Letters Question Gamecock Professionalism

TO THE EDITOR:
I read with alarmed interest your editorial-story and illustrated comments in the Gamecock, LXIV, 7, for 19 July 1973, which I obtained from our Branch Library at USC-Spartanburg.

As typical of radicals, using scare-tactics, yellow-journalism, and obscurations, you gluttonously generalize the issue of the recent 5-4 Supreme Court decision supposedly regarding obscenity.

Quite to the contrary, the decision was not involving either obscenity nor the First Amendment to the Constitution; but was concerned with restoring to the Constitution that Inalienable Right of the States: powers to govern things within their sovereignty.

As a serious student of journalism with a reasonable background in Constitutional Law and Political Science, I must object to using sensationalism as a means of obscuring the facts. The Gamecock is guilty of this.
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Better Trash For USC!

Guttenberg Experiment

BY HARRY HOPE
INTER OFFICE MEMORANDUM
To: Dr. Thomas F. Jones, Ms. Rita McKinney, Vice-President C.H. Witen, Mr. Zane Knauss, Hon. Mike Grier, et al.
From: Harry Hope
Subject: University Garbage

I note with some dismay the lack of quality garbage being thrown away at the University of South Carolina. After a few pleasant afternoons rummaging through dumpsters, trash cans and organizational files, I can only conclude that the University is indeed falling to present itself in its best possible light to the taxpayers of this state and the various sundry alumni who so willingly part with their money for tax purposes.

Some of your quotes in the section "THOUGHT FOR THE CENSOR", are also amusing.
You quote Sir John Milton as a defender of the free press. This is not right except that it ignores a very important fact about history which is explained by Sandman, Rubin, and Sachman in Media; Introduction to Analysis (Princeton Hall), page 23:

"A victory for Parliament, the revolution soon proved a defeat for freedom of the press. Its leader Oliver Cromwell, quickly established himself as a virtual dictator of England. Unlicensed printers were harshly dealt with, while licensed printers were subjected to incessant censorship. IMPOSSIBLY ENOUGH IT WAS JOHN MILTON HIMSELF who became the NATION'S CHIEF CENSOR under the PURITAN REGIME."

Placed in context with your quotation, it gives a different meaning to the alleged "champion of the free press," John Milton.

The ruling of the Supreme Court may have been a more balanced view and will avoid obscuring the real facts with sensationalism. After all, by no stretch of the imagination can the recent ruling of the Supreme Court be interpreted as an abridgment of the freedom of the press. But, in true John C. Calhounian philosophy, thepress has exposed the President and Congress to a verifiable portion of those Constitutional Inalienable Rights of the States to say States, which had been stolen by the Websterites and the Supreme Court in decision after decision since 1865:

Freddy [Freddie] Mauney
USC—Spartanburg

TO THE EDITOR:
This letter is to inform you of our decision to resign from the staff of the Gamecock. This decision was prompted, in part, by the questionable journalistic tactics of fellow staff writers. Also, we cannot comply with our own writing standards when faced with muddied editing and gross typesetting errors.

We felt that the summer was not the time for deep, intrinsic reviews, therefore, we have kept our column in a light, if not purposefully ridiculous vein. Unlike you other writers, we refuse to wallow in the slime of sylae...!

Hopefully, in the fall, a new staff will help overcome the Journalism laxes now inherent in the Gamecock. Should this occur, we will reapply for a position on the staff. Until then, however, we cannot allow our names to be associated with such an unprofessional publication as now exists.

David Simpson
Terry Dugas

STUDENT NIGHT
At The
Pizza House

BUY ONE DINNER—GET ONE FREE

SPAGHETTI $1.95
Served with garlic, bread and chef salad.
Serving MONDAY
3P.M. Till Midnight
Located at the intersection of 378 and I-26
across from the Ramada Inn

Osceola

(From page two)

But Osceola often utilized a subjective and often no-holds-barred writing style that may have turned off some older, more conservative readers.

And I don't deny that we're different and we're never going to stop being different as long as we're in publication," said Walser. "We're going to be different for this area because we just don't believe things have to be done the way they're being done now."

Despite what may appear to be an approach in the paper that is designed to appeal to a large, liberal audience, Walser said Osceola is designed to be read by anyone who lives in Columbia.

"We try to appeal to everyone," he said. "We try to be the kind of paper that a person who lives in Columbia would like to read. That's about the only criterion we can cite. If they live here we want them to read it. We want them (the public) to be able to pick it up and have something in there of interest, that all we're trying to do; write about life as it exists in Columbia, S.C., in 1973. No more, no less."

Letters Welcome

Letters to the editor on topics are welcome but subject to editing and condensation to meet style and space requirements. All letters must be typed and must be signed with full name, address and phone number of the author. Unsigned letters or those with pseudonyms will not be printed.
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