective performances in previous offices and their positions on certain crucial issues, I would be betraying both my sense of justice and my sense of reasonable policy analysis if I did not vote for the better of the two candidates on November 2: President Gerald R. Ford. Can you justify any other choice in your mind?

## Arts and Entertainment

November

- 2 The Wake Forest Chamber Music Society presents Ingrid Dingfelder and Larry Shilzer, flute and harpsichord, at Reynolda House. Admission is by season tickets.
- 3 Wake Forest University presents a Biology Seminar in Winston B at 4:00 P.M. with Dr. Thomas Murphy giving a lecture on "Population Biology: The American alligator, in a South Carolina Reservoir."
- 2-4 MESDA. At 7:30-9:30 P.M., three evening sessions will be given on the Connoisseurship of Furniture. Cost is \$10.00 for the three sessions.
- 5-26 SECCA. A two man exhibition of the works of photographer Stan Duncan and painter Bill Dunlap.
- 11-13 & 15-20 Wake Forest University presents "Purlie Victorious" by Ossie Davis at 8:00 P.M.
- 12-14 & 16-20 NCSA presents "I Am a Camera" by John Van Druten at 8:15 P.M. Admission: \$2.00 for students.
- 16 MESDA. At 8:00 P.M. there will be a lecture and performance of Southern musical works composed before 1820. Cost: \$1.00.
- 18 Wake Forest University presents pianist Andre Michael Shub at 8:00 P.M. in Wait Chapel. Admission is by season tickets to the Artist Series.
- 19 NCSA. At 8:15 there will be a program of classical music with strings and piano called "Kaleidoscope". Admission: \$2.00 for adults, \$1.00 for students.
- 26-27 The Carolina Theatre Company presents "Light Up the Sky" by Moss Hart. The performance is at the Reynolds Homestead Learning Center. Admission: \$2.00 for adults, .75 for students.
- 9 MESDA. Audrey Michie will give a slide lecture on "Some Early Practices in Interior Room Arrangements." Cost: \$1.00.

