

GAMECOCK

BILL PRATT, Editor

BILL OUTLAW,
Editorial Page EditorBILL GRANT,
Managing Editor

SEPTEMBER 8, 1975

Political Accreditation

USC's distinguished political puppets, better known as the Board of Trustees, have once again displayed its incompetence by deciding to lower USC's Law School entrance standards, possibly jeopardizing the school's accreditation.

At least four times during the past two years the Board has intervened in policy matters at this University in which the Board should have had little or no input. In so doing, the Board has repeatedly ignored the best interests of students, faculty and administrators in order to appease the members of the South Carolina State Legislature.

First, there was the Thomas F. Jones affair. Mystery and suspicion still surrounds the sequence of events leading to Jones' resignation and the sudden appointment of William H. Patterson as president. It has been repeatedly rumored that Patterson is just a front man until former Gov. John C. West is appointed.

Next, the board decided it should have the responsibility of hiring a new football coach. It formed a search committee to do the hiring, but there were several board members on the search committee and there is little doubt the final authority rested with the Board.

Last spring, the Board attempted to give the president of this university the power to appoint up to seven per cent of the incoming freshmen class at the law school. After much debate this power was eventually turned over to the Law School Admissions Committee, but Patterson still has the power to make appointments. This leaves room for many political considerations.

Now, the Board has made its most tragic step to date. It has decided to lower the entrance requirements for 14 freshmen enrolled in the Summer Pre-Admission Trial program (SPAT). This action jeopardizes the law school's accreditation and the future of all law students just because of some state legislator's son.

Ed Saleeby, son of State Sen. Edward E. Saleeby, D-Darlington, is reported to be one of the appointments. Saleeby is the one responsible for making the complaint which resulted in the board's decision to lower the entrance standards. Saleeby reportedly made a 1.66, which the Board set as the cutoff point for admittance as a regular student. In other words, Saleeby failed to make the required grade, he cries foul and the Board of Trustees decides to lower its requirements to accommodate him. Why don't they just hand him a law degree on a silver platter? Of course, he will still have the bar exam to contend with, but the way things are going a USC law degree may be meaningless anyway, and there will be no need for him to take the bar exam.

A dangerous precedent is being set here. This decision not only affects all USC law students, but the entire University system for years to come. Admission to undergraduate and graduate schools could become so arbitrary that the only thing required for admittance would be to have a prominent father with friends.

If the Board is allowed to lower entrance requirements for law students, it logically follows they could do the same for the medical school and on down the line.

For these reasons the Board should rescind its decision to lower the entrance requirements for these students and never again should it attempt to intervene in admissions policies.

In decision after decision, the influence of the S.C. State Legislature on the Board of Trustees can be seen. There is only one way to put an end to all of this. The election of the members of the Board of Trustees should be taken away from the state legislature and put into the hands of educators where it belongs. Then, and only then, will this institution become an educational rather than political university.



LETTERS...

Patterson

TO THE EDITOR:

I would like to commend the summer staff of *The Gamecock* for an excellent job of digging and presenting the facts surrounding decisions made at USC. I was particularly impressed with the final editorial in the last issue of the summer *Gamecock*. It's about time that someone had the courage to put into print what so many have been thinking and discussing off the record.

In the past year the university has been steadily progressing downhill. To allow Dr. Patterson to use the title of President is, in itself, a sham, for the title implies leadership, a quality Dr. Patterson obviously lacks. We have seen a succession of idiotic decisions made by so-called competent administrators. And the result has been, and will continue to be, tragic. It's no wonder that no one can get an accurate count of the number of faculty who have left this year. The figure would not only be startling, but quite embarrassing. And the number of faculty seriously looking for other employment is much higher than most would care to believe.

I find it quite ironic that USC would fire a man with the competence of Tom Jones and an institution of the caliber of MIT makes him a vice president. Somehow, it just doesn't make sense.

Can we wait until December? We could probably form a committee to study the question. But we have already waited much too long. However, if only Dr. Patterson steps down, little will be accomplished. Obviously, the best solution would be a new chairman of the Board. Since that seems unlikely, a major house-cleaning in the Osborne Building would be the place to start. Not only does Dr. Patterson have to go, but our illustrious provost should be put on the first banana boat to Tanzania. Any man who can alienate virtually every segment of the university community can be nothing but a detriment to USC and its reputation. Since no one seems

to know who is really running the university, let's get rid of all of those who believe they are. Maybe then we can get some people who care enough about USC that they will move the university forward, rather than constantly pushing it backwards.

NAME WITHHELD

Boswell

TO THE EDITOR

I'd like to commend Mark Leary for his provocative column in the Sept. 4, issue of *The Gamecock*, which might signal the coming of better sports coverage for the academic year. While I applaud his observations concerning the Boston Celtics' selection of Tom Boswell in the first round of the National Basketball Association's draft, I do not share some of his opinions.

Isn't it true, Mr. Leary, that all rookies must prove themselves before landing a starting berth, including the incomparable David Thompson of N.C. State who opted in favor of the rival ABA Denver Nuggets?

The fact that the Celtics drafted Boswell in the first round is testimony to his vast potential in the pro ranks.

Boswell should not be blamed for Carolina's disappointing season last year. A team is no stronger than its weakest link. Boswell provided Coach Frank McGuire's squad with a catalyst, but a basketball team functions on five cylinders as does a baseball team on nine and a football team on 11. If one of these cylinders is not

functioning, it will render that team useless.

Boston is a sports-conscious city, and its frenzied fans demand a lot from athletes--in baseball, in hockey, and in basketball. Boswell is cognizant of this I'm sure.

Perhaps the Celtics picked Boswell because of his unselfish play on the court, in addition to the intensity with which he plays the game. Boston players are usually aggressive. Boswell played aggressively, and his aggressive

play contributed to his tendency to make, at times, unnecessary fouls. More often than not, he would find himself on the bench when McGuire needed him most.

You indicated Boswell on two counts. To which I must comment.

The first charge concerns Boswell fitting into the Celtics' team concept. Perhaps you observed Boswell in different games. Rarely did I see Boswell launch low percentage shots. He generally would look for the open man and pass the ball off to that person. That certainly is my idea of team play.

The second charge concerns Boswell's defensive ability. Well, Mr. Leary you cannot judge a college player by the same yardstick used to judge a professional, the same way you cannot regard a juvenile offender as an adult.

Boswell can be remembered in good terms and bad ones. But I'd like to think his chances of making it in the pro ranks are great.

DREXEL B. BALL

Letters policy

The GAMECOCK invites all persons within the campus community to make their opinions and thoughts known to our readers. It is your voice--we are the vehicle. We attempt to print weekly in our "Letters to the Editor" section all letters received. Minimal editing is promised, and though longer letters will be printed, letters of 200 words and under are given preference due to space requirements. And, it is the decision of the editors that we not run anonymous letters, though we will withhold names for valid reasons.

Preferably, letters should be typed with name and address of the author included. Please deliver letters personally to our office in Room 318 Russell House or write Campus Opinion, Drawer A, USC, Columbia 29208.