

Letters

Bull what?

In reference to Mr. Roger M. Long's letter on the Ross Linehart commentary, which Mr. Long coyly titles as "—"

Obviously, Mr. Long has never walked behind a bull.

Robin Chakravarti
Grad Student

Stunned

I am truly stunned at your entries re: God, especially this last chapter. I find it difficult to admit that the level of rational reflected in these articles, which come across like a child's tantrum, are representative of the students on this campus. It seems those "supporting" God failed in extending His love, and the "other side" conveyed no more than an ill thought-out flair of emotionalism.

Were these par for the letters you received or did you choose them for a condescendingly amusing editorial spread?

When it comes to Christianity the number of trips one takes to find the way doesn't matter, except maybe to oneself. The only true example of Christianity is Christ. Humanity, under the banner of Christianity or any other religion, has admittedly failed in living the goal Christ set for us: to act always from love. In pointing out man's failure, Mr. Lienhart, (in the Crusades, various wars, and just plain hypocrisy) you are definitely correct. That's the basis of Christianity—man is so screwed up. Take a look around.

I can think of two reasons off hand why Christ is so hard to swallow. Number one is because His is the only doctrine one cannot think through from end to end. There's just too much to it; too many deep paradoxes which the short-sighted will write off as contradiction without completing the circle of thought.

This is in keeping with the concept of God as beyond total human understanding, and with Christ's condition (point number two): only believe in Me.

Have faith.

He did not advocate a doctrine that the intellectually superior would be the first to grasp. Christ is probably the only indiscriminate person in history. First, one must believe and only then can one learn, grow and live Christianity as Christ did—though no one will be likely to achieve His perfection on earth.

Our society reels at the thought of accepting Christ on faith, yet we step out on faith every day of our lives. How can a loving God condemn anyone? He doesn't. We condemn ourselves. God gave us the choice to accept or reject His love, and because of love He will not meddle in our choice, even though it be to reject Him.

Condemnation? Just as in the physical world there are laws of cause and effect, so

are there spiritual laws of cause and effect. No matter what your opinion of gravity, if you jump out the window you will experience the inevitable result: you'll fall. And no matter what your opinion of God, the fact of His existence remains.

If you accept His love, peace, joy and love result; if you reject Him you will spend your life struggling for answers to fill that empty vacuum and question "Why?" which plagues man's soul. God is a God of order and the laws of both the natural and the spiritual world are in complete harmony. Nature is one big parable, and Jesus spells it all out.

No one can convince, sway or decide for anyone else. If it's important to you, you will give Christ (not Christianity) fair consideration. And if not, I truly hope your involvement with people or social cause will bring you some semblance of inner fulfillment. You're right, I'm giving a pitch,—I hope and pray you will realize the incomprehensible fact of God's personal love. That's the real issue.

Betty Wagner

Whosoever

At first I didn't know how to appreciate Mr. Mascott's and Mr. Siegel's Commentaries, but that has since changed. Now I see that although their writings lack intrinsic value, they have served to stimulate valuable response from voices in the Kingdom.

I hope it is not too unkind a blow to Mr. Mascott's and Mr. Siegel's team morale to learn that even their very untoward energies are being manipulated by God to further His Kingdom (as all things are).

While Mr. Mascott makes his position perfectly clear, Mr. Siegel is somewhat devious. Nevertheless it requires only a small effort to decipher the intent of his metaphorical jumble ("Selling God—cosmic ripoff") and discover an ambitious ploy to soft-sell the Jesus Revolution as the lesser of two evils—nice try Lee, but we don't need your type of apologetics.

I'll say this much for Tom Mascott; he evaluated the true substance of Mr. Siegel's presentation even if Mr. Siegel didn't (Mascott's letter April 10).

Even if you do not understand the Jesus People, Tom and Lee, we understand you. Obviously you are not able to relate to the World's desperate need for God, and you could not possibly do so with your present sinful natures. In order to be saved we must be given a new spiritual nature from God. As Jesus said, "except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." (John 3:3).

True compassion can only come from sharing God's nature in a right relationship with Jesus Christ; but don't expect God to lavish his most precious gift on anyone who doesn't have the courage, humility or wisdom to seek it.

Tom and Lee, before you cast yourselves in the role as God's adversary, I suggest you do some more reading in the scriptures. You might not want the part (Romans 9:22).

Jesus Christ is still casting for the 'good guy' roles, and His notice reads as always "Whosoever will" let him come (Revelation 22:17).

Norman A. Peterson, Sr.
History

Sharpen Sensitivity

Last Friday a tasteless cartoon appeared on the editorial page of the Emerald. On Tuesday, a backhanded apology for the cartoon was run in the same place. This apology only betrays the obtuseness of the Emerald editorial staff toward the everyday problems facing women.

The apologist is unable to perceive the sexism expressed by the cartoon and claims to see the workers as the target of the joke. However, it is considered neither foolish nor unacceptable in this society for men to harass women on the street with cat calls, crude remarks or ogling. From this standpoint the cartoon fails except as a source of sexist sniggering.

There is a bigger issue. It matters little who is supposed to be the target of the cartoon. Its premise is that the situation of a young woman being harassed by construction workers is somehow funny.

Well, Mr. Editor, it isn't funny at all — as anyone who has been the target of such embarrassment will tell you.

The Emerald would obviously never, never publish a cartoon which implied amusement at any aspect of an indignity suffered by a member of a minority group. We suggest that the same consideration can reasonably be expected by women.

We trust you will sharpen your sensitivity in these matters.

Rustie Cook
Regina O'Neill
Torrie McAllister
School of Journalism

Against Plan

Do university students, faculty, and administrators who are gung-ho for the McCall tax plan fully realize its implications for the university?

Oregon's economy is notoriously cyclical, depending on the vagaries of the national housing market. State government financing already is heavily dependent upon income taxes. A couple of good years and the legislature has money to burn. A couple of bad years and all state agencies feel the screws.

With such a large fixed state commitment to public school funding, to be drawn mainly from further income taxes,

how much will be left for funding other state agencies after a couple of bad years? And what state agency is most vulnerable to cuts?

If the McCall plan goes into effect, in future years we may look back on past budget cutting and tuition increases as the good old days!

That's fine, if that's what we want. But let's at least know what we're doing when we vote.

No, I am not anti-education. I've paid Oregon property taxes since '48, and have never voted against a local school budget. And yes, I have been a registered Democrat since 1940, but I am not blinded by party loyalty.

Roy J. Sampson
Professor of Transportation
College of Business Administration

From Sorenson

I am running for re-election on the OSPIRG Board, and this is the chance the students at the University have to react to what we have (or have not) done over the past year. For those of you who have not had the time or the inclination to participate in OSPIRG, I hope you will appreciate our efforts in fighting for equality in the marketplace and the environment. My sincere belief is that OSPIRG is one of the few ASUO programs bringing about realistic change in this state.

My efforts with OSPIRG have included work both in projects and in the actual management of the corporation. After serving on the local board for five months, I have been chosen by the members to be one of four students from the University on the state board of directors. At this level, decisions regarding project priorities, budget problems and the hiring and firing of staff are made.

OSPIRG is not the typical student group — few social climbers stay active because of the very nature of our purpose. I ask for continuation of my present responsibilities.

This term I am a part of a study group ("Man and the Oregon Coast") at the Oregon Institute of Marine Biology in Charleston. At Coos Bay, we are working on a number of the environmental problems of the coastal area.

Since I will be in school this summer in Eugene I feel I can provide the necessary experience in leadership needed to give OSPIRG a headstart on our greatest year yet. With the grants we have applied for and other help from friends around the nation, OSPIRG's work this year will be minute compared to 73-74. I ask not only for your vote, but for your continued support of OSPIRG.

Peter Sorenson
geography major
Oregon Institute of Marine Biology
Charleston, Oregon 97420

AS TO
SEPARATION
OF
POWERS—



CONGRESS
HAS
BEEN
PROVEN
IRRESPON-
SIBLE.

AS TO
FISCAL
INTEGRITY—



CONGRESS
HAS BEEN
PROVEN
IRRESPON-
SIBLE.

AS TO
LOBBYING
FOR
SPECIAL
INTERESTS—



CONGRESS
HAS BEEN
PROVEN
IRRESPON-
SIBLE.

AS TO
LEAKING
CLAS-
SIFIED
DOCU-
MENTS—



CONGRESS
HAS BEEN
PROVEN
IRRESPON-
SIBLE.

THEREFORE IT HAS
BEEN PROVEN THAT
CONGRESS IS GUILTY
OF EVERYTHING.



THE CONGRESS
IS UNDER
ARREST.



NOW WE COME
TO THE MEDIA.



Dist. Publishers-Hall Syndicate

©1973 JMS JEFFERSON 4-15