

# Discipline demonstrators

Section 5-3, Chapter V, of the 1974-75 Record of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, charges the Chancellor with the responsibility of investigating any actions which violate any section of Chapter V of the same. Such violations include the prevention of free speech. Section 5-1 of Chapter V says: "The University of North Carolina has long honored the right of free discussion and expression... That these rights are a part of the fabric of this institution is not questioned. They must remain secure."

Section 5-2 of the same chapter states that: "...any student who, with the intent to obstruct or disrupt any normal operation or function of the University... shall be subject to prompt and appropriate disciplinary action, which may include suspension, expulsion, discharge or dismissal from the University."

I challenge the Chancellor and the administration of this University to follow said procedures and punish those students who prevented Mr. David Duke from presenting his lecture in Memorial Hall on Jan. 16. I also ask the Chancellor to apologize not only to Mr. Duke for his failure to prevent such criminal activity (either with a prior warning of expulsion to potential trouble-makers or with their physical ejection from the hall), but also to those students whose constitutional right to hear a public speech was violated. Any retreat from these two requests will further enlarge the vision of Chapel Hill in the minds of the taxpayers of North Carolina as not only a hotbed of pernicious radicalism and Communist activity, but as the standard bearer of liberal hypocrisy.

The citizens of this state are simply not going to allow Communist revolutionaries such as Angela Davis, Bernadette Devlin, Bobby Seale and Neil Baily to spout out Marxist propoganda at a state institution which they finance, when speakers as David Duke are prevented from exercising the same right by an organized group of savage stormtroopers. Either this University must faithfully ensure the right of free speech for all, not just for those whom its guilt complex finds compatible, or lose this right by virtue of such discrimination.

The people of North Carolina, the alumni, and the trustees of this university could very well bring to a halt the collectivist, secularist and atheistic influences which dominate this university. The legal means are there; the motivation is readily available.

Thursday night's spectacle brought chilling remnants of the Nazi, Bolshevik and Maoist rise to power. The criminals who prevented Mr. Duke from speaking are the new Nazis, the new barbarians whose violence simply cannot be tolerated. Hate is their weapon. Our passivity fuels their hate which only savages, not civilized men, can respect. Mr. Duke is also a symbol of this



hate. His philosophy was finally delivered at the reception following the "lecture." Warmed-over racism and anti-Semitism characterized the thrust of his remarks. The frustration of the Anglo-Saxon male, the quality of American life and the state of the white, Christian, western civilization were Mr. Duke's concerns.

I'm sure that if his speech had been heard by the many instead of the few, many would have shared his frustration over the rise of violent crime in America, the deterioration of the public school system, the "affirmative action" (i.e. quotas) program imposed upon the populace by the petty bureaucrats in Washington, and the senseless busing of school children to achieve racial balance. Most, however, would reject his vulgar racism and anti-Semitism which cause people to hate and categorize racial and ethnic groups into menacing numbers which, according to Mr. Duke, conspire to subvert the American way of life.

The presence of black militants at the foot of a KKK leader who secretly hoped that these objects of his hate would react in such a way as to reinforce racial hatred and sympathy to the Klan cause, produced such tragedy. The racial and ethnic slurs and distortions uttered by Mr. Duke at the reception added fuel to the racists' fire which also employs factual weapons to its cause. For example, Mr. Duke could say that the violent primitivism of the protesters was perfectly understandable since never has any black nation or civilization afforded freedom of speech or fair elections to its subjects.

Black anger at a man such as Duke is quite understandable. Yet the collective behavior of the mass of blacks violating Mr. Duke's civil rights was indeed sordid. I did not see an organized group of Jewish students displaying similar vulgarity in the name of solidarity or self-defense, despite the fact that most of Duke's prepared speech and commentary was directed toward Jewish influence in the United States. It seems incredible to me that such a

monstrous adherent of hate and violence—Miss Angela Davis, a member of the U.S. Communist Party—would not only be allowed to spread her vicious lies freely, but would be given a hero's welcome and introduced as the greatest human example of individual rights in America, while Mr. Duke would not only be insulted by the SG President and the representative of the Carolina Forum, but would be jeered off the stage. A Daily Tar Heel editorial didn't greet Angela Davis with denunciations (as it did Duke) for the simple reason that the DTH editors do not possess the courage to antagonize blacks even if they object to their causes. How else can one explain the silence directed toward one (Miss Davis) whose total life is in support of violent revolution, class warfare, totalitarianism, denial of all basic freedoms (including that of freedom of speech) and more Gulag Archipelagos? Mr. Duke's bigotry is dangerous too, but I find no evidences of subversion and the systematic destruction of human lives and properties in his speech.

If my theory is correct, the Carolina Forum's goal of discrediting the conservative viewpoint failed. Their obvious guilt from scheduling no conservative speakers during the farcical "Colloquium on Individual Rights" led them to select a white racist and anti-Semitic kook like Mr. Duke in order to hoodwink the student body into believing that a "conservative" had indeed been heard. Well, Mr. Duke's voice went unheard and so did the voices of responsible conservatism which could have so easily been secured.

Rorin Platt is a junior political science major from Greensboro.

All unsigned editorials are the opinion of the editors. Letters and columns represent the opinions of individuals.

Founded February 23, 1893

Friday, January 24, 1975

## Crisis-orientation is an easy, harmful fault

The big question in everyone's mind now is "What happens when the next extremist speaker comes to UNC?" But the main lesson of the Duke and Ervin incidents is our regrettable behavior when there is not a confrontation or a crisis.

We have strained our hindsight, drawn our distinctions and girded our loins for the next crisis. Whether we have decided to become more or less tolerant, we are ready for the next confrontation. But the most important time that we should prepare for it is now.

Whatever one's opinion of last week's demonstration, and non-demonstration, the fact is that both were freakish events and it will be a long time before another Klansman, Bircher, or proto-Nazi comes to scare us from our civil liberties. The chances are that we have already done our best to guard against future disturbances since crises by their very nature cannot be anticipated. We still won't be able to prevent them so we should as well concentrate on something we can improve.

The important thing to realize is that we are by nature crisis-oriented and that day-by-day events are what should be consuming our attention. The tremendous outburst of energy and emotion caused by last week's controversies should be harnessed for daily use. It is a healthy sign that so much feeling was stirred up in

classrooms, dorm rooms and on the back pages of this newspaper. But we should be using our talent in normal, not abnormal, circumstances.

The DTH has been deluged with a month's supply of letters on the Duke issue. The Cashion firing evoked a similar response last spring. Yet other more important, and more frequent and enduring issues fail to capture our attention.

This is not a plea for greater interest in student government. On the contrary, major issues like world starvation, national economic collapse, the failure of our own educational system and even the state legislature should be examined on an everyday basis. Freedom of speech and minority rights are excellent issues, but we should care about them even when they occur outside Memorial Hall. We must not be so limited and parochial in our outlook.

Crises are the easiest events to watch, to criticize and to learn from, but we must apply their lessons to everyday events as well. Other happenings, some of which seem quite mundane, are equally deserving of our scrutiny, support and hate mail.

Hopefully, future extremist speakers will be greeted, if not with open arms, at least with restrained protest. But it should not take a crazed Klansman to shake us alive so that we may see the reality around us.

### Letters to the editors

## Duke issue emotional, not objective

To the editors:

Now that the Duke issue has cooled down, why don't you—for just a moment—put aside your pen and your holier-than-thou objective views for freedom of speech. Try, just try, to use your emotion for a change. I realize that it's difficult since this society has conditioned you to declare that side of yourself null and void.

Duke was an emotional issue; not an objective one. And the only way you can understand it is by using your emotions and try to see it through a black perspective. You would then realize that the very word "Klansmen" has filled black people with fear and hatred for decades—feelings that were perpetuated by the Klan's systematic killing and maiming of black people—of my people. And I hate Duke. The organization he represents has affected the history and the future of my people.

My people are an emotional people as well

as intellectual—a fact of which I am very proud. It makes us artistic, fun-loving, proud and beautiful. Yet we have the right to be angry because we have been the ones to suffer. And regardless to how many Klansmen want to tell me that the organization has changed, I can not erase that suffering.

Yes, the last recorded murder of a black man was about 10 years ago. But there is such a thing as black love and black unity that allows pride and suffering to transcend time. I feel the grief of the mother whose son has been lynched and I feel the pain of the castrated black man. There is no way that I could have denied these feelings, for those people are a part of me.

There was no way I could not have protested Duke's presence, despite all the brainwashing I have received in your schools. I am proud of myself. Please do not misunderstand the intent of

this article and feel that I am trying to justify my reaction. Nothing could be further from the truth. I merely wanted to see if you have some hidden emotions that are not apparent in your conglomeration of puns, alliteration, metaphors, etc., that you usually call the editorial.

You must realize that there will always be issues similar to Duke, where you will have to think one side and feel the other to editorialize without bias.

Vanessa Gallman  
0-2 Colony Apts.

### Kincaid clarifies Duke article

To the editors:  
My Jan. 21 article on the subject of free

speech expresses my viewpoint alone and does not necessarily reflect the opinions of the New American Movement as a group or its individual members. Nor did anyone in that group, myself included, take part in the actions that prevented David Duke from speaking. Thus any reactions to the event or my article which focuses on "the New American Movement" are misdirected.

Finally, much has been said to the effect that those who deny the rights of others cannot expect theirs to be held inviolate. I couldn't agree more. Is it then to be assumed that the Ku Klux Klan, an organization which for decades has interfered with the rights of blacks and continues to do so today, will find its views tolerated by those it militates against? There seems to be a contradiction.

Doug Kincaid  
Chapel Hill

L.T. McRae

## Ford's economic proposals: best alternatives

President Ford's proposed program for reducing oil imports seems to be stirring more controversy than all the rest of his recent economic proposals combined, yet oddly enough it is here that the President is on the firmest economic ground.

Mr. Ford proposes to reduce oil use by placing a tariff on imported oil and an excise tax on domestic oil and by decontrolling the price of domestic crude, currently set at \$5.25 a barrel. The price of domestic crude would rise toward the oil cartel's price of about \$11 a barrel, while the new taxes would be reflected in higher prices for all petroleum products. These higher prices should discourage petroleum use in this country and to that extent discourage petroleum imports.

To offset the higher oil prices, Mr. Ford proposes a tax cut of \$30 billion, concentrated on low- and middle-income taxpayers. There would be no income tax cut for the highest income groups.

Everyone agrees on the need to reduce oil imports. As an earlier column argued, we cannot indefinitely allow our currency to drain to the Persian Gulf. But Mr. Ford's program has been condemned as "inflationary" and hence "unfair" to lower income groups. Congressional critics, such as Democratic Senators Kennedy, Church and Jackson, would prefer import quotas, allocations, rationing and perhaps a stiff tax on gasoline, while maintaining price controls on domestically produced crude oil.

If oil imports are restricted below their present level by import quotas, there will be less oil available in the U.S. market. If prices are held at their present level by Congressional fiat, the result will be excess demand at that price. That is, Americans will want to buy more oil



at the fixed price than domestic producers can or will make available for sale at that price. We would feel the excess demand in the sort of gas-station lines we saw last winter, in difficulty in obtaining home heating oil and in short tempers.

To evade these problems, the Democrats propose to ration gasoline by issuing tickets entitling the holder to buy X gallons of gasoline, and by government allocation of crude oil among users and of petroleum products geographically. Supposedly, this will result in a "fair" distribution of gasoline and other petroleum products, while maintaining prices near their present levels.

Rationing, particularly of gasoline, has an odd and frightening attraction, for many Americans and for Democratic liberals. Rationing will not make more gasoline available. Many people will be disappointed in their ration. Others, such as physicians, will have an unlimited gasoline privilege which they can use to drive a 6,000 pound monstrosity to the golf course. (They sure as hell won't use it making house calls.) One can only conclude that everyone is convinced that his own use of gasoline is not extravagant and that, therefore, any rationing program will provide him with all the gasoline that he "needs."

Coupon rationing ought to be viewed

as a last resort suitable only for use in wartime. It will inevitably result in distortions and black markets. Some will have less gasoline than they would be willing to buy even at a higher price while others will have ration coupons for more gasoline than they have any conceivable use for. Only those trapped by too small a ration will have any incentive to conserve fuel. (While a scheme of transferable ration tickets would answer some of these problems, it would raise others just as great.)

Finally, the cost to the public of administering and policing a ration-allocation-price-control program would probably be greater than the cost of the price increases likely to occur under Mr.

Ford's program.

The President's scheme, on the other hand, would use the market system for the one thing it does really well—allocating scarce resources, or sharing a scarce commodity around so that anyone can buy as much as he's willing to buy whenever he wants it. As the price rose, Americans would use less petroleum of all sorts, including gasoline, and the uses eliminated would be the least important uses as viewed from the standpoint of consumers. High prices would provide a strong incentive to adopt new energy sources and to use all energy more efficiently.

Eventually the price of petroleum would hit a point where the quantities demanded and supplied were equal. The excess-profits tax Mr. Ford proposes would take away the oil companies' otherwise huge profits, while the contemplated \$30 billion tax cut would put back into Americans' left pockets what the high oil prices took out of their right pockets. This is not circular reasoning with no net impact. Because of the higher price of petroleum relative to other goods, Americans would buy less petroleum even if the tax cut completely restores the purchasing power lost through higher oil prices.

If we wish to pursue the goal of "energy invulnerability," or even the more realistic goal of reducing the strain on our balance of payments caused by the oil cartel, we must recognize that we have a price to pay. Although we cannot evade that price, we can minimize it by working within our established institution of free markets.

The impact of high oil prices on poor Americans is an entirely different issue. Being poor, after all, means that you can't buy as much as others. If we desire a more equal distribution of income in this country, there are far more

meaningful ways to achieve that end than tinkering with the price system. Mr. Ford's tax-cut scheme would minimize the impact on the poor of restricted oil imports. Perhaps most importantly, the President's program would let the poor decide for themselves how to spend their money rather than presenting them with the artificial choice imposed by rationing.

Larry McRae is a grad student in economics.

## The Daily Tar Heel

Jim Cooper, Greg Turosak  
Editors

David Ennis, Associate Editor  
Lu Ann Jones, Associate Editor  
David Klinger, News Editor  
Harriet Sugar, Features Editor  
Elliott Warnock, Sports Editor  
Gene Johnson, Wire Editor  
Martha Stevens, Head Photographer  
Jim Grimsley, Night Editor