

The Daily Gamecock

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor JACKIE ALEXANDER	Managing Editor MICHAEL BAUMANN
News Editor BRAD MAXWELL	Copy Desk Chief CALLI BURNETT
Assistant News Editor LIZ SEGRIST	Viewpoints Editor AMANDA DAVIS
The Mix Editor PAUL BOWERS	Sports Editor ALEX RILEY
Design Director MEREDITH RAY	Assistant Design Director JULIA ANDERSON

IN OUR OPINION

Condoms hit runway to encourage protection

In a little under three weeks, an upcoming fashion show will feature models wearing nothing but condoms.

No, it's not what you think.

By putting together clothes made out of condoms (don't worry, they're still in the wrappers), the Department for Sexual Health and Violence Prevention and S.H.A.R.E. are hoping to promote safe sex among students.

Go watch the fashion show; learn a little bit about contraception and have a good time.

A college campus is an atmosphere where 17,000 hormone charged young adults live and work in close proximity, and in such an environment, preventing unwanted pregnancies and the spread of STIs is, and should be, a major public health initiative. Project Condom will certainly not do any harm on that front, and if everything goes as planned, it could make some progress in demystifying and popularizing contraception.

However, it's unlikely that anyone will go to the fashion show and think, "Wow! I never thought about using condoms before—I should try that!"

In order to be a success, Project Condom needs to be accompanied by information on where and when students can get condoms on and off campus (they're free at the Thomson Student Health Center) and literature on sexual health and wellness.

So go watch the fashion show; learn a little bit about contraception and have a good time.

And we'll see you next year at Project Diaphragm.

CORRECTIONS

If you see an error in today's paper, we want to know about it. E-mail us at sagckvew@mailbox.sc.edu

IT'S YOUR RIGHT

Voice your opinion on message boards at www.dailygamecock.com or send letters to the editor at sagckvew@mailbox.sc.edu

About The Daily Gamecock

Editor
JACKIE ALEXANDER
Managing Editor
MICHAEL BAUMANN
Copy Desk Chief
CALLI BURNETT
Assistant Copy Desk Chief
LAUREN SMITH
Design Director
MEREDITH RAY
Assistant Design Director
JULIA ANDERSON
News Editor
BRAD MAXWELL
Assistant News Editor
LIZ SEGRIST
Viewpoints Editor
AMANDA DAVIS
Assistant Viewpoints Editor
JOSH RABON
The Mix Editor
PAUL BOWERS
Assistant Mix Editor
COLIN JONES
Sports Editor
ALEX RILEY
Assistant Sports Editor
MICHAEL AGUILAR
Photo Editor
LIZZY SHEPPARD
Assistant Photo Editor
CRISTINA KUBICKI
Copy Editors
MELANIE BYRUM, EDDIE COBB, STEPHANIE EWELL, ABIGAIL GARRISON, LIZ HOWELL, KERYN SENN, BOBBY SUTTON, KATHLEEN TENNANT, CATHERINE WALKER
Staff Writers
AUSTIN COLLINS, CHRIS COX, HALEY DREIS, SEAN GRUBER,

CONTACT INFORMATION
Offices located on the third floor of the Russell House
Editor: sagcked@mailbox.sc.edu
News: sagcknew@mailbox.sc.edu
Viewpoints: sagckvew@mailbox.sc.edu
The Mix: sagckmix@mailbox.sc.edu
Sports: sagcksp@mailbox.sc.edu
Online: www.dailygamecock.com
Newsroom: 777-7726
Sports: 777-7182
Editor's Office: 777-3914
Fax: 777-6482

KATIE JONES, ZACH LAMB, KEITH LOCKLEAR, ELLEN MEDER, THOMAS MALUCK, HALLEY NANI

Public Relations Director
ANDREA LUCAS
Graduate Assistant
EMILY VERNON
Student Media Director
SCOTT LINDENBERG
Faculty Adviser
ERIK COLLINS
Creative Director
EDGAR SANTANA
Business Manager
CAROLYN GRIFFIN
Advertising Manager
SARAH SCARBOROUGH
Classifieds Manager
SHERRY F. HOLMES
Production Manager
C. NEIL SCOTT
Creative Services
KEVIN ARCHIE, BEN BUCHANAN, MEGAN SINCLAIR, KATIE WARING, LIZZIE WILSON
Advertising
BEN CRANE, CARLY GALLAGHER, KATIE HUDSON, BEN LEBERTH, LAUREN SPIRES, JAYLENE WILLIAMS

The Daily Gamecock is the editorially independent student newspaper of the University of South Carolina. It is published daily 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 Daily 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 Daily Gamecock. The Department of Student Media is the newspaper's parent organization. The Daily Gamecock is supported in part by student-activity fees. One free copy per reader. Additional copies may be purchased for \$1 each from the Department of Student Media.



Obama's plans could worsen deficit

Candidate's proposals may cost country more than we bargained for



SETH DUNCAN
Second-year graduate student

As Barack Obama continues to sweep up states and delegates on his way to the nomination, one can only ask, is America ready for a President Barack Hussein Obama?

At first glance some would suggest that I am attempting to play to conservatives' fears or trying to make some sort of right-wing hay out of Sen. Obama's middle name. Rather, I am just stating his name as it would be recorded if he were to become president. After all, historians, political commentators and others often cite presidents using their full formal names such as William Jefferson Clinton, George Walker Bush and others. Some may want to make or take political cheap shots with his middle name, but that is not the purpose of this article.

The real purpose of this article is to examine what a President Obama may look like.

As we see with all candidates for the Oval Office, many promises have been made on the campaign trail, along with

sentimental fluff and to a lesser extent, substantive policy initiatives.

For starters, Obama just recently unveiled his economic plan, which he hopes to enact when he takes the reins from Bush. He is full of great ideas like universal health care, more tax cuts for the middle class and an additional \$150 billion worth of economic stimulus aimed at the "green energy sector," according to report published on Bloomberg.com.

Additionally, Obama wants to invest \$60 billion in national infrastructure projects on top of doling out more loans and other financial assistance for higher education. All of these plans sound great, but as Rod Tidwell (Cuba Gooding, Jr. in the movie "Jerry Maguire") said, "SHOW ME THE MONEY!"

At a time when this nation is spending more money than it can print, an Obama presidency may be far too expensive. Democratic operatives,

supporting Obama, are chatting up the airwaves trying to convince the nation that with the repeal of the Bush tax cuts and with the ending of combat and non-combat operations in Iraq, we can afford all of these and other programs. However, they may be fudging the numbers.

It has been suggested, by some economic pundits, that if a President Obama was able to repeal the tax cuts, the generated revenue would add up to around \$100 billion. This leaves a substantial gap still to be filled.

Some argue that a savings will occur with the ending of the war in Iraq, but they are wrong. The money we are spending in Iraq is borrowed money, not money the Treasury Department has accrued through normal revenue streams. Thus, by eliminating Iraq spending and replacing it with other discretionary spending we save a total of \$0 if we break even, which I don't think would happen.

Balancing the budget and returning to surpluses should be the top priority of the next president, but with a President Obama we might just see a continuation of out-of-control spending.

THE COCKBLOCK

In response to the column 'Conservative whiz spreads heartbreak' by Thomas Maluck

This is the way differences are supposed to be vetted. One can staunchly disagree with one's viewpoint and the manner in which they are expressed.

In response to the article 'Is campus living worth price?' by Katie Jones

Just imagine what graduate students pay to live in the awful graduate student apartments. The prices are significantly higher for outdated and run down apartments that have seen no signs a true improvements.

I realize a majority of graduate students choose to live off campus, but this decision could be in part due to a lack of options. So much time and so many resources have been spent on undergraduate housing, while graduate housing has remained neglected and unimproved. Graduate students deserve equal

options, opportunities and amenities as well.

In response to the editorial 'Same-sex couples take stand at courthouse'

It's sad that some people are so ignorant that they actually whole-heartedly believe that laws banning gay marriage affects only eight people. That's just horrible. Open up your eyes to the real world. There are more than eight gay people in the world. It is 2008, for God's sake. Why should there be any discussion of discrimination? You would think that as a country we would have matured pass discrimination. But we haven't. This ban on gay marriage affects and offends me. So before you make a bold, ignorant comment like that, make sure you get your information straight. The fact that you haven't heard of this story should make you wonder why. Why hasn't this story made it to the press? Are we silently saying as a country that this issue is not important? What exactly are we saying?

As a country that is supposed to be tolerant to views, what are we exactly tolerating? What are we exactly promoting if it isn't freedom?

I had actually not heard anything about this "courageous" protest until I read about it here.

I fail to see how "these couples have guts" in this article. These people were obviously openly gay already, or else they wouldn't have tried to get married in the first place. So what is so courageous about trying to make a scene at a courthouse in front of a whopping eight people? I agree that it's wonderful to live in a country where we can petition the government for change; however, why should we care if a law offends a mere eight people? If we pass a law that only bothers eight folks, then the government is doing a pretty good job.

I'm amazed that a four person ... I repeat, a four person protest can garner such gushing praise. Comparisons to the Founding Fathers? Are you serious?

Bill assumes maturity comes with service time

Smith's new policy sparks controversy by rewarding occupation, not age group

Recently a state representative from Greenville proposed lowering the drinking age. State representative Fletcher Smith does not want to lower



MONIQUE CUNIN
Third-year print journalism student

the drinking age to 18 for every South Carolinian — he wants to lower it for every South Carolinian in the military.

Military service does force people to grow up but so does life outside of the

military. Maturity is a very subjective argument for lowering the drinking age. There is no way to measure how mature an individual is for the simple reason that maturity means different things to different people.

Some people would even argue that going to college makes someone more mature. Thinking about it — we all have that friend who really should have put college off for a few years and used that time to grow up. Yet we also have friends who are so mature they should be working full time and preparing to collect social security.

Just because someone can hold a gun and fight in a war does not mean that they are mature enough to drink at Dr. Rocco's in Five Points. On the same note, just because someone chose to go to college or work after high school doesn't mean they are not mature enough to go to Good Times and have a few beers.

Every year people argue that if you are old enough to fight in a war, then you are old enough to drink. Representative Smith has misinterpreted this to mean that if someone is 18 years old and in the military, they are old enough to drink.

With every privilege comes responsibility. With the privilege to drive comes the responsibility of keeping yourself and others safe on the road. However, enlisting in the military is not a privilege someone earns — it is a career choice that someone makes.

No one's career entitles them to special treatment from the government.

Should we pass a bill that allows police officers to speed because they are police officers? Maybe we should pass a bill that allows judges to commit murder because, after all they're judges, they should know what they are doing. This bill signals that they are also entitled to special treatment.

Passing this bill creates a slippery slope that the state must be careful with. If we start treating one group of people differently, based on a career choice, what is to stop us from treating other groups differently?

Rep. Smith is on the right track in his thinking that 18-year-olds are old enough to drink. However, he should try and extend the right to all 18-year-olds and not just those that are in the military.