



Serving USC Since 1908

Stephanie Sonnenfeld, Editor in Chief
Chris Dixon, Viewpoints Editor

Editorial Board

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

**IN OUR
OPINION**

Homeless should be given more respect, opportunities

There are certain problems in American society that will not go away. Problems with no quick solution, no easy fix that will be provided by simple

governmental legislation.

Homelessness is one of these problems. There are millions of people in this country who have no address, no phone number. No roof over their head or a bed to sleep in, much less a place they could call "home".

The problems that contribute to their homelessness are many and varied. It's almost different for each person. And it's something that's not going to go away.

To solve homelessness we need to look at the roots of the problem and address them. We have seen that the "safety net" of welfare does not work.

Handouts and shelters just keep people's bellies full and off the street. And that's fine when they first encounter trouble. But we need programs that help people help themselves get off the street.

We also need more compassion when it comes to the homeless. We need to have respect for those who are less fortunate than us, and let them know we still view them as people.

People who are just as valuable and capable as those of us who

The Homeless

Americans need to see homeless as people with skills and abilities.

do have a home. By giving the homeless respect we will be on the first step to helping them. Then we need to stress the programs like job training.

Many people are homeless because they can't get jobs. If we give people the basic education they need, and job training, then they will be able to attain jobs where they can support themselves. We stress to our young people that education is the most important thing they can have in life.

We need to extend these opportunities not only to the young, but also to those who missed out in the first place, so they can go back to school.

The minimum wage increase is also important. There were many homeless who work for minimum wage, but still can't find a place to live, because housing just cost too much.

The value of the dollar has just decreased too much, and \$4.25 an hour cannot support a person. Now they at least have a fighting chance to survive off the wage.

Once we do this we will be on the way to solving the homeless problem. We will be giving people a chance and giving them respect, which is all that anyone should really need.

Affirmative action needs improvement, revamping

Republican presidential candidate Bob Dole spoke out Monday on affirmative action, saying the government should provide assistance based on economic status, not gender or race.

Dole said the government should fight discrimination with justice and opportunity, not more discrimination.

Ideally, affirmative action is positive because it attempts to integrate minorities into the workplace.

Like too many programs enacted by the government, affirmative action has strayed from its original intent.

It's become a program

Affirmative Action

Employers and government should not use discrimination to fight discrimination.

dependent upon filling quotas and meeting numbers based on gender and ethnicity.

Isn't that discrimination of sorts? Doesn't that seem to

defeat the purpose of affirmative action?

Using discrimination to fight discrimination doesn't teach us anything. All it does is legitimize discriminatory hiring practices.

Can we, as the world's leading democratic nation, afford to tolerate any more discrimination? The answer is no.

What can we do to rectify this? We'll have to change the process.

We'll have to change today's affirmative action to meet yesterday's ideal.

NOW AVAILABLE AT THE RUSSELL HOUSE BOOKSTORE...



Quote, Unquote

"He kept telling us 'play Bloody Mary. Play Bloody Mary.' So, we asked him why. He said, 'So you will see me.'"

Freshman Amy B. about her experience with a USC ghost.

Letters To The Editor

Same-sex marriage doesn't infringe on anyone's rights

To the editor,

I would like to respond to a letter submitted by Chris Herrod. He commented on how same-sex marriages infringe on his rights.

Granted, I am not gay. I have had, and still have, gay friends. When I read his letter on how gay marriages "infringe" on his rights, I was outraged.

First of all, he states that liberals have no tolerance for his beliefs. This upsets me because I do agree with liberals on some, but not all, subjects.

He stated, "What is really meant is tolerance for those who believe as they do, but critical attacks against, and very intolerant rhetoric toward, those who don't."

I don't know from where he got that idea. Most of the liberals I have spoken to believe there should be tolerance for everyone and for everyone's beliefs, no matter what they are.

Now, as far as the Defense of Marriage Act goes, I totally disagree that a marriage has to be between a man and a woman. What is the difference between seeing a gay couple that is not married compared to seeing a gay couple that is married?

There is only one thing that comes to my mind: a ring. A simple ring around the left ring finger of the person. Herrod makes marriages between two people of the same sex sound like the biggest sin on the face of the earth.

While on the subject of the Defense of Marriage Act, I would like to comment on laws in this country. Laws in America have been changed time after time after time.

For example, take African-Americans in this country. They were brought to the U.S. as a minority group, and are still a minority group.

Even though they are a minority group, they have the same rights as anyone else in this country. They started out in America with no rights at all.

They could not own land, be married or vote. Now, however, they can do all of these things and more. What is my point in bringing African-Americans into this issue? To prove that laws can be changed depending on the situation at hand.

When Herrod states that his rights have limits because others have rights, and their rights are limited because he

has rights, I totally agree.

I do not, however, see how a married gay couple would go against his rights. What could possibly be the difference?

If he has to put up with gay couples that are not married, and does so, why can't he tolerate a married gay couple? I see no difference.

While I am on the subject of rights and their limits, I would like to comment on what he said about liberals and their beliefs on rights. He said liberals sounded like they wanted "unlimited freedom or unbounded rights."

This is not true by a long shot. Most, if not all, liberals do not believe in this. They simply believe that homosexuals should have the same rights as anyone else in this country, and that these rights are now being limited.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to comment on Herrod bringing God into the subject. In the Bible, it says, "Love thy neighbor." It does not continue to say "only if they are straight."

Liberals are not out to change someone's religion or beliefs or limit their rights. They are simply saying that they respect your beliefs, so please respect theirs.

Herrod's letter upset me most of all because he sounds ignorant to the facts, and the letter sounds like a clear attack on liberals and homosexuals in this country.

Ken Caudle
Marine Science Sophomore

Freshman Council member's statements irresponsible

To the editor,

Rarely do I call the intelligence of someone into question, but in the case of Freshmen Councilman Timothy Clardy, I'll gladly make an exception.

His recent letter in The Gamecock (Oct. 28) regarding a letter I wrote critical of Student Government was at best immature, at worst boorish, illogical, childish and openly hostile.

After reading it, however, I can better appreciate the military term "target-rich environment." With so many utterly

ridiculous statements in one letter, it was hard to choose which to address now and which to let fade into the oblivion they so rightly deserve.

I suppose the best place to start would be with the personal attacks on me. In his letter, Clardy calls my conclusions concerning the senate perks proposal suggested by SG senator Bryan Menees "cowardly and intolerant."

Pardon me, but why? Specifically, how were my opinions cowardly? Should I have smacked Senator Menees across the face with a glove, then presented him with a copy of my letter? Would that have been brave?

As for calling me "intolerant," Clardy is the one who told me just two paragraphs below to "shut up" and later to "...not ever again criticize SG and the senators..." Clardy is hardly encouraging free-thought. Has he ever heard of the concept of agreeing to disagree?

Clardy makes the statement (one of the few valid ones) that I have never run for any SG office. Well, I confess. I'm a sinner. I have never run for any SG office.

I haven't contracted malaria either, but that doesn't stop me from knowing I don't want any part of it. Some things common sense tells you are just bad, and SG is one such thing.

I have, however, visited the SG offices before. In fact, I did so again today. I discussed Clardy's letter with some of those present, and all, including SG President Patrick Wright, seemed rather embarrassed by it to say the least.

The main purpose of my visit, however, was to obtain a copy of Senator Menees' senate perks proposal, since Clardy accused me of never having read it.

Well, you know what? No one has read the proposal because Senator Menees has not written it down, I was told by the SG receptionist. I based my opinions on the issue of senate perks from quotes attributed to Senator Menees in The Gamecock. If those statements were in error, I suggest he contact them for a retraction.

Regarding Clardy's offer to "teach" me about respect and power in government, I'm afraid I'll have to decline. I would venture to say it is Clardy who could learn a thing or two.

Most notably is Clardy's striking ignorance of how a republican form of

government works. In this type of government, the people (in this case the students of USC) elect representatives (that dubious distinction encompasses Clardy) to represent their interests.

In simple terms, you work for me, Mr. Clardy.

Part of my tuition goes to fund SG and I, along with every other USC student, have the right to vote you in, vote you out, or not vote at all. Furthermore, that means I may criticize you, student senate, or SG as long, and as much, as I like.

I simply don't have the time to waste on an organization that, in its own constitution, states, "Note: By law the Board of Trustees is the governing board of this University and this constitution in no way abrogates or limits the authority of the Board in matters of governance."

That seems rather clear, doesn't it? Since only five to eight percent, on average, of the student body as a whole votes in SG elections, apparently many of my fellow students agree with my opinion that SG is impotent to affect change at this university.

The last issue that needs addressing is Clardy's none too subtle threat to withhold funding for the Department of Computer Science as a result of my criticism of SG. So many adjectives come to mind when I think of this, but I guess I'll have to settle for ludicrous.

SG has no control over the budget for the Department of Computer Science. SG did, however, provide some funding for the Association of Computing Machines chapter on this campus, an organization that is unfortunately defunct at present.

In closing, I should like to ask Clardy to publicly retract his statements concerning Computer Science and acknowledge that they were inappropriate.

Should he fail to apologize, I call upon SG President Patrick Wright to issue an apology on behalf of SG for Clardy's irresponsible comments.

I would also hope that the senators who represent the College of Science and Math, Curtis Brown, RaNell Cheney, Jonathan Dickson, Craig Harrison, Sue Moyer and Lisa Weaver, would voice their disapproval of Clardy's heavy-handed statements.

Dev Brown
Computer Science Senior



News: 777-7726
Advertising: 777-1184
FAX: 777-6482

Student Media • Russell House-USC • Columbia, SC 29208

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Stephanie Sonnenfeld
Editor in Chief | Angie Campbell
Lisa Noworatzky
Sara Svedberg
Copy Desk | Rob Gioielli
Asst. Viewpoints
Jessica Nash
Asst. Features | Chris Carroll
Director of Student Media |
| Chris Dixon
Viewpoints Editor | Robert Walton
Photo Editor | Bryan Johnston
Dwayne McLemore
Asst. Sports | Laura Day
Creative Director |
| Martha Hotop
Adam Snyder
News Editors | Brian Rish
Graphics Editor | Nikki Thorpe
Asst. Photo | J.T. Wagenheim
Art Director |
| Jennifer Stanley
Features Editor | Jason Jeffers
Daniel Brown
Cartoonists | Ben Muldrow
Asst. Graphics | Mark Hopkins
Graduate Assistant |
| Achim Hunt
Sports Editor | | | Marilyn Edwards
Taylor
Advertising Director |
| Cece von Kolnitz
Special Projects | | | Erik Collins
Faculty Advisor |

Letters Policy

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.

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.