

Rules

Greek system unfairly persecuted at California university

This year is a difficult one for fraternity and sorority members at the other USC. The University of Southern California has placed harsh new rules on the Greek system that set a dangerous precedent for schools nationwide.

Greek houses at Southern California are now subject to searches at all times. Greeks must also maintain a higher GPA than regular students. Restrictions have been placed on parties as well, limiting their size and length. Finally, opposite sex visitation is not allowed when there is a party serving alcohol.

These rules are largely in response to a date-rape on campus. A university official said the rules weren't excessive because some schools had banned the Greek system completely. That's like saying it doesn't matter if someone was maimed — at least they weren't killed.

The Greek system can be seen as an elitist anachronism. However, it should be allowed to exist on college campuses without draconian restrictions. Blaming an entire system for the crimes of a few is simply un-American. Date-rape is a serious crime, but like the cliché says, one cannot legislate morality. A person who is inclined to rape a woman will do it, no matter what the rules say.

The new situation at Southern Cal is just another example of the conservatism sweeping colleges as a whole. Across the continent, our USC is also turning into a police-state. On-campus parties, Greek or otherwise, have to be registered if there are more than 10 people. Opposite sex visitation is heavily restricted. Alcohol has been virtually banned. Universities are regressing all over, even in liberal California. Students, as paying customers, have to put a stop to it.



Death penalty immoral means of justice

In 1983, Donald "Pee Wee" Gaskins did the dirty work for our state, but he did the state's work a little earlier than the state had intended. More importantly Gaskins did the work without the state's consent. Gaskins blew another man's head off with a radio bomb and after being convicted of nine other murders, he was finally sentenced to the electric chair.

I guess the irony of fate will never cease to amaze me. Here we have a man convicted of killing another man, who was on Death Row, and the murderer gets sentenced to die. But why doesn't the state get sentenced to the same punishment? The man killed in 1983 was convicted, sentenced and a resident of CCI's Death Row. Justice was served, although not as the state intended. Even though the means were different, the end was all the same. The man was murdered, just as Gaskins will be on Friday at 1:30 a.m.

My point comes to this, the practice of capital punishment, regardless how you look at it, comes out in the same light everytime: hypocritical. By executing a murderer, the victim remains dead. Most mainstream churches don't support it. And have you ever met someone who said they didn't kill another because they stopped and thought about being sentenced to death? Yet these are all emotional arguments, and this doesn't concern the future.

Over the summer, the newspaper covered the sensational story around the Federal Crime Bill.

CARL MAAS
Guest Editorial

The Senate would propose forty-nine crimes punishable by death, and then the House would propose fifty-one crimes punishable by death, and yet no one seemed to give a damn why a country which has one of the highest standards of living has the highest violent crime rate in the Western world.

No one asked themselves what the estimated \$1.3 million bill per execution would do to our economy. I mean \$1.3 million is a pretty outrageous price tag just to kill someone. Yet our judicial system requires us to defend the accused, an estimated 20,000 murder convictions a year. Now we're only talking about executions for violent crimes, but should we take into account the future of the Crime Bill and the steady erosion of Habeas Corpus and the Petition of Writ, we are talking about executions for non-violent crimes.

When the state is allowed to kill its citizens, the ideas of the people, regardless what they are, are in jeopardy. Many of our peers in the world today include countries like China, South Africa, Libya, Kuwait, Turkey and, everyone's

favorite, Iraq. As a matter of fact, along with Barbados, Bangladesh, Iran and Iraq, the U.S. is one of only five nations worldwide to execute its children, defined as persons below eighteen years of age as stated in the American Convention of Human Rights which has been signed by the United States.

Lastly, one must question a practice that is as inconsistent as the death penalty. The General Accounting Office stated in a recent study that 82 percent of death sentences are racially biased. And even as the federal government pushes, one must remember that two-thirds of all convictions or sentences are overturned because they are too Constitutionally flawed to be upheld.

The saddest fact is that last year was the state's most violent year in the history of South Carolina, the same year we killed Rusty Woomer. I thought the death penalty was supposed to be a deterrent. As George Bernard Shaw stated, "It is the dead that teaches, not the name we give it. Murder and capital punishment are not opposites that cancel one another, but similars that breed their kind."

Carl Maas is the South Carolina Student Area Coordinator for Amnesty International. There will be a vigil at the Governor's Mansion on Lincoln Street at 7:30 p.m. and a Dinner of Repentance at the United Methodist Church on Colonial Drive. Both will be held on Thursday, Sept. 5, 1991.

DEMOCRATIC LOGIC AT WORK



Honors college worthy institution at USC

Gee, I know how the guys in the Civil War must have felt.

This past week, this beloved newspaper ran an editorial slamming USC President John Palms for saying how great South Carolina College, the Honors College, is.

For all my honors college friends, I had no part in that editorial. Why should I anyways? Why would I want to slit my own throat by discrediting my college?

Well anyways, the editorial went on to say Palms was selling the "regular" USC colleges short by praising the honors college.

The writer of the editorial mentioned Palms said, "The honors college offers a superior education to young people who might otherwise attend academically acclaimed schools outside of South Carolina."

The editorial also said Palms was basically saying, "USC stinks, but at least we have the honors college."

I'm sorry fellow newspaper hounds, but that is not at all what Palms said.

When the editorial was written, the writer took Palms' quote out of context. All throughout the statement by Palms, Palms mentioned the different angles that are so "great" here at USC.

Anyway, let's face it, the honors college is a superior college. Otherwise, it would not be called the honors college.



TIGE WATTS

Let's also face that if not for the honors college, we would lose a lot of talented individuals.

The honors college houses almost 700 students with an average SAT score of 1250. Pretty high standards for any institution.

The average SAT score at John Hopkins University is 1290. Northwestern University, a highly acclaimed liberal arts university, boasts average scores of 1230.

Want more proof? North Carolina-Chapel Hill, 1109; University of Michigan, 1195; University of California at Berkeley, 1176; University of California at Los Angeles, 1142; and Carnegie Mellon University, 1225.

All those institutions above were ranked in the top 25 of national universities. Let's face it, we have some pretty impressive stuff here.

Even the number one university, Harvard, had an average test score of 1370, only 120 points ahead of South Carolina College.

Compare those numbers to "regular" USC and you'll find the average SAT score to be only 960 points, almost 300 lower.

Now can you sit there and tell me some person with Einstein capability will decide to go to an institution of a lower nature. No, they won't and that's why we have the honors college.

Even my roommate has told me if not for the honors college, he wouldn't be here. If it wasn't for a scholarship check and the honors college, I wouldn't be here either.

We have to swallow our pride and admit there are smarter people. But there are also richer people, nicer people, more beautiful people, athletic people and people with nicer clothes.

South Carolina College is here to attract those smarter people and I think they're doing a pretty decent job.

In this time of "bad press," it's OK to have a few shiny sparkles. Until we catch the honors college doing something wrong, though, let's have some pride in something.

I'm sorry guys, but I can't stand behind you in tearing apart the honors college. As long as my name is in the staff box to the left, I cannot sit by and let an injustice occur.

So if you want, draw up the lines and put me on the honors college side.

THE GAMECOCK

News: 777-7726

Advertising: 777-4249

CHRIS SILVESTRI
Editor in Chief

DAVID BOWDEN
Managing Editor/Viewpoint Editor
TIGE WATTS
News Editor
AARON SHEININ
Sports Editor

BRANT LONG
Copy Desk Chief
OCTAVIA WRIGHT
Carolina Life Editor
TEDDY LEPP
Photography Editor

PATRICK VILLEGAS
Asst. News Editor
TRACEY DAVIS
Asst. Carolina Life Editor
VIRGINIA MARSHALL
Asst. Copy Desk Chief

GORDON MANTLER
Asst. News Editor
RICH TAYLOR
Asst. Sports Editor
GREG RICKABAUGH
Asst. Photography Editor
ERIC GLENN
Darkroom Technician

RENEE A. GIBSON
Asst. Media Director/Advertising Manager
STACIE LEWIS
Asst. Advertising Manager
ERIK COLLINS
Faculty Adviser
LARA CHAPMAN
Asst. Classified Manager

LAURA S. DAY
Production Manager
RAY BURGOS
Asst. Production 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.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

President clarifies issue

To the editor:

Thank you for your editorial Wednesday concerning my recent reference to the honors college. As you may know by my comments of the past few months, I am extremely impressed by the high quality of the undergraduate education and experience that students find at Carolina, and I appreciate your pointing out their value. This university has much to be proud of.

However, using the word "superior" in referring to the honors college does not denigrate the university's undergraduate program as a whole. My comments referred to other parts of that program I find noteworthy, and there are many more. "Superior" is a relative term and does not suggest that the rest of the university is not performing well. In the reference you cited, I referred to its superiority relative to higher education throughout the country.

Placing the honors college on par with other "academically acclaimed" schools out-of-state is not mere rhetoric. Deans at Ivy League colleges and professional schools, external academic review committees, and faculty, students and graduates with whom I have spoken and whose evaluations I have read attest to the education the honors

college offers. Our honors college students are statistically among the nation's best. Further, *How to Get an Ivy League Education at a State University*, by Martin Nemko (1988), places the honors college among the top such programs in the country.

In both performance and perception, the honors college is deeply respected. But it is only one part of the university's strong undergraduate program. I tried to bring attention to that entire program by noting several of its fine elements. I am committed to helping the university improve across the spectrum of its academic mission, and to making people aware of the many things we do well.

John M. Palms
USC President

Honors kids pitch tantrum

To the editor:

Has *The Gamecock* trashed just about everything that it can at USC? Is there anything else that needs to be bashed? Might we suggest Student Media? Although USC is far from perfection, students should have a sense of pride in their institution and its great diversity.

The editorial on the honors college is almost beyond mention. In a week when USC has come under

attack for admitting students with "low" average SAT scores and GPRs, the slam on the honors college really takes the cake. Obviously, the writer does not understand what SCC and its students are really like.

Honors students are involved in all forms of campus life: Student Government, the Greek system and various other student organizations. Thus, SCC should be viewed in the light of being an integral part of university life — like the athletic department, the school of business, or HRTA. When a university official praises the international business program, does the journalism school pout about it? Do SCC students whine when President Palms compliments our football team? SCC and its hard-working staff should be recognized for the unique opportunity it presents to its students just as any other "regular" university program should be. Surely one understands that President Palms could not possibly praise every department on every occasion.

The second point the writer babbles about is even more ridiculous than the first. What basis does the writer have for making statements such as the honors college is involved in "false advertising?" The prestigious *New York Times* calls SCC "a thriving undergraduate honors college that operates at Ivy League standards." Also, we refer you to the book *How to Get an Ivy League Education at a State Uni-*

versity by Martin Nemko, Ph.D. These "words" come from independent authors over which not even Dr. Holderman had influence.

The key phrase to remember is "Ivy League education at state-supported prices;" surely schools that charge students \$10,000 or more for tuition might offer some better programs to those few students who can afford it. We were both accepted to and received scholarships from some of those "academically acclaimed schools," but we chose to attend USC. Personally, we are quite proud of the degrees we will receive from USC through the honors college.

This slam on the university should not come as a great surprise. In our old age, we seem to have forgotten the last time a member of *The Gamecock* has said anything positive about USC. Do you think that our student activity fees should fund such irresponsible and inane journalism? Considering the rather lame argument Tige Watts makes that abortion is the economical solution to unwanted children, we suggest that *The Gamecock's* portion of student activity fees be sent to the District of Columbia to help underwrite adoptions. At least then, the money will not be wasted at parrot-cage lining.

Chris Smith
USC senior

Ted W. Wooten, III
International studies senior