

Exit

Palms too quick to purge those associated with Holderman

The casualties of the Holderman regime are piling up. Two more administrators who have long association with Holderman are leaving.

While Holderman is now widely known as a corrupt official, those under him, for the most part, have been faultless. So why is new President John Palms suspending USC's chief financial officer John O'Donnell and why is Chris Vlahopolus resigning under pressure?

Vlahopolus and O'Donnell are taking the blame for Holderman's transgressions. That is blatantly unfair since no connection has been made between them and Holderman's misdeeds. This is simply guilt by association, pure and simple. By that logic, George Bush should have resigned from the Vice Presidency in 1987 for being around during the Iran-Contra mess.

Arthur Smith will probably be soon to follow. Obviously, Palms is trying to demonstrate his break from the former administration by getting rid of the former administration.

This restructuring is good for his public relations, but it is bad for the careers of the men he is forcing out. At least it distracts attention from the \$90,000 Palms is spending on remodeling the President's House.

Hopefully the students and supporters will see that all administrators from the Holderman era don't need to be purged. Some talk about the so-called "spoils-system," where a new leader gets rid of the old leader's personnel to make room for his own. Casting aspersions on good people's careers is taking this system too far.

WORLD HIGH SCHOOL HEALTH FAIR



Social Security begs for needed reform

ARTHUR C. MAYER

Financial Columnist

With a continuing recession and acute concerns over U.S. competitiveness, you would think something would be done about the high costs of labor and capital in the U.S. Do people really think Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan can do it all? Not Senator Malcolm Wallop (R-Wyoming) and Rep. Tom DeLay (R-Texas).

Together, they are proposing a package which would cut Social Security and capital gains taxes. There is bipartisan support for the view that a capital gains tax cut would boost the economy, but Social Security is a much more emotional topic.

The same people who rail against the middle class tax burden are often those who don't even want to hear there is something wrong with the Social Security system. After all, it's running a surplus, isn't it? Let's take a closer look at the tax-transfer system the government wants us to use for our retirement fund.

The Social Security tax, quite apart from its regressive nature, is a bad tax. It introduces a "tax wedge" into the labor market which raises the cost of labor to an employer and reduces the gains from labor to an employee. The clear result is employment is reduced below what it otherwise would be, translating into a lower gross national product and income tax revenue.

This might not be so bad if the nation really got something in exchange for it. Social Security is still represented as a retirement-savings program. If participation was voluntary, work-

ers could determine their own level and method of savings.

Instead, income is confiscated now in return for the promise of equivalent future payments indexed to future wage and price levels. Many of our senior citizens planned their retirements around Social Security and therefore did not take measures to provide for themselves. These beneficiaries are among the "human shields" of the welfare state, as many would-be budget-cutters have discovered.

In reality, Social Security is little more than an income distribution program. There are no "savings" involved anywhere in it. The tax paid by today's workers is transferred to retirees who spend it. The current excess of tax revenue over benefit payouts is used to absorb some of the federal budget deficit and take the heat off our politicians.

No reserves are being built up for the day when the baby boomers start retiring. Benefits paid in the year 2010 will come out of GNP in 2010. The entire system will collapse at that time unless something is done now to reduce the projected growth of benefits and to encourage private alternatives (such as expanded indi-

vidual retirement accounts) to Social Security.

When Democratic Senator Moynihan introduced his payroll tax cut last year, Republicans opposed it for fear of enlarging the budget deficit. Meanwhile, President Bush's capital gains tax initiative was thwarted by Congressional "fairness" demagoguery.

Now, Wallop-DeLay, though not perfect, offers an excellent opportunity to promote economic growth with a capital gains tax cut and fairness through a Social Security tax cut for working people. If past experience is any guide, the capital gains cut would stimulate economic activity and raise revenue. Since labor markets are slower to respond than capital markets, the payroll tax cut would lose revenue in the short term.

There are many politicians and voters alike who don't want to tamper with Social Security. Leaving it alone, however, will guarantee a future meltdown while imposing a harmful tax burden on the nation's workers along the way.

Our government should be urged to lower the excessive costs of labor and capital with tax cuts, reduce the budget deficit with real spending cuts and get Social Security off the road to disaster by scaling down benefit growth and allowing, if not encouraging, private alternatives. Defenders of the "status quo" wouldn't like it, but the rest of us would be better off.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Paper, college are prejudiced

To the editor:

I have reviewed your article of 3-29-91 about Professor Justiz which brought to mind a number of issues I have thought about USC.

When I returned to Columbia in 1979, I visited the Russell library where a white female student was checking out books. I was second to be served. The phone in that department was ringing. The student waited on the person ahead of me and then went and answered the phone.

By the time she returned, another white person had appeared. She looked at me and then looked at the new person and went to the end of the counter where the white person was waiting. I left and went to reference. Upon watching me leave, she yelled "may I help you?" — a comment I ignored.

In reading the Gamecock Newspaper, I have not seen it since I was last on campus in December. Your paper is possibly the worst newspaper I have seen put out by students who had the greatest amount of resources.

I saw your article wherein you endorsed Dean Smith for the new position of President of the University. Was Mr. Smith putting out his own press. Nowhere was there a checking of credentials, a questions of what was he doing while Holderman was practicing things resulting in his resignation?

And then his obnoxious granting of honorary degrees to the Holdermans. I immediately called his office to inquire whether Lee Atwater had ever been granted an honorary degree from USC. After questioning why a citizen would ask such a question, after considerable effort I finally got an answer. No, he had not. (actually, he had, ed.) Why the rush to give the Holderman degrees when there should have been a full investigation of his years in office? And the newspaper offered no inquiries.

I saw the Justiz article and it appears to be what is known as secondary research. Why is a newspaper who is in the midst of its

primary source merely a rehash of what other articles have said. I mean the level of ignorance here maybe points to why for 13 years Holderman existed.

For example according to U.S. News and World Report, the colleges that Justiz attended ranked low in academic credentials. Did that article also state at the time that Prof. Justiz was attending school, what the quota level on minorities were at high academic schools.

Did Watts contact his masters program and doctoral, and receive a copy of his papers presented and find that they were intellectually inferior. Was his reasoning in his dissertation off, sources nonexistent or has it become a crime in America to attend a certain type of university or college.

In 1985, he was fired by William Bennett. A political appointment, a political firing. Is Watts saying many of us who have been fired from previous jobs have no rights after then to be employed? I have always questioned unnamed sources, after all one can always make them up.

For a newspaper who in 1991 still does not capitalize the term Black when used as a proper noun, I would greatly question your hatchet job done on Justiz. Who were the persons who worked with him at the University, what did they say about his performance here?

Your article includes a lot of hints and innuendoes, but how many of your staff have checked for facts?

The Holderman story can be granted to a law student for her actions. It's too bad the university Gamecock itself didn't follow up with investigation.

Question. If Holderman is not excusable for his conduct, then what about the members of the Board who rubber stamped his actions? Should they not also resign?

At the time Justiz was pursuing his education, America was not open to all its citizens. And the statistics, were they for when he graduated or for 1991? Are there no credentials in newspapers nowadays?

I work part-time temporary at the university, and I have found the university to be racist, discrimi-

minatory and sexist. Your newspaper is reflective of the university.

Mamie L. Jackson

Athletes don't need 'diddly'

To the editor:

April 17's editorial was the biggest bunch of garbage I have ever read in *The Gamecock* (there certainly are ties for a close second). It was a ridiculous, whiney attempt to show why college athletes should be paid — yes, PAID.

First, the article starts off, "College athletes are supposed to practice, play to the best of their ability and still keep up their grades." Still keep up their grades? What is so tough about keeping a simple 2.0 average? Anyone who attends class should be able to do that; if not, he or she should not be in college.

Here's more: "Some players have little money for outside activities... food and shelter isn't much for the sacrifice the players make to the schools." What's wrong with a little part-time or full-time work in the off-season? Now that kind of puts a new twist on things, doesn't it?

All these athletes that don't think they get enough can join the ranks of students who work 20 to 30 or more hours a week all year long (we have little money for outside activities too!).

Another good one: "Full tuition to some universities one could name isn't exactly fair compensation." Fair compensation? Who said life was fair? Neither the NCAA or any university owes any athlete diddly! And who decided to sign with that "some university" in the first place?

If someone wanted me to suit up and run around with a ball in my hands, or swim, or whatever for room, board and a free education, I'd be glad to! It'd seem like a picnic and more than fair to me.

The editor alleges that it's a shame the universities make all this money on sporting events and don't share it with the athletes, because the masses are really paying to see "awesome athletic ability," assumedly displayed by these poor,

under-compensated athletes. Folks don't buy tickets to see ability (lord knows, USC's athletic department would never have been around this long).

They go to events to tailgate a little and maybe see some good ball from the school they support. If these athletes the editor speaks of were so "awesome," they would've bypassed college for a pro career because they would have been drafted. Hint: truly awesome is Bo or Jordan on the tube for free — they get paid for a reason.

Now let's look at this from an ECON 101 point of view. College sports are big business, no doubt. But who's going to end up paying these salaries to these athletes? The schools, that's who. So suppose the NCAA sets a standard "salary" for a Division I school. The school forks over to its athletes (because if it doesn't, the athletes either won't play or the school won't have any).

Who ends up forking out to the school (that money has to come from somewhere, children!)? And do you know where? Right. From its supporters, which means MO' MONEY, MO' MONEY, MO' MONEY for the schools and less for you and me. Does this system guarantee under-the-table, private "contributions" will stop? HELL NO.

It's a simple fact that everybody looks out for Number One, and if one stands to make his or her position better by giving or getting a little cash in hand, he or she will do so. Case closed.

So as we can all see, college athletes are probably not as bad off as the editor would have had us believe. Didn't anyone see "Field of Dreams?" Isn't anybody glad just to be able to play the games at all, whether they're getting some compensation or not?

We need to nip this absurd idea in the bud before we end up with a lot of self-absorbed, prima donna "pseudo-athletes" who could care less about playing the game, and like spoiled children when the game is not played exactly to their liking, will take up their balls and go home until their demands are met.

Christy Whitlock
Political science senior

"LET'S SEE YOU COME IN AND GET ME, CIVILIANS"



THE GAMECOCK

News: 777-7726

Advertising: 777-4249

KATHY BLACKWELL
Editor in Chief

ROBYN THOMPSON
Managing Editor

CHRIS SILVESTRI
Copy Desk Chief

DAVID BOWDEN
Viewpoint Editor

LUCY SOTO
News Editor

KATHY HEBERGER
Carolina Life Editor

STEVE JOHNSON
Sports Editor

RENEE MEYER
Photography Editor

AARON SHEINN
Assistant News Editor

TIGE WATTS
Assistant News Editor

OCTAVIA WRIGHT
Assistant Carolina Life Editor

PATRICK VILLEGAS
Assistant Sports Editor

JENNIFER JABLONSKI
Assistant Copy Desk Chief

JULIE BOUCHILLON
Assistant Photography Editor

ERIC GLENN
Darkroom Lab Technician

WAYNE WILLIAMS
Comics Editor

ED BONZA
Director of Student Media

ERIK COLLINS
Faculty Adviser

LAURA S. DAY
Production Manager

RAY BUKGOS
Assistant Production Manager

RENEE GIBSON
Advertising Manager

KYLE BERRY
Assistant Advertising Manager

CAROLYN GRIFFIN
Business Manager

Letters Policy: The Gamecock will try to print all letters received. Letters should be, at maximum, 250 to 300 words long. The writer must include full name, professional title if a USC employee or South Carolina resident, or year and major if a student. An address and phone number are required with all letters sent. The Gamecock reserves the right to edit letters for style, possible libel or in case of space limitations. The newspaper will not withhold names under any circumstance.