

Viewpoints

Vote

Despite hindrances, registered students should make every effort to go to polls

Despite the fact South Carolina's voter registration office in Columbia is a cubby hole, and you cannot always trust those who accept forms during registration drives, it is still fairly easy to vote in this state in comparison to the rest of the country.

South Carolina's system allows those with motivation to be registered but also lets groups organize to register voters such as those on USC's campuses. The system is one having its roots in the political exclusion of "frivolous" voters, but with registration drives like the Voter Van sponsored by The State and WIS-TV, the electorate has expanded in the state.

South Carolina's system has its flaws and advantages, and it depends on your perspective as a voter on how you see it.

South Carolina keeps voters eligible only if they vote every two years. If you miss an election, your name is taken off the roll and you have to re-register. This may have the effect of keeping the current electorate voting, but it also makes it more difficult for those who skip an election and wish to vote.

As far as USC goes, student organizations in most cases have gone a long way in making voting easier for most students. Kappa Delta sorority and Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity will be sponsoring a day care at the P.E. Center for those of you with kids or who just want to take full advantage of the holiday. Programs such as these support students and parents in getting out the vote.

On your registration card, it says in what precinct you can vote; however, no information is provided on the card about polling places. If you do not know where your polling place is, call Richland County Voter Registration at 748-4944 or Lexington County Voter Registration at 359-8361.

We know tomorrow you have the day off, but you need to take advantage of this time. Speak your conscience, and tell America who is in charge of your future. So put down the beer, get off your butt and vote.



Politicians and the suckers who vote for them

Last spring, I got sick one Saturday night, and my friends took me to Baptist Medical Center. A nurse took my blood pressure and temperature and put me in a bed for three hours. When a doctor finally showed up, he gave me a dose of green medicine and sent me on my way.

My parents received a bill for \$200. If the Thomson Student Health Center was open, I probably could have received the same health care for half of what Baptist Medical Center charged.

One month later, I was sitting in an organizational meeting, and two candidates were vying to become student body vice president.

They both gave good speeches, and it was difficult for me to determine which candidate would serve the student body the best. (I did not know either one of them.)

One candidate, however, said she wanted to work to have the health center open weekends. Then she told us a heartbreaking story of how she had to go to Baptist Medical Center one



ROCHELLE KILLINGBECK
COLUMNIST

weekend, costing her parents \$2,000.

I gave my vote, therefore, to the above-mentioned candidate. Being the naive voter I was, I did not think she could have been an opportunist or that she did not know what she was talking about.

The honest, intelligent, trustworthy candidate I thought I was voting for won.

I was relieved because students would not have to go to Baptist Medical Center if the candidate kept her pledge.

I was upset when I read a letter in the Oct. 19 edition of the Gamecock where the student body vice president stated she researched having the

health center open on weekends, and she did not think it was feasible.

What type of leader would pledge to work to have the health center open weekends, but say it is not feasible after she is elected?

A) She really wanted to have the health center open weekends but did not know she should have researched it before she made it a part of her platform.

B) She researched the project but did not do a thorough investigation.

C) She never had any intentions of working to have the health center open weekends and is an opportunist who lied to get votes.

I feel my vote was wasted. It is partly my fault, however, for voting for a candidate whom I did not question or check out before I voted.

Let this be a lesson to voters who rely on a speech to determine which candidates are best suited to serve our interests. Don't be a sucker — like me.

TOP TEN THINGS STUDENT GOVERNMENT IS DOING ON ELECTION DAY BY MAT HANLEY

10. Filling out absent-minded ballots
9. Putting the names of each of the voters they were responsible for in a hat and will pick one out: the winner votes in their place!
8. Thanking the good Lord there's a place for people like them in SGA
7. Planning to pull the lever for Dukakis/Bentsen
6. Putting off 'that shower thing' for another two weeks
5. Will lie, kill or do whatever they can to disrupt the democratic process
4. Writing 200 letters of apology
3. Thinking how they'd like to one day be as smart as Dan Quayle
2. Eating the Halloween candy they stole from the kids in the neighborhood
1. Starting their petition to repeal the 26th Amendment

Clinton/Gore playdown economic rebound

As I stood on the Horseshoe listening to Al Gore lie about the state of the U.S. economy, I realized how easily misled the American public can be. After months of being bombarded nightly with reports on how bad the economy is, fear has led many to discard common sense and to vote for a man whose qualifications are seriously lacking. I suppose Clinton and Gore have been too busy campaigning to notice most all prime economic indicators have shown improvement in the past few months. Unemployment is down, and housing starts are up. This has occurred without government intervention. The free market has dictated this recovery.

Clinton and Gore have stated this economic period is the worst since the Great Depression. I have to wonder how they can retain any credibility while making outrageously bogus claims of this sort. Even CNN, not considered a conservative source, has reported our previous two recessions ('73-'74 and '81-'82) as worse than this one. If this is true, then why has President Bush's approval rating dropped so rapidly? People have a warped view of the events of the last twelve years.



RYAN ATKINSON
GUEST COLUMNIST

Clinton and Gore have continually misstated the principles of supply-side economics and the deepness of the recession. It is well-documented that the recent recession has virtually been a global occurrence. Some economists believe a cyclical change in many advanced societies from a production-based economy to a service-oriented economy caused this. If this is true, it has likely been fueled by technological advancement. Even the Democrats cannot blame that on George Bush.

My biggest grievance with the Democrats has been their attacks on Bush concerning the "Read my lips" statement. The Tax Budget Deal of 1990 was introduced by Democrats as a means of reducing the deficit. Bush, who does not have the luxury of a balanced budget amendment like

Clinton does in Arkansas, went along with it in hopes of reducing the deficit. It did not curb congressional spending where the real problem lies. In fact, it probably attributed to prolonging the recession.

The Democrats have attacked Bush for going along with an idea originating with them. On top of that, Clinton plans on raising taxes again. He claims he will only raise taxes on the richest two percent, but most reports show he cannot raise the revenue he needs for his social and economic programs without taxing the middle class more.

Finally, government will get bigger under Clinton. Under no circumstances is this good. Government is the most inefficient means of creating jobs imaginable. Any politician or social program cannot remedy this because the government is never subject to the free market principle of competition. Competition produces quality and efficiency. Inefficiency in government equals a waste of tax dollars. As the government enlarges, taxpayers' burden becomes greater. This means less take-home pay for the average American.



Editor in Chief.....	Greg Rickabaugh
Managing Editor.....	Patrick Villegas
Copy Desk Chief.....	Jay King
News Editors.....	Chad Bray J.T. Wagenheim
Viewpoints Editor.....	Jack Dunn
Features Editor.....	Lee Clontz
Sports Editors.....	Nancy Salomonsky Tim Thorsen
Photo Editor.....	Stephanie Newlin
Graphic Editor.....	Ryan Sims
Cartoonist.....	Paul Jon
Asst. News Editor.....	Melissa Tennen
Asst. Features Editor.....	Jennifer Fuller
Asst. Sports Editor.....	Rob Rodusky
Asst. Photo Editor.....	Lea Clayton
Asst. Graphics Editors.....	Kristin Buehlman Gregory Perez
Asst. Copy Desk Editor.....	Brian Garland
Student Media Coordinator.....	Jim McKellar
Production Manager.....	Laura Day
Asst. Production Manager.....	Jim Green
Faculty Advisor.....	Erik Collins
Advertising Manager.....	Renee Gibson
Graduate Asst.....	Brian McGuire
Darkroom Technicians.....	Erin Galloway Rika Hashimoto

The Gamecock will try to print all letters received. Letters should be no more than 250 words. Full name and professional title, or year and major if a student, must be included along with address and phone number. The Gamecock reserves the right to edit letters. The Gamecock is the student newspaper of the University of South Carolina and is published three times a week on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays during the fall and spring semesters and weekly during both summer sessions, with the exception of university holidays and examination periods. Opinions expressed in The Gamecock are those of the editors or author and not those of the University of South Carolina. The Board of Student Publications and Communications is the publisher of The Gamecock. The Student Media Department is the parent organization of The Gamecock. Change of address forms, subscriptions, requests and other correspondence should be sent to The Gamecock, P.O. Box 85131, The University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208. Subscription rates are \$46 a year. First class postage paid at Columbia, SC. The Gamecock is a registered student organization of the University of South Carolina and is partially funded by student activity fees.

Letters to the Editor

Student loses right to vote due to trust

To the editor:

I have been closely following the election this year. As a first-time voter, I wanted to make sure I knew the issues and would be able to make an educated decision. I am, however, embarrassed to admit that I am not registered to vote.

I filled out my registration form well before the deadline, but I made a mistake. I trusted my registration form to a group of college students running a voter registration booth during the organization fair.

Several weeks later, I had not received my registration card. Calling Voter Registration, I learned my form had never been turned in. After investigating, it seems one of the students involved in the registration drive showed up at the student legislature with over 200 forms.

On Election Day, 200 students will not be able to vote, myself included. I would like to thank that nameless student for teaching me a valuable lesson. I will never again trust another person with something as important as my voice in democracy.

Melanie Beth Lewis
English junior

Bookstores swindle students

To the editor:

It could be a freshman thing, but I need a clarification about returning "like new" books. Several weeks ago, I returned a "like new" \$23 book to a certain bookstore on campus. I needed some cash, and, like any rational human being, I thought I would get what I paid. Obviously not! I thought it was a joke when an employee handed me \$7 for a new book that had hardly been used.

To my knowledge, scalping is illegal. Scalping tickets at a football game is illegal, so why is it O.K. for a bookstore to scalp books to money-exerted students?

It seems only Holdermanistic (referring to former USC President James Holderman, who used state funds for personal use) to con students out of every bit of money they have.

Why should we, as tax-paying students, have to put up with this book scam? Is there a reliable bookstore on or near campus that does not monopolize books? Finally, why does the bookstore overprice books? An answer would be appreciated.

Jamie Jeffcoat
Undeclared freshman

Endorsements not befitting objectivity

To the editor:

After watching CNN this afternoon, my faith in the political process diminished a little bit more. The newscaster stated that several prominent newspapers from around the country had announced their endorsement of candidates. My mouth dropped open. I have heard of newspaper support before; however, the situation never seemed important to me until now when I can vote.

Journalism classes teach that the newspaper's sole purpose is to report the news in an unbiased and factual manner and to present all sides of a situation to readers. Then readers are able to form their own opinions.

This situation is analogous to a celebrity endorsing a product. A fan of the celebrity might be influenced into buying a product just because of the endorsement. The fan probably figured if the celebrity likes and uses the product, then it must be a good product.

The same result is possible when a newspaper endorses a presidential candidate. This is not a new car or a Pepsi. This is a serious matter. The editor's opinion belongs in the editorial section alongside an opposing viewpoint. The founders of the Constitution gave the power

of the vote to the people, not the press, because the founders believed in the individual and the individual's right of self-determination.

I love this country. I believe in freedom of speech and freedom of the press; however, the democratic process, the right of the individual to choose the president, is the basis of this country.

Today's press takes advantage of its power and rights in order to influence individual's opinions. It is violating the freedom of individual choice and attacking the foundation of this nation. A conflict of interest, therefore, arises with the endorsement of candidates. The press' role as an unbiased information provider is tarnished. Due to the media's responsibility of remaining unbiased, endorsement of any candidate is unethical.

The media needs to return—if it were ever there—to a purely unbiased, fact-based presentation of the issues showing all perspectives. We, the American people, need to get up from our La-Z-Boys and make our own educated decisions about our country's future instead of relying on the media's opinion.

When the mass media moves from being deliverers of information (e.g. The postman delivers the mail) to presidential candidate groupies is when the statement "America is going to hell in a handbag" is validated.

Vasa William Cate
Undeclared freshman