

VIEWPOINTS

IN OUR OPINION

Search for Six deserves praise

It's admirable to set one's goals high, and the Search for Six is no exception.

Yes, perhaps they set their goals too high in hoping to grab Steven Spielberg or Colin Powell (sorry, we don't think the war in Afghanistan is all that's preventing him from coming to USC), but it was noble of them to try.

In fact, it reflects well on the committee members that they made the effort in the first place. The initiative of the student members shows that

Search for Six's record of success shouldn't be marred by lack of participation from chosen alumna Leeza Gibbons.

students aren't as apathetic as some think. And faculty and administrators are to be commended for giving their time to the project. Though they might not have gotten the biggest names on their list to visit campus, they've done a good job of getting some high-caliber celebrities to drop in.

Pat Conroy, always willing to visit and make a speech, was still a notable achievement. Getting Patch Adams to come also was no small task. Both events had good student turnout and were truly enjoyable, a tribute both to the committee and to the Carolina community. Though the Dalai Lama didn't come, the monks' exhibit was informative and entertaining — a big hit for students and Columbia residents.

However, we're disappointed with Leeza Gibbons, winner of the alumni category. Having won out over an impressive list of names that included Darla Moore and former South Carolina governors, Gibbons should have been honored to come and eager to set up an event. Instead, she has yet to publicly set a date. That she was chosen as the alumna who most represents the Carolinian Creed makes her hesitancy all the more galling.

Overall, though, the committee has achieved most of its goals, and its drive to advertise and put on interesting events is commendable. But it's a shame Leeza Gibbons has yet to commit herself to taking part in Search for Six, to taking part in her alma mater's Bicentennial celebration.

GAMECOCK CORRECTIONS

Monday's staff editorial incorrectly said faculty senate will vote on the sexual orientation clause on Monday. It will vote today at 3 p.m. in the Law School Auditorium.

In an article about USC women's basketball, a player's name should have been spelled Shaun Gortman.

The *Gamecock* regrets the errors.

If you see an error in today's paper, we want to know. Write us at gamecockviewpoints@hotmail.com.

ABOUT THE GAMECOCK

Martha Wright
Editor in Chief

Mary Hartney
University Editor

Ginny Thornton
Asst. Univ. Editor

Victoria Bennett
The Mix Editor

Justin Bajaj
Asst. The Mix Editor

Chris Foy
Sports Editor

Preston Baines
Asst. Sports Editor

Elizabeth Swartz
Online Editor

Aaron Mark
Photo Editor

Andrew Rogers
Asst. Photo Editor

Greg Hambrick
City Editor

Alicia Balentine
Asst. City Editor

Brandon Larrabee
Viewpoints Editor

Rene Moffatt
Political Cartoonist/
Illustrator

Candi Hauglum
Graphic Artist

Page Designers
Mackenzie Clements,
Crystal Dukes, Katie
Smith, David Stagg

Copy Editors
Crystal Boyles, Jason
Harmon, Jill Martin,
Carolyn Rowe

CONTACT INFORMATION

Offices on third floor of the Russell House.
Editor in Chief: gamecockeditor@hotmail.com
University Desk: gamecockdesk@hotmail.com
City Desk: gamecockcitydesk@hotmail.com
Viewpoints: gamecockviewpoints@hotmail.com
The Mix: gamecockmixeditor@hotmail.com
Sports: gamecocksports@hotmail.com
Online: www.dailygamecock.com
Newsroom: 777-7726

TO PLACE AN AD

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. One free copy per reader. Additional copies may be purchased for one dollar each from the Department of Student Media.

STUDENT MEDIA

Erik Collins
Faculty Adviser

Ellen Parsons
Director of Student Media

Susan King
Creative Director

Carolyn Griffin
Business Manager

Sarah Scarborough
Advertising Manager

Sherry F. Holmes
Classified Manager

Advertising Staff
Betsy Baugh, Caryn Barowsky,
Amanda Ingram, Denise
Leveraux, Jackie Rice,
Stacey Todd

Gamecock Community Affairs
Karen Yip



COURTESY KRT CAMPUS

Silent majority is on my side



PHIL WATSON
WATSONPHIL@YAHOO.COM

PC jockeys need to simmer down about my adoration for breasts.

Dear Phil,
I always read *The Gamecock* and enjoy its sometimes sarcastic, very controversial columns. I often read yours, and thought that you were a very talented writer with good ideas before today. The article you wrote about WOST classes makes me sick. I'm sure that you're going to be getting many e-mails from very angry females, so I won't berate you on your ignorance, crudeness and stupidity. You were trying to get a reaction, and you got it. The talented writers of today who want their writings to get attention do not get it by belittling females and their studies. Maybe you should grow up and use your writing "talent" for something that's worth reading. As a whole, I'm disappointed with *The Gamecock* staff for even printing such a lame article written by a horny boy trying to get a reaction from his readers. You make me sick, and I

will never read your articles again, and I'm extremely disappointed with the entire *Gamecock* staff.

(I won't include this young lady's name for her privacy)
First-year student, Moore School of Business

That's an e-mail I received about my last column, in which I declared an undying adoration for the boobies. I got a lot of response about that column — some good, some bad.

I try to compliment women on something, and they get as mad and bitter as a Clemson fan at the Humanitarian Bowl. Just look at the other column on this page. It's from a women's studies professor who calls me a "boy" and thinks I'm as sexist as Sir Mix-A-Lot.

Even one of my good friends told me I wasn't PC enough in my column. "Don't be sexist. Broads hate that," he said to me. (Don't hate me for that; I'm just the messenger.)

My anonymous WOST informant, whose code name is "Jugs," told me about how my breast column was bashed in her class. This double agent I've got working on my side said her fellow students knew someone in the class had revealed the secrets of the WOST breast-fondling assignment to the chauvinist scoundrel Phil Watson. My informant listened to the conversation and heard her fellow students spitting out

vile lies about the origins of my last column. Rumors spread like wildfire. Some of the angry women's studies said I wrote the column two weeks before it went to press. Jugs, knowing the rumors were untrue, played it cool like 007 and didn't correct the angry feminists. That could have blown her cover.

It sure is easy to offend people in the Unies (evidently, that's what some people are calling this decade — there you go, Ryan). Unless you're making fun of white males, everybody gets mad at you.

But I don't bash people in my columns, with one notable exception earlier in the semester. When I wrote my breast column, I wasn't trying to bash WOST. But people these days are overly sensitive. When you mention anything people are sensitive about in a joking manner, even if it's not a direct insult to the sensitive issue, they go nuts and release the hounds on you.

My breast column didn't offend everybody. I think I have the silent majority on my side. Many people, male and female, told me they liked the column. So take that, you humorless, breast-lover hating, overly sensitive PC jockeys. Someone needs to give you all a sense of humor for Christmas. Or maybe baking some cookies or playing with your breasts and writing a detailed journal about it will put you in the Christmas spirit.

No excuse for silly columns



LEE DAVINROY
ELLISED@GWM.SC.EDU

Feminists can take a joke, unless it's about women being objects.

I've heard that we've seen a slew of silly (or ironic) columns lately in *The Gamecock* is to provoke us into a response. This explains but doesn't excuse the steady stream of columns that have talked about campus women as though they are objects of ridicule, sexually available to anyone or merely body parts such as breasts.

Mr. Prashaw and Mr. Watson admit they've never taken a Women's Studies course. This explains but doesn't excuse their recent columns advising students to take a WOST course for an easy A or reducing a WOST classroom exercise about breast self-examination (because we actually have to learn to do it effectively) to a fantasy.

If Prashaw and Watson and boys with their view of women are reading this, they're likely to be resorting to a boy's stereotypical response: Women, especially feminists, have no sense of humor (probably because no guy will go out with us, so we're bitter and sexually frustrated). We can't take a joke. And they're partly right. I can't take these jokes. I can't because they offend me and remind me too much of other jokes we have become civilized enough not to spread anymore — jokes that mock and degrade blacks, Jews, homosexuals, Italians, the retarded and other groups who no longer have to pretend to be entertained by such rubbish.

I'm not laughing because jokes have consequences. Last Wednesday, how many young women on campus first read an irritating juvenile essay about feeling their breasts and then had to put up with young male jokesters asking them if they're taking WOST 113 and if they need help studying? And where were those jokers looking when they asked this question? How many USC students will never take a Women's Studies course now because they think the intellectual content and requirements are simplistic: If you're female, feel your breasts and write about it; if you're male, repeat the mantra that men suck and you'll make an A.

Unfortunately, those students will miss something wonderful. Because a Women's Studies course isn't about hating men (most feminists even like men and find them useful occasionally), and it's not about a "feel-good" experience masquerading as academic material. WOST courses are about majorities and minorities and the power relations between them. They're about the ways in which race, socio-economic class, sexual identity and gender are represented and regarded in our literature, history, art, families, faiths, education systems and politics. They're some of the most engaging courses on campus. They're courses about social justice and making a real difference in the world. What you learn in a WOST course are things you'll take with you when you leave this campus. And because we study complex issues and have high expectations of students, our courses aren't easy. If you're looking for a bunny course, you need to look elsewhere.

So I'd like to invite Mr. Prashaw and Mr. Watson and any other students who have not yet done so to take a WOST course. In fact, I invite you to take my WOST course: I'm teaching WOST 111 on Mondays and Wednesdays from 2 p.m. until 3:15

IN YOUR OPINION

Explanation of ads is disappointing

I have often wondered why *The Gamecock* continued to run ads for Maurice's establishment, particularly when these ads featured a Confederate flag, and, well, we all know Maurice. No need to go there again.

I was disappointed by the explanation offered this week, that *The Gamecock* is open to a lawsuit if it refuses to run the ads. I don't know where you're getting your legal advice, but federal district courts have upheld the refusal by student publications of political advertising (and if Maurice is making the argument of free speech, that's exactly what it is). The courts have stated that it is not a First Amendment issue because the content is decided by student editors, and the Supreme Court agreed with that by refusing to hear the appeal. See *Yeo v. Lexington*, First Circuit 1996, or *Leeds v. Meltz*, Second Circuit 1996. Then, tell Maurice what he can do with his "political statement" and stop running the ads.

KRISTI COGSWELL

FOURTH-YEAR STUDENT
COLLEGE JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATIONS

Editor's note: Thanks for sending those along. However, there are other cases where courts have decided that prohibiting ad publication is an infringement on First Amendment rights, such as *Lueth v. St. Clair County Community College*. Also, it's incorrect to say Maurice's ad is political advertising — he's promoting his barbecue and his

book, which has a Confederate flag on the cover. Unless the university decides it's time to remove Maurice's ad and is prepared for the lawsuit that will follow, the ad will stay, but it will always be paired with *The Gamecock's* disclaimer.

Sanford's comments just to look better

I'm writing in response to gubernatorial hopeful Mark Sanford's comments in the Nov. 19 issue of *The Gamecock*, specifically, the comments about the educational funding redundancy of Central Carolina Technical College and the USC Sumter campus.

First, I was really ticked off because I felt personally assaulted. I am a 2001 graduate of Central Carolina Technical College (CCTC). I agree with Mr. Sanford that both USC Sumter and CCTC offer similar courses, but that's where the agreement ends. On the educational side, CCTC is a two-year technical school, whereas USC Sumter, for the sake of argument, is a four-year college. Yes, the schools offer similar courses, but the courses are generally taught to different degrees. At CCTC, my major was computer technology and Internet working. My core courses were similar to the ones I will have here at USC (my major is computer science). But CCTC's instruction is centered on hands-on experience rather than theory. On the other hand, my core courses here at USC will probably focus more on the theory than on hands-on experience (for the sake of argument). CCTC's mission is

to produce competent students who can go into the work force after graduation, workers who know their jobs inside and out. If Mr. Sanford didn't know, USC Sumter and CCTC have joint programs, such as the nursing program. Not all nurses would like to or can afford to go to school and obtain a four-year degree in nursing. This way, future nurses can get two-year degrees and still be certified as nurses.

On the economic side, CCTC's tuition is lower. So, it's easy for students to go to CCTC or a two-year school and take courses and then transfer to USC Sumter or another four-year school to continue their education. It is a common practice among college students, but then again, I guess Mr. Sanford didn't have a problem having his education funded. If he has so much to say about CCTC and USC Sumter, why didn't he mention Morris College, which is less than five minutes away from both schools? Morris offers similar courses as CCTC and USC Sumter. Or, even in Columbia itself, what about Allen University and Benedict College? If it's a matter of physical distance, then a few miles should not matter in Mr. Sanford's equation. The comments make me more and more irate when I think about it, because Mr. Sanford is saying them only to make himself a "better-looking" candidate for governor. If Mr. Sanford wants to understand higher education, he needs to go back to college for a year or so and then tell us all what he thinks about his comment then!

RAY JEFFERSON JR.

SECOND-YEAR STUDENT
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY