

glenn boettcher

even editors get the blues

So what's so great about a college diploma? Everybody's got one or is working on one, but a degree no longer equals a job or — more importantly — an education.

While our out-of-control economy continually erodes the "job security" an undergraduate degree once insured, increasing numbers of graduates with advanced degrees are being turned away by prospective employers because they're overqualified.

The only college graduates who seem to get jobs are the ones who compile statistics on the dismal unemployment rate for their fellow graduates.

Maybe a college degree can't live up to the image created for it in the late 1950s by the short-sighted sellers of education who told us going to college meant a well-paying job. But the

huge structure of higher education that continues to support this myth still offers honest-to-goodness education to those who don't tire of waiting for the real classes, the real teachers, the real texts — and financial aid.

Some of these people aren't even seeking a degree. They'll settle instead for just an education. After all, a degree and an education aren't necessarily the same thing.

The two often are compatible, but for many the degree gets in the way of the education. Examples of this hit the media with a wallop every few years: College graduates can't write, they can't read, they can't balance their checkbooks, etc.

The institutions invariably bear the blame for the resulting public outcry, despite the reality that

no college student is forced to settle for anything less than a good education. The mythical proportions of the degree continues to obscure its real size in the minds of those college students who stake their futures on graduation rather than education.

The benefits of a degree may be declining, but the benefits of an education continue to accrue, even for the unemployed college graduate. The skills to pursue learning outside the classroom and critically assess communication of any kind are invaluable.

Graduates who find their degrees won't get them jobs should feel ripped off by the system that sold them a faulty product. But students who don't make sure they get an education to accompany their degree have lost more than a job.

YOURS

Will feminists win?

Will feminists win? The letter in regard to the feminist role and their expectations ("Feminists will win," Monday) left me with a very disturbed feeling. The tone in which it carried led me to believe this individual would hardly be satisfied with dignity and respect on the part of men towards women. The intense bitterness suggests the contrary. Perhaps a reversal of the stereotypical roles would be suitable.

The letter expressed sentiments reflecting components of the various attitudes we are striving to overcome. I do not disagree with the importance of the feminist voice and certainly not the goals of the feminist. But rather the manner in which it is voiced in this particular case.

Attacking a portion of the population (that has exhibited behavior which clearly serves to exacerbate disgusting and dangerous roles for men and women) in such a hostile way is ridiculous. Even worse is to focus on such people. The problem is much more complex than looking at a "few little fellows." It is quite obvious that for many women values such as power and respect hardly take precedence over the personality and physical characteristics that were so elegantly mentioned.

My points are simple. Men and women are in this together. They all contribute to perpetuate the current situation in some manner. The direction of effect cannot be determined and this must be remembered.

Secondly, that the means by which we must go about this arduous battle be given special attention. To achieve the goals a loud and strong voice is imperative so that all can hear. But this voice must be wise to be effective.

We can all benefit and we can all win.

David Greenwood
Junior, psychology

Unfounded attack

I find it very strange that Eric Engelman thought he knew his "facts" well enough to attack Prof. Sanders ("Open eyes", Monday) when it is obvious that he has never taken a class from him. I, however, am a veteran of seven courses taught by Prof. Sanders and was his graduate teaching assistant last year. Not at any time did he teach or imply "that there is no God who judges sin or man" (Mr. Engelman might consider including women, for Dr. Sanders is a feminist). He does teach, though, that only some, but not all, prophecies were written "after the fact:" for example, the so-called prophecies in "Daniel", chapters 7-11, which cease to be historically accurate after 11:39. One might surmise that the author of this part of "Daniel" unques-

Page 4



tionably believed that the successful and antagonistic Antiochus IV Epiphanes soon would control Egypt; in fact, Antiochus did not. Some prophecy, indeed.

What Dr. Sanders does teach is how to examine the evidence objectively and to form one's own unprejudiced idea of the meaning and purpose of the Hebrew and Christian scriptures. Often the conclusions do not conform to what is taught in Sunday school, but this does not make them "myths."

One last point: I would like Mr. Engelman to explain how the Hebrew Scriptures "adequately predict...the most vicious (sic) war yet." I cannot understand how weapons can survive horrendous battles of this "imminent (sic), present-day war," and then, when the war is over, provide the victors with an immense amount of firewood (Ezek. 39:9-10). A wooden tank, a wooden airplane, a wooden bomb?? — or will our modern warriors be fighting with, as Ezekiel says, "shields and bucklers, bows and arrows, handpikes and spears?"

Susan Plass
GTF, history

More comics flap

It has become quite apparent that the Oregon Daily Emerald has stooped to the lowest possible professional standards.

Last term, my fellow students and I were led to a false sense of security when it was hinted that "Peanuts" would return for winter term. Something to the effect that "Sparrow", the pathetic successor to the bright "Peanuts", couldn't be eradicated until the end of last term.

Now we are asked to embrace "Mixed Nuts", the even more detestable successor to "Sparrow". Well, I won't have it!

Let's just flaunt the fact that we are a

government-subsidized paper and don't have to worry about trivial little things like reader opinion and increased sales. I suggest that you commission a graphic artist to rework your masthead to read "Oregon Daily Emerald — We don't care, we don't have to."

"Peanuts" is Americana at its flag-waving best. Snoopy, Charlie Brown, Pigpen and Peppermint Patty are all touchable friends. We've all known individuals like the people they represent, so relating to their triumphs and their tragedies is easy.

Some people escape through "General Hospital" or "All My Children". Is it wrong to escape through a beagle and children who never grow up? Of course it's not.

In these times of skyrocketing inflation, erratic stock exchanges and demanding terrorists, it was nice to count on Charles Schultz for a morning chuckle.

If demonstrations weren't so popular at this university, I'd encourage the student body to storm your lofty offices and demand results. As it is, all we can do is harass you with letters to the mindless editor.

Although Snoopy and Charlie Brown may be on vacation somewhere in the Bahamas, they will never be forgotten by truly devout fans.

Geoff Grigsby
Junior, Marketing

Useless letter

I can't decide whether Eric Engelman's letter ("Open eyes", Monday) was intended to amuse, confuse or anger those who read it. It succeeded in doing all three by turns, all for the same reason: there is not a single shred of useful information or logical argument in it, and

it was infused with a great degree of baseless arrogance.

A graduate student who dares to challenge a recognized scholar in a field greatly removed from his own, and who cannot effectively use the English language to even begin to do so, is possessed of an extreme presumptuousness. I strongly suggest that he look up the words "fact" and "myth", not to mention "explanations" and "prophecies", and then use them as they are meant to be used.

Little need be said about his arguments — and I use the word loosely — except to point out that, as every student of the subject from the Bible to Nostradamus and beyond is aware, prophecy is the most elastic of materials, and its inherent ambiguity can be stretched to fit almost any specific purpose. Periods of peace during the last few thousand years have been practically non-existent; the significance of 'ancestral voices prophesying war' is little greater than that of my predicting that the sun will rise tomorrow.

I could not make head nor tail of the rest of his diatribe, except to guess that it is Mr. Engelman's position that a scholar who does not accept every last assertion drawn from those nebulous Hebrew Scriptures as The Truth, immutable and incontestable, is a closed-minded pedant of some other century teaching myths in preference to facts (as if "fact" were a relevant word in Mr. Engelman's arguments.) I suggest that, nascent physicist or not, Mr. Engelman would not know a real fact if it bit him, and that is the disintegration of his own personal myths which frightens him — as much as his know-nothing attitude amuses, confuses, angers and frightens me.

Michael Stamm
Graduate secretary, English
Friday, January 16, 1981