



'Even the history here is not history; it is how it affects how we deal with events.'

Dr. Robert Herzstein, USC Professor of History

The Gamecock

Serving the Carolina Community since 1908

EDITORIAL BOARD

- Sara Ladenheim • Editor in Chief
- Kenley Young • Managing Editor
- Emily Streyer • Viewpoints Editor
- Corey Ford • Assistant Viewpoints Editor
- Brad Walters • Editorial Contributor
- Kiki McCormick • Editorial Contributor

Positive legislation from the SG senate

As the impeachment saga continued at yesterday's senate meeting, an amendment [SBL (99) 053] was passed to the legislative codes outlining the rules and procedures for such trials. Compared with the first reading that wrongfully stated the press and public had no place at the deliberations, this amendment bears no resemblance. Rules governing procedures referring to the banning of *The Gamecock* and the general public were abolished from the legislation and all instances of Freedom of Information Act violation, were removed.

However, much to the dismay of many senators, another amendment was proposed to allow for secret balloting to replace roll-call voting during the procedures. By a large majority, the initiative was defeated and the issue put to rest.

Senate members have shown with the passing of this legislation that it is indeed serious about present and future cases of impeachment. Rather than table the issue, they met it full force and debated its merits and faults. The final read of the bill reflected much debate from members of Student Government, the public and *The Gamecock* that was shaped accordingly.

The Gamecock commends the senate for its initiative and applauds the hard work and dedication of the concerned members of the student body. In no way did the passage of this bill make a mockery of the legislative process. Senators have decided to take the issue seriously, and their hard work will show in the fair and ethical trial they are about to undertake.

Debate absentees have much to hide

Presidential debates, a critical aspect of moreso the nomination process than the general election, provide the opportunity for likely primary voters to gain an understanding of where the candidates stand on the issues.

By learning about the candidates' stances, the people move away from simply judging politicians on charisma or style portrayed in campaign television ads.

With the 2000 election season gearing up, New Hampshire, the first primary in the nation, along with Iowa has already started televised debates. Republican White House hopefuls have held two debates so far, yet some aspect was missing from the debates.

The Republican front-runner Gov. George W. Bush skipped out of the debates.

On the surface, Bush had somewhat valid, personal reasons for not attending. Candidates who turn down debates, however, many times have something to hide from the media and the prospective voters.

Whether it is a personal mishap involving affairs or a perceived extreme stance on a critical issue, no reason should keep a candidate from proclaiming his or her platform.

Especially with the race for president, candidates should attend the debates. Being the leader of the nation, an expected president must display leadership by taking a firm, principled stand on a controversial issue. And by dropping out of debates, candidates do the exact opposite.

COLLEGE PRESS EXCHANGE



LETTERS

GMP found lacking in service, cleanliness

To the Editor:

I am writing to address the issue of campus dining. Recently, I found a bug in my Caesar salad from the Grand Marketplace (GMP). I sought a manager who told me there was nothing he could do about it besides give me a free meal. However, I asked myself why I would want to eat here after such an incident? The manager agreed that there is a bug problem and stated the fact that the building is old as an excuse. He informed me that they often spray to prevent more insects. Furthermore, I have heard rumors that our food service was ranked the fifth worst college food in the country. Clearly, there is a problem with campus dining.

The GMP is the most accessible eatery on campus, serving residents in the Women's Quad, South Tower, Patterson, the Towers, and Horseshoe dormitories as well as all other students and faculty. However, in my opinion, this mess hall has the worst service, food and appearance.

There are a few employees at the GMP who are kind and always greet you with a smile. However, many servers and cashiers are often hostile, rude and impatient. There have been times where the employees do not wear hair nets or gloves, or they just serve the food in an unsanitary manner.

The food, especially the hot line, is inadequate and disgusting. Before coming to school, I expected poor cuisine but I never thought it would be this bad. Colleges have an ill reputation when it comes to dining halls, but among the others I have visited, ours is much worse.

Finally, the appearance of the GMP is awful. As stated before, I had the unfortunate luck of finding a bug in my meal. I have also seen cockroaches running around on the floors!

I cannot say I will not eat at the GMP again, because it is most convenient. However, I will avoid it when possible. I plan to eat at the Patio, which I have found to be superior in quality, appearance, taste, and hospitality. I hope that Marriott Dining Services will improve its service at the GMP to further satisfy students and faculty, and I urge students to literally watch what they eat. Bon appetit!

Tania Simonetti
Marketing/International Business Junior

Gamecock misses mark on several counts

To the Editor:

A while back, *The Gamecock* ran a series of articles on a court decision in federal court allowing schools to censor

school newspapers. Your paper came out clearly against the position of the courts [editorial, "Recent ruling tragic for campus freedoms," Sept. 10].

However, since then, you have given plenty of reasons as to why the court system should restrict the ability of student media to promulgate its views across campus. Let us look at the three main ones, all of which have appeared either in the last week or months. There has been an increase in crime on the various corridors between campus and Five Points, as is to be expected with the influx of students back into the community during the beginning of the fall semester. However, you use this rise to blame SLED, campus police, and a host of other factors for failing campus security [guest column, "Only safe haven at Pavlov's," Sept. 10]. You refer to underage drinking several times in your articles, once even going so far as to create a fictional scenario in which students drink underage, are robbed and dare blame law enforcement units. You have yet to come out clearly opposed to underage drinking. Let's make this perfectly clear. Drinking under the age of 21 in the state of South Carolina is illegal. That should be your position. And it should be one pointed out vehemently, and repeatedly. If you claim to be concerned about campus safety, then that must be your position.

Crime can be directly linked to alcohol consumption, and if you increase the population of drinkers, you increase the population of victims and perpetrators. Until you decide to take the hard road, the high road in the debate about campus safety, you have no right to attack anybody else in their quest to make us safer.

The second issue you fail to raise yourself to the level of serious thought to is the use of drugs. Your papers' position is that "drug users should be warned before their funding is cut off, AFTER they have been convicted." [editorial, "Warning necessary before loss of loans," Oct. 29] There is not a single drug user in this country, that had a gun put to his head, and was forced to use narcotics. It is done out of choice.

If you make the choice to use illegal drugs, you are making the choice of possibly being caught. There is nobody left in this country that does not know that certain drugs are illegal to use. And to use those drugs incurs a certain responsibility, namely the possibility of arrest, prosecution and prison time, or in certain cases, loss of scholarship money. Nobody has a right to any funding if they use illegal substances. They have no right to a "warning" because their warning came when they decided to use an illegal narcotic. You simply wish to perpetrate continued lack of responsibility amongst our society.

And finally, the issue that probably comes closest to this Marine's heart is the article you printed, in rather bad taste, about abortion [column, "Abor-

tion on the military's turf," Nov. 1]. You enjoy the freedom of this newspaper, the ability to speak freely and the knowledge that you can go to school here in relative peace because there are men and women of courage out there who wear the uniform and who protect your freedom to do so. You trivialize, demonize and spit on the memory of those who have died for our freedoms by placing the duty of "killing" in their hands. Abortion is a medical procedure. Therefore, it should be carried out by medical professionals. Driving a tank is obviously nothing the author has ever done, or he would have seen the lack of analogy.

Nobody in the military relishes the thought of killing. Nobody wants to go to war less than those of us who wear the uniform, because nobody knows better how deadly the battlefield actually is. I suggest that your author walk a mile in the shoes of doctors and soldiers, sailors, airmen or Marines to see what it means to them to be able to stand proud and say that they do what the rest can't do for themselves.

It would appear that your contributing authors have flashes of ignorance every time they attempt to write a piece that has the ability to be rather influential and important. It is sad that you lose your chance to make a significant impact for the positive with every little editorial you publish that belittles and humiliates you, since you are doing it yourself.

Thomas A. Eybl
Criminal Justice Freshman

Editor's Note: A column represents the views of the columnist alone. The opinion of The Gamecock is confined to the editorials in the box on the left side of this page. Opinions expressed by columnists are in no way endorsed by The Gamecock. Columnists enjoy the same freedoms of speech as are granted to those submitting letters to the editor.

Columnist's stance on abortion applauded

To the Editor:

This is just a quick note to say that I appreciate Kiki McCormick's viewpoint piece concerning the abortion "debate" [column, "Abortion rhetoric shrouds truth," Oct. 29]. I realize that I am the stereotypical pro-lifer (white, male, Christian), but the piece was well done, and I will be using it Wednesday evening at a youth program that I lead. Please know, Ms. McCormick, that there are many who believe the words that you wrote.

Robert Tyson
Pennsylvania

CAMPUS ISSUES

Freedom not always absolute

Look around you and notice those people who dress like they just got out of bed.

Now get angry with them because it is they who may indirectly prey on your freedoms.

I am the last person in the world to try to impose my morals or standards on others. In fact, I wholeheartedly believe in the maximum exercise of people's rights. But I also realize that exercising rights to an extreme may result in stepping on others' rights.

People who wear flip-flops, scrawny plain white T-shirts and shorts that could be boxers, and look like they are wearing the same clothes they slept in, have the potential to step on our rights.

While they may be exercising their freedom of expression, it is those individuals who chose to take their freedoms to the edge that instigate the policy-makers.

And when policy-makers are instigated, policies and laws happen. And when policies and laws happen, people's freedoms are abridged.

Policies and laws are usually a result of someone's inability to be self-governed. Most laws would probably be unnecessary if people used some common sense and the Golden Rule of "Don't do unto others what you don't want done to you."

It wouldn't surprise me if a dress code were created tomorrow because people are pushing the boundary of what is appropriate to wear to college. Though we are in college and the flow of expression is welcomed, even college has its limits. When those limits are exceeded, it could result in new freedom-biting policy.

I am not trying to impose my standards on anyone else. This isn't a conservative tactic to persuade people to dress alike. And frankly I wouldn't care what people wore to school if I knew there would be no consequences.

But since someone's lack of self-control may result in some of our freedoms getting abridged, you bet I am going to try to prevent that from happening.

The truth is our rights are never open-ended. They stop where someone else's begins. I realize that by asking people to dress more appropriately, I am asking them to sacrifice some of their rights.

But the fact remains that they can still choose to listen or not. When policy is passed, however, ignoring and not listening may result in some sort of punishment.

Thus, there is really no choice in the matter.

I believe school is about expression and exchange of ideas. But in order to let this flow, ironically, it means we have to be judicious in the way we celebrate and express our freedoms.

We have to limit our freedoms so that policy makers don't come in and do it for us.

I could also say that people should dress up properly for school because it is an institution where we are training to become professionals. Thus, it would behoove people to start acting like it.

But there are too many problems with saying that. What is dressing properly? How do we define a professional? How should a professional dress? And so forth.

For this reason, the best I can do is ask you to be judicious. Weigh your actions by your own standards.

And don't instigate the policy makers by riding the edge, calling attention and begging for your rights and mine to be taken away.

Leave the decisions to us. Let's govern ourselves.



Mario Ona is a biweekly columnist for *The Gamecock*. His column appears on every other Friday. Ona can be reached via *The Gamecock* at gckviews@sc.edu

ABOUT US

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 and nine times during the summer 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 the newspaper's parent organization. *The Gamecock* is supported in part by student activities fees.

ADDRESS
The Gamecock
1400 Greene Street
Columbia, SC 29208
Offices on third floor of the Russell House.

STUDENT MEDIA Area code 803
Advertising 777-3888
Classified 777-1184
Fax 777-6482
Office 777-3888

GAMECOCK Area code 803
Editor gcked@sc.edu 777-3914
Advertising gcknews@sc.edu 777-7726
Viewpoints gckviews@sc.edu 777-7181
Etc. gcketc@sc.edu 777-3913
Sports gcksports@sc.edu 777-7182
Online www.gamecock.sc.edu 777-2833

SUBMISSION POLICY
Letters to the editor or guest columns are welcome from all members of the Carolina community. Letters should be 250-300 words. Guest columns should be an opinion piece of about 600-700 words.

Both must include name, phone number, professional title or year and major, if a student. Handwritten submissions must be personally delivered to Russell House room 333. E-mail submissions must include telephone number for confirmation.

The Gamecock reserves the right to edit for libel, style and space. Anonymous letters will not be published. Photos are required for guest columnist and can be provided by the submitter.
Call 777-7726 for more information.

THE GAMECOCK

- Sara Ladenheim
Editor in Chief
- Kenley Young
Managing Editor
- Emily Streyer
Viewpoints Editor
- Kevin Langston
Brock Vergakis
News Editors
- Clayton Kale
Associate News Editor
- Rachel Helwig
Etcetera Editor
- Todd Money
Jared Kelowitz
Sports Editor
- Kristin Freestate
Copy Desk Chief
- Sean Rayford
Photo Editor
- Rob Lindsey
Encore Editor

STUDENT MEDIA

- Ellen Parsons
Director of Student Media
- Susan King
Creative Director
- Kris Black
Julia Burnett
Todd Hooks
Betsy Martin
Kathy Van Nostrand

- Will Gillaspay
Online Editor
- Corey Ford
Asst. Viewpoints Editor
- John Huett
Asst. News Editor
- Ann Marie Miani
Asst. Etcetera Editor
- David Cloninger
Asst. Sports Editor
- Greg Farley
Asst. Photo Editor
- Casey Williams
Asst. Online Editor
- Brad Walters
Graphics Editor
- Copy Editor,
Editorial Contributor
- MacKenzie Craven
Charlie Wallace
Philip Burt
Senior Writers

- Creative Services
Sherry Holmes
Classified Manager
Carolyn Griffin
Business Manager
Erik Collins
Faculty Adviser
Jonathan Dunagin
Graduate Assistant

Do you think your opinion really matters?
The Gamecock does.
Write *The Gamecock* at gckviews.sc.edu.