

Grade proposal necessary change

Tomorrow a special meeting of the entire faculty will be held to reconsider the grade proposal passed by the Faculty Senate. The newly formed Senate approved, as one of its first major decisions, a new grading system that would replace D's and F's with the grade of NC. They also provided that students must make C or above on 50 per cent of their courses during a 12 month term. Both changes would go a long way toward upgrading the standards of this University.

If the Faculty does overturn the grade proposal it will seriously hamper the credibility of the Faculty Senate and destroy what could have been a progressive program. There is a movement afoot to amend the grade change to put the D back into the system, but not count a failing grade. We hope that the faculty would not seriously consider an amendment which would so greatly hamper the academic growth of the University.

The purpose of a University is to transmit as much knowledge to its student clientele as possible, not to coddle them with a less stringent grading system which accepts mediocre work. We think it is time the University began working hard toward raising its standards. This grade change could be the first step.

Some faculty members have said students should be able to make D's in required courses, in courses they do not enjoy. In this sense the problem is not in the grading system, but the feeling that so many courses should be required.

Petitions are presently being distributed by Student Government and we strongly urge students to support the grade change. In addition Student Senate is expected to pass a resolution this afternoon supporting the work of the Faculty senate.

It is important that students talk to their professors, offer their opinion and stand up for a school struggling to escape academic mediocrity.

What to do with it

Your clothes are off, your body walking slowly to the mirror. The body that eats, moves, fondles, drives itself to sweat, says things that your words whine over. Take your words, your songs, your papers, your cultivation, and unite them with that reflection. Hang that mirror image in a lounge for people to see.

And a self-ordained chosen few will crowd around, panting, giggling, blinking, frowning; the eternal pantomime of smut, and call your expression smut.

There are a few ministers and administrators who are forcing an issue of obscenity on a campus populace who, by this time, know where their body is and know what to do with it.

The "obscenity" in question is three nude paintings by Arlette Goldstein (nee Landers) in the student lounge. (Mark the concept "student").

To protect your tastes in art, take your body to a controversial meeting at 5:00 p.m. tomorrow. The information desk will give you the room number.

GAMECOCK

THE GAMECOCK is published tri-weekly during the fall and spring semesters and weekly during the summer semesters with the exception of University holidays and exam periods. Change of address forms, subscription requests and other mail items should be sent to Drawer A, USC, Columbia, S.C. 29208. Subscription rates are \$7 per year or \$3 per fall and spring semesters and \$1 for both summer sessions. Bulk copies are \$6 per 100. THE GAMECOCK this year received \$39,000 from the student activity fund, entitling full-time students to a subscription to the paper. Offices of THE GAMECOCK are in Rooms 308 and 310 of the Russell House on the University campus. Phones are 777-8178, 777-4249 and 777-4220. Second class postage paid at Columbia, S.C. Although THE GAMECOCK is published by the University, of South Carolina, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of the University, the student body or the staff.

Editor-in-Chief	Charles Beebe
Associate Editor	Scott Derks
Editorial Assistant	Cheryl Manning
Managing Editors	Jim Farrell Alice Potter
Assistant Managing Editor	Lucretia Jones
Business Manager	Ute Huckabee
Sports Editor	Teddy Heffner
Chief Photographer	Parker Renaud
News Editors	Jerry Calabrese Charlie Fellenbaum
Assistant Sports Editor	Doug Williams
Advertising Manager	David Lundgren
Circulation Manager	Terri Mol
Secretary	Anne Hightower

"I SAY REPUDIATE THE NEW GRADING SYSTEM... IF D's AND F's WERE GOOD ENOUGH FOR ME, THEN THEY'RE GOOD ENOUGH FOR STUDENTS TODAY!"



The Gutenberg experiment

You think you're confused

By HARRY HOPE
Columnist

Washington, D.C.—President Richard Nixon called a news conference today for the express purpose of clarifying recent U.S. movements in Southeast Asia. The conference was scheduled for 10 a.m.

As of 1 p.m., no one had shown up.

Reporters, most of whom were past their deadlines, immediately sought out the president's closest advisor, White House janitor Harley V. Feeney.

"Well, the president decided that in order to straighten things out with the American public, he had to get things straight in his mind. He'd been in his office for three days now, and the session has not ended yet."

Feeney discounted rumors that the president has spent the past three days locked in his office with

Honey Dingaling, a member of the White House secretarial pool.

Meanwhile, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird called a news conference and announced that American troops were "not necessarily unengaged in any ground, air, sea incursions into, around, through, over, after, before or between Laos."

Laird would not clarify his statement. His nurse then wheeled the secretary back to his home at the Happy Hollow Home for the Mentally Confused.

Reports from the front indicate that troops are encountering "hellacious" resistance. General B.S. MacIllfuddy wired the president, calling for at least six more transports of reinforcing material, but refused to clarify.

Student protests were equally confused throughout the country.

In many college, students marched against racism, poverty, pollution, war, the gold standard, and demonstrated support for Cesar Chavez, Angela Davis, Abbie Hoffman, W.C. Fields, Hugh Hefner, Kate Millet and the Saskatchewan Six.

The group which has coordinated the marches, the Inter-galactic United People's Anti-Repressive Liberation Front, met today and called for an end to the war in Laos.

"We will achieve this end by destroying the decadent capitalist system of government, by uniting all the people, and by bringing peace into the world."

Informed sources say that the IUPALF is just as confused as everybody else.

When asked to clear up the situation, one student leader told the news media "Phuque you."

Letter

Editorial is a disservice

Dear Mr. Beebe:

For one so eager to see an end to the war, discrimination, poverty and ignorance, your editorial (Marches or protest 'lead to trouble') of Feb. 8 does a disservice not only to these causes but also yourself. Never has such relatively incisive analysis given rise to such fatuous conclusions.

By way of background you provide us with such observations as: "alienation, injury, destruction of property and in some cases death are the result of marches, sit-ins, and pickets" and that such a state of affairs is usually brought on by the indiscriminate use of porcine power. Though these have become daily truisms, it's territory that can always bear covering again. Yet, in spite of these enormous concessions, you wrap up the case by counselling us (albeit in the name of "reasonableness") to eschew the constitutional right to peaceful demonstration of grievances in

favor of knocking on doors and chewing the fat with hard hats.

Come now, Mr. Beebe, if the peaceful exercise of any constitutional right is sufficient to bring down the jack boot of the power-that-be, what makes you think that the more "reasonable" alternative of doorbell-ringing will be long-tolerated should that technique also threaten to be successful? Such advice, in fact, puts the lie to your subsequent declaration welcoming the resurgence of anti-war activity, for, if such activity has not traditionally manifested itself in marches and demonstrations, then one is forced to conclude that there really never was a war in the first place.

No, Mr. Beebe, I'm afraid it won't go down. It's obvious to this reader that your little gloss was little more than an exercise in wishful thinking, conceived well in

advance of the activities which actually transpired on the State House grounds last weekend. Furthermore, your red-baiting tactic of diverting attention to the supposed nihilistic-anarchistic composition of the demonstration organizers only served to confirm the questionable sincerity of your earlier disclaimers against the war. Indeed, such convoluted logic is nothing more than a thinly veiled apology for the status quo, and in no way sprang from the heart of one who has ever experienced the slightest doubt about the efficacy of our social, political, and economic institutions.

You are quite right, however, when you note that the past need not be repeated, but as long as we are fated to suffer such polemics from you and others (Now who could that be?) in positions of responsibility, history is bound to serve up more of the same old shit.

MICHAEL P. CLARKEN