Speculation easy if offer were official

Rumors have a nasty way of sparking more rumors, and before you know it, speculation has run rampant.

University President Myles Brand may or may not be the victim of a rumor concerning the vacant president's job at Michigan State University. He said he has not been contacted by any representatives from the school and can't be considered a candidate.

The campus newspaper, however, reported that Brand has indeed been made an official candidate for the position. The paper apparently has more connections within the Presidential Search Committee than MSU itself.

If the Michigan State campus paper is correct, and Brand is perhaps eventually offered the job, what should he do? Given this opportunity, let's speculate.

His options would be fairly straightforward: stay in the figurative purgatory that defines our university, or escape to the greener pastures of Michigan State. Given the choices — swimming painstakingly upstream on the rapids of discontent vs. floating happily along atop a gentle current - how could he not jump at an alternative to Oregon?

Oregon has 1990's Ballot Measure 5. This demon has repeatedly hindered Brand's ability to be a superior administrator by making him focus nearly all his efforts on solving the budget crunch. Given the cutback choices he and other administrators must face daily, we should expect a healthy allowance for Tylenol and hard liquor among his business expenses.

Had Measure 5 never passed, he could probably have pushed the University forward with new and dynamic program enhancements, which he is still trying to do anyhow. Unfortunately, it seems he must constantly struggle to simply maintain the status quo.

In comparison, Michigan State is fairly wealthy. Its programs are already enhanced through contributions. It has a strong and loyal alumni list (as any school with more than 40,000 students will), and backs it up with tradition and prestige that would make any graduate

Oiven our penchant for speculation, would the political climate at Michigan State be easier for Brand to deal with? Brand could probably escape those no-win situations he constantly enters with various campus special interest groups. It is to Brand's credit that he listens to these groups, who often make excellent points.

However, as often as these groups are right, there are those who protest against the administration simply for being in power, and wouldn't it be nice for Brand to just pack it up and ignore it?

Of course, Brand wouldn't do that. He faces up to nearly all the criticisms he encounters while explaining the University's perspective. Through this process, he has become aware of the complexity of the University's shortcomings, such as the lack of ethnic representation on this campus. And he understands that no problem can be solved with a quick-fix solution.

All in all, he would be a valuable pickup for Michigan State, who probably doesn't need him as much as this university does. Of course, it's all just speculation.



Dave Charbonneau Calley Andersor

Associate Editors: Tammy Batey, Student Government/Activities; Daralyn Trappe Community; Colleen Pohlig, Higher Education/Administration

News Staff: Chester Allen, Matt Bender, Justin Brown, Sarah Clark, Meg Dedolph, Amy Devenport, Jen Ellison, Amanda Fernie, Anthony Forney, Beth Hege, Teresa Huntsinger, Usa Mauri, Rebecca Merritt, Steve Mims, Katy Moeller, Tiffini Mueller, Trista Noel, Ellen Shaw, Erick Studenicka, Marion Suitor, Michele Thompson-Aguiar, Amy Van Tuyl, Todd

Production Manager: Michele Ross General Manager: Judy Riedl

Advertising: Tom Leech, Sharon Vaz, Sales Managers, Shawn Berven, Office Manager, Jane Irota, Teresa Isabelle, Philip Johnson II, Chris Kanoff, Jeremy Mason, Van V. O'Bryan II, Gillian Oh, Rachael Trull, Angie Windheim, Brian Windheim

iffied: Becky Merchant, Manager, Barry Logan, Sharon Sauve Distribution: Brandon Anderson, Nick Mannning, Graham Simpson

ess: Kathy Carbone, Supervisor, Judy Connolly

roduction: Ingrid White, Production Coordinator, Kristine Granger, Dee McCobb, Stacy tchell, Jenniter Roland, Jenniter Smith

346-5511 346-5512

Display Advertising Classified Advertising 346-4343

346-3712

I AM STILL HEAD OF STATE.



LETTERS

Changes

I don't see how Stephanie Sisson has assumed that the "Bible answers tough questions" (ODE, April 5).

Many people nowadays are giving up on religion, in part because they can be hard to follow the way they were followed hundreds of years ago. Society has changed, but holy books like the Bible cannot. I, for one, hope that Sisson finds the strength to abide by all parts of such a book, including the ban on tattoos "given to the Jews" in the Old Testament.

Doesn't she think she's being judgmental when she says "Give me a break!" If she wants to use only the New Testament, why doesn't she just do so and form yet another denomination of Christianity or a cult?

People have come to our country to escape lands where there was no separation between Church and State. They came for freedom. Nowadays, discrimination based on race, ethnic group or sexual orientation still exists in this country. Let's hope it is not the so-called Christians (many besides the KKK), who are perpetrating such evils against humanity.

Imagine how much her own life would be changed if the Bible were used as law, as it has been before. Or did she ever think about that?

French/Japanese

Feeling good

I couldn't feel good about myself unless I responded to Stephanie Sisson's column on homosexuality and the fact that the Bible teaches that this "chosen" behavior is wrong (ODE, April 5).

I know she means well, but I doubt that homosexuals on this campus raised their heads from their Monday Emeralds and said. "Oh. so that's it!" Does she really think it's that simple?

Where she blew her argument, I believe, is in her paren-

thetical comment on the Old Testament's prohibition of tat-toos. She said that she takes the Bible as her "supreme authori-ty," but she laughs off that par-ticular rule. "Give me a break!"

Perhaps she disregarded this rule because many people have tattoos today, and they seem pretty harmless. Isn't this the same "everyone's doing it" mentality that she finds so "dangerous"? Can she really be so selective in following the rules of her "supreme authority"?

Maybe the tattoo rule seems arbitrary to her. Perhaps it was written down in reaction to some specific crisis long ago but is irrelevant today. Couldn't the homosexuality rules be just the same? Arbitrary? Outdated?

Think about which rules you ignore and which ones you grasp hold of and then think about whether those reasons behind the choice are good enough to justify telling people that their lifestyle is wrong.

Heather Afton

What proof?

Concerning Bjorn Petterson's letter (ODE, April 5). Seeing as how Petterson just "proved" to us that "no environmental factors play any role" in being gay.

I wonder if he could be a little more specific than, "A trip to the library would quickly convince you of this." I've taken a few trips to the library on this subject in the past and nothing I've read quickly, or even slowly, convinced me.

I don't believe that the scientific process is quickly convinced of anything. So if Petterson would give me a more

specific reference, such as the title of a source, the title of an article and perhaps the pages that "prove" his claim, then I will go and enlighten myself.

Allen James Pre-journalism

Shop cops

I am writing in response to the editorial "Police wasting time with Cops in Shops" (ODE, April 6).

The editorial addressed the issue of having police officers in the stores in order to curb the purchase of alcohol by minors, which I believe to be a wonderful idea.

However, the editorial skews off in another direction and talks about lowering the drinking age to 18.

In defense of its view, the editorial asks us to think about this question, "Are minors really too immature to drink alcohol? No." I say yes. The whole point of having laws of this nature is to prevent people (in this case minors) from harm.

And just because "minors have found ways to skirt the system," is not a viable excuse for changing the present law. Is it not the same to say that drug dealers find ways to "skirt the system," therefore we should legalize heroin, cocaine, etc.?

nd yes, minors drink, but that doesn't make it right. Rapists will still rape, but that doesn't make rape right.

Laws are to protect individual people and society as a whole. I'm sorry to see that it seems so many believe otherwise.

> Robyn K. Hagg Pre-journalism

LETTERS POLICY

Letters to the editor must be limited to no more than 250 words, legible, signed and the identification of the writer must be verified when the letter is submitted.

The Emerald reserves the right to edit any letter for length or