



Serving USC Since 1908
Stephanie Sonnenfeld, Editor in Chief
Chris Dixon, Viewpoints Editor

Editorial Board

Martha Hotop, Achim Hunt, Brian Rish, Adam Snyder,
Jennifer Stanley, Lisa Noworatzky, Cece von Kolnitz, Robert Walton,

**IN OUR
OPINION**

School spirit more than just football and cheerleaders

Well, it's about that time of year again. Time for Carolina Homecoming; a four-day celebration of all things garnet & black. Basically, if you don't have school spirit after this weekend, you won't ever.

Homecoming

As students at Carolina, we have a duty to take pride in every aspect of the University.

we all have an obligation as students at the University. Everyone has a duty to believe in what they are doing and try to improve it as best they can, whenever they can.

All Homecoming events this weekend basically focus on one thing, school spirit. Spirit in what it means to be a student here at Carolina, to have pride in our school.

Granted, some of the activities that will be put on are kind of cheesy, but hey, what would Homecoming be without cheese?

The problem is that a lot of people think that's all school spirit is, cheese. Stupid things like knowing all the words to the fight song and having 47 different Gamecock T-shirts. But school spirit is more than that. It's realizing that, as students here, we are part of a community. And no matter what our place may be, from football player to art major,

So you're an engineering major and may not be the biggest football fan, but you should still have pride in your school, in your program, in what you do. After all, you are paying to be at USC, so you might as well make the best of your experience while you are here.

That's really what school spirit is. Not just pride in the football team, the fact the Horseshoe is two days older than dirt, or that Darius and the boys used to live in the dorms that everyone calls the worst on campus.

It's a pride not just in these tangible things about Carolina, but the ideas behind Carolina. That we are a community with a common goal, and that we should do everything within our power to achieve that goal.



CHARLTON HESTON OVERREACTS TO SUBWAY'S NUTRITIONAL POLICIES.

Quote, Unquote

"We don't know if people are athletes or not, and most athletes keep to themselves because we have the same schedule."

Katherine Stephenson, freshman Volleyball player

American people overuse 'extremism'

**John Frick
Columnist**

If I just had a nickel for every time I have heard the word "extreme" or a derivative thereof over the past 12 months, I could retire the national debt and still have enough dough leftover to retire to Malibu.

The funny thing about it is, that for all the talk about extremism in our modern world, we as average Americans don't fully understand what real extremism is.

What is the first thing you heard when the newly-elected Republican majority started their daunting task of reigning in this monstrosity we call the federal government? It probably sounded a little like "Those right-wing extremists want to starve our children and our grandparents."

While this is not a direct quote, please understand that this is not an exaggeration either.

In fact, some of the actions of the Republican majority were likened to actions of the Third Reich.

So what was it that these congressional left-wingers were whining about? It was about reductions in the rate of growth of some of the biggest cash cow programs in Washington.

The Republicans were not only cutting spending on these programs, they weren't even freezing it.

They were merely lowering, by the smallest of margins, the rate at which

these programs would grow each year.

Yet, this was likened to a holocaust on the American people. There can be only two explanations for this unconscionable label.

One is that the people who level these accusations are so adept and uncaring about purposely deceiving the American people, that they do so without remorse, or two, we have become so spoiled in our wonderful system of government that we've lost the understanding of what true extremism is.

Extremism is a term that connotes change.

In our system, you should never hear someone who advocates keeping something the way it already is being labeled as an extremist (in relation to the common mind set).

This holds true because of the nature of our political system, which tends to produce ends which are much more centrist.

Unfortunately, the term extremism has been co-opted by the left as a way of combating many of the rights more popular and common sense issues by not arguing with the principle (i.e., a balanced budget) but citing the means to that end as "going too far."

For example, the first two times the president had an opportunity to sign the new Welfare bill, this approach was used. He could say he was for this "overhaul" of the welfare system (a popular initiative), but didn't have to sign it by using the excuse that the means were just too

What is the first thing you heard when the newly-elected Republican majority started their daunting task of reigning in this monstrosity we call the federal government? It probably sounded a little like "Those right-wing extremists want to starve our children and our grandparents."

extreme. It is a clever tool, but its inherent results are sad.

It has become extremism to stand up for anything. It is obviously not extremism to protect the traditional institution of marriage, for it is an institution societies have been built on for centuries.

Yet, what is the label given to those who support the protection of marriage? Extremists. Why is this extremism? Nobody seems to know.

In the history of our country, there have been some extremists; some rebels who truly resorted to extreme measures to pursue their ideology.

They were our founding fathers. The men who stood up against tyranny and risked their lives for the principles they believed in. Their views were extreme for their time.

They preached the doctrine of individual rights, of the sovereignty of the people's right to self-determine. They knew the true meaning of what Barry Goldwater meant when he said, "Extremism in defense of liberty is no vice, and moderation in the pursuit of Justice is no virtue."

Their willingness to die for what they believed was right would be labeled extremism today. It would violate the

permissive non-committal ethical code our society has endorsed.

It would entail politicians who cared more about what was right than what was popular. It would entail a gut check of our society, the likes of which our generation has never known.

Look out for the word extremism. When you see it, look hard, for its use is a sign that the ideas which it describes are hard to argue with any other way.

It is an intellectual cop-out, a name you can call somebody or something which will shrink its legitimacy without actually calling into question the true ideas which it entails.

It is a buzz word which you should look for as a sure sign that another politician is grandstanding.

Do not forget that there are few leaders who ever amounted to much who weren't labeled extreme at one time or another. Discounting everyone or everything labeled extreme is destructive to ingenuity and progress.

Ideas and men should be judged upon their merit, their effectiveness and their motivation, and not upon some two-bit insult hurled in a desperate attempt to discredit and disparage.

Letters To The Editor

To the editor,

After reading your September 16 editorial, titled "Christian Coalition shouldn't dictate American morals," I was left a bit bewildered. You stated that Mr. Dole had spoken at a Christian Coalition rally recently because its members have money and votes, which Mr. Dole needs. You then cautioned that the Coalition should not be allowed to influence morals.

I find this odd because, to the best of my knowledge, the Coalition has done no such thing. After combing my memory, I could not think of a single instance in which a Coalition leader had made a vow to turn America into a theocracy, or establish national morality standards. You did not provide any examples of that. In fact, the First and 14th Amendments to the Constitution prevent the establishment of religion, which I presume is part of what you meant.

To the best of my knowledge, the Christian Coalition plans on working through legal channels to make the influence of believers felt in government. They have opinions, and they have every right to express them. Ralph Reed has publicly stated his desire for religious and cultural tolerance.

If the Gamecock has evidence to the contrary, I suggest you publish it, as it would be a bombshell on the order of the Pentagon Papers.

You criticize Mr. Robertson's belief that the election is based on morals, not money, which he can say "because

he has plenty of money," and suggest that those struggling financially should not worry about such things. Having been poor all my life, I take issue with your apparent suggestion that the poor should not be concerned with moral behavior. One does not do what is right because one is wealthy, but because it is right. The Christian Coalition has plenty of middle-class and poor supporters, as does the Republican party.

As a last note, I wonder why you are so concerned with this one interest group influencing politics.

The Democratic candidates pander to the education establishment, unions and minorities. Each exacts a toll, in many cases a moral one, from them, which is paid by the rest of society. Why did you not assail them?

Let me reiterate my challenge to you to provide specific examples of Christian Coalition attempts to "dictate American morals." Given a chance, I shall obliterate whatever you concoct.

By the way, your attempts to demonize a sector of the population remind me of a fellow whom I once had the displeasure of encountering. He lectured me on the evil influence of the Jews on American politics and morals. I knew better than to listen to him, and I know better than to believe you.

Vernon C. Davenport
Economics/History senior

**Fred Leach
Columnist**

This Thursday, the Senate will vote whether or not to override President Clinton's veto of the Partial-Birth Abortion Bill.

The bill, which would place a ban on the procedure, except in cases necessary to save the mother's life, was approved by Congress last March. President Clinton vetoed the bill on April 10.

Not everyone is completely aware of this issue however, because the liberal media is avoiding it. Partial birth abortion is not just a term invented by politicians to win sympathy for their cause. It literally is a partial-birth abortion.

The liberal media will not describe the issue because it is shocking, to say the least.

Following is a description of the procedure: The partial-birth abortion procedure is used any time after 20 weeks (4-1/2 months) of pregnancy; often six months or even later. The abortionist, guided by ultrasound, grabs the baby's legs with a pair of forceps.

Then the baby's legs are pulled into the birth canal. The abortionist then

delivers the baby, except for the head. The abortionist next inserts scissors into the baby's skull.

The scissors are then opened to enlarge the hole, and the baby's brain is sucked out of the skull. This causes the skull to collapse and the dead baby is removed.

Folks, I did not just make that up. This is really what goes on all across America, although you will never hear it described on the news.

The following is an excerpt of the testimony of Brenda Pratt Shafer, a registered nurse who was assigned by her nursing agency to an abortion clinic. Shafer considered herself "very pro-choice," so she didn't think that her assignment would be a problem. It was not a problem until she witnessed a partial-birth abortion.

"I stood at the doctor's side and watched him perform a partial-birth abortion on a woman who was six months pregnant. The baby's heartbeat was clearly visible on the ultrasound screen. The doctor delivered the baby's body and arms, everything but his little head," Pratt Shafer said.

"The baby's body was moving. His little fingers were clasping together. He

Not everyone is completely aware of this issue however, because the liberal media is avoiding it. Partial-birth abortion is not just a term invented by politicians to win sympathy for their cause. It literally is a partial-birth abortion. The liberal media will not describe the issue because it is shocking, to say the least.

was kicking his feet. The doctor took a pair of scissors and inserted them into the back of the baby's head, and the baby's arms jerked out in a flinch, a startle reaction, like a baby does when he thinks he might fall. Then the doctor opened the scissors up."

"Then he stuck a high powered suction tube into the hole and sucked the baby's brains out. Now the baby was completely limp. I never went back to the clinic. But I am still haunted by the face of that little boy. It was the most perfect, angelic face I have ever seen," Pratt Shafer said.

The bill by Congress allows a partial-birth abortion to be performed to save the mother's life.

However, pro-abortion groups and President Clinton want a loophole included that would allow for "emotional well-being" and "depression". In addition,

doctors have testified that a baby at this age can experience "great pain."

Dr. Martin Haskell, who has performed over 1,000 partial-birth abortions said that he performs them "routinely" for non-medical reasons, and that 80 percent are "purely elective."

How can this be going on in our country? I realize that many people are pro-abortion, but this goes beyond the issue of choice and personal freedom.

This is murder--it can be nothing else. Some might say that life only begins at birth, but even if that is so, the baby is, for all purposes, born when the procedure takes place.

This is allowing murder for the purpose of allowing someone to get out of having to face the responsibility of being a parent. Things like this took place 50 years ago in a little place called Nazi Germany.

The Gamecock
Student Media • Russell House • USC • Columbia, SC 29208

Stephanie Sonnenfeld
Editor in Chief
Chris Dixon
Viewpoints Editor
Martha Hotop
Adam Snyder
News Editor
Jennifer Stanley
Features Editor
Achim Hunt
Sports Editor

Cece von Kolnitz
Special Projects
Lisa Noworatzky
Copy Desk
Robert Walton
Photo Editor
Brian Rish
Graphics Editor
Rob Gioielli
Asst. Viewpoints

Dipka Bhambhani
Jessica Nash
Asst. Features
Bryan Johnston
Dwayne McLemore
Asst. Sports
Nikki Thorpe
Asst. Photo
Jason Jeffers
Daniel Brown
Cartoonists

Keith Boudreaux
Circulation Manager
Chris Carroll
Director of Student Media
Laura Day
Creative Director
J.T. Wagenheim
Asst. Director
Mark Hopkins
Graduate Assistant
Marilyn Edwards
Taylor
Marketing Director
Erik Collins
Faculty Advisor

The Gamecock is the student newspaper of the University of South Carolina and is published Monday, Wednesday and Friday during the fall and spring semesters, with the exception of university holidays and exam 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 Department of Student Media is its parent organization.

Letters Policy

The Gamecock will try to print all letters received. Letters should be 200-250 words and must include full name, professional title or year and major if a student. Letters must be personally delivered by the author to The Gamecock newsroom in Russell House room 333. The Gamecock reserves the right to edit all letters for style, possible libel or space limitations. Names will not be withheld under any circumstances.