The Open Forum

To the Editor of The Gamecock:

During the last few weeks we have heard much discussion of the honors committee and its findings, and the right of the accused individual to appeal to the student court. Some of this discussion has been in the form of constructive criticism, while some has taken the form of verbal assaults hurled at certain members of the honor committee. It is not the purpose of the writer of this article to inveigh the merits of that august body with deprecatory fervor or to magnify its impeccable decisions.

It has been said by certain students that the faculty have the honor and the students have the system; but after what has taken place during the past few days, I am not sure that these were right. I have been informed by reliable persons that a more or less disinterested "member of the faculty" made the request just after the trial that he had been on the jury of either case he would have voted to sustain the action of the honor committee regardless of the evidence submitted at the trial. He controls that the jurors avoided it to the honor committee and to the Alma Mater to affirm every conclusion brought forth by them.

How the writer of the opinion that when a junior takes on each before Alumnus God to decide the case upon which he sits according to the preponderance of the evidence submitted at the trial he is as much bound by those high and cautious principles as the poor fellow who is being tried for his honor. "There is no man who has a greater regard for one's opinion than I have, but I must confess that I cannot see why the deannounced professor used to arrive at his opinions.

According to the time honored custom of the civil and criminal courts of this and all other states, every defendant is given the benefit of any doubts that rise as to his guilt. However, it seems to be the policy of the honor committee and certain members of the faculty to dismiss any student of the University who might feel himself in a precarious situation even of the simplest degree. It also seems to many members of the student body that a defendant's social and political affiliations in a great measure determine the status of his trial. It is not the purpose of the writer at this time to engage in a pedantic display of squeamishtonal morbidness on this subject.

Both all the rule or that concerned, it appears that for the honor system and not, as it really is, that the honor committee thinks that the students were made honor system was made for the student body. They do not, however, realize the seriousness of declaring a man to be without character and casting him on upon his fellow citizens as one not to be trusted. They seem to think that they are duty-bound to uphold the integrity and efficiency of their body by "shipping" all those who come within their clutches. I contend that a man's reputation should not be at the mercy of the students, but may be preserved beyond a shadow of a doubt by its proper and judicious treatment for which he is accused.

--C. P. Owens

The contest put on by O. K. offering prizes for the best four cheers is well taken. It should be a stimulus to the students to write new cheers. It is regrettable, however, that prizes have to be offered before students will show enough interest in the school to compose a few yells.