



to the editor

Cheap shots

Dear editor:

Why did Mr. Albers in his editorial on Mr. McDowell's speech find it necessary to take cheap shots at the effective public relations campaign and the possible separation of church and state problems involved in Mr. McDowell's appearance? Was not Albers obligated to discuss the major issue (the resurrection) before he declared Mr. McDowell's speech "empty"?

Was Albers threatened by the potential power of Christianity to change his life? Did his doubts about his ability to refute Mr. McDowell's resurrection thesis cause him to ignore this thesis?

We challenge Mr. Albers to use his God-given intellectual ability to prove that Mr. McDowell's presentation was truly "empty" by refuting the historical basis of the resurrection.

We have staked our lives on the historical and existential truth of the resurrection. Is Mr. Albers willing to take the relatively smaller risk of backing up his opinion?

Joel Jank
Steve Gerdes
Michael Jank
Larry Hubbard

Gate crasher

Dear editor:

Endless thanks are in order to Wes Albers for his editorial (*Daily Nebraskan*, Jan. 27) on the "Josh" phenomenon of the last several weeks.

Finally someone has said what so many others have been thinking but have been afraid to express for fear the next passer-by would call down the wrath of God on them.

Nothing turned me off to Josh faster than the countless self-appointed John-the-Baptists proselytizing from every nook and cranny of the campus. Of course, the posters of the mysterious prophet casually standing in a drainage pipe gazing heavenward added to the effect of theological ludicrousness.

Last Sunday while hitchhiking across Lincoln, the first thing my ride asked as I got into the car was whether I was going to see Josh that night, which I suppose only goes to show the dangers of hitching.

It appears that some confusion has occurred regarding the separation of church and state at the University of Nebraska. A state school supported by tax money hardly seems the place for the pushing of Christianity or any other personal doctrine. I have been under the impression that the various campus ministries had taken the task of spiritual guidance on themselves, and that this was the purpose of their buildings.

After this crass display of religious needling, it is to be hoped that the appropriate governing bodies of the University and the Nebraska Union will show a little more discretion in whom they allow to come crashing through the gates.

Tom Diehm

Meaningful message

Dear editor:

A couple of observations need to be made concerning Wes Albers' editorial ("Josh Showmanship is entertaining, but empty") in the Jan. 27, *Daily Nebraskan*.

The body of the editorial was an attack on the "Madison Avenue" techniques used in advertising for Josh McDowell. Granted, the method and amount of advertising was objectionable to many people. But how does this relate to the conclusion of the editorial, "Madison Avenue messiahs are entertaining but leave you empty"? In other words, what does previous campus advertising have to do with the "emptiness" of Josh's Christian message? Evaluating his message on that basis is comparable to evaluating the quality of a football team on the basis of the band's pre-game performance!

The other main point of the editorial makes an issue out of Josh's entertaining style ("showmanship"), implying that this is somehow in conflict with the effectiveness of his message. Again, what does the entertaining aspect of Josh have to do with the "emptiness" of his real message? Anyone who feels there is a conflict between Christianity and laughter or entertainment does not have an accurate understanding of Christianity and must not have been paying too much attention to what Josh had to say.

I found Josh's message meaningful and refreshing, and I'm sure a large percentage of Sunday night's audience would agree with me.

Todd Havekost

Harbingers of doom

Dear editor:

The artists' conception of the calculator-eyed student of the future, which appeared on page one of Friday's *Daily Nebraskan*, intrigued me. Those "clubbed" fingers upon which he counted are harbingers of doom.

Nascent anatomists quickly recognize edematous distal phalanges as pathological features of pulmonary disease, cardiovascular disorders, hepatic malfunction, etc. To me this picture indicates that the slide-rule for lunch bunch and their kindred boy-wonders with computers, shall suffer a timely demise.

Lest I not unduly exaggerate the uprightness of my own posture, or the whiteness of my teeth, I hasten to add that I, along with chalky pedagogues and simian sophomores, will continue to tick off the digits on our unclubbed fingers.

Dennis Hickstein

Mr. Mediocrity

Dear editor:

M. Schmit asks that Nebraska elect a U.S. Senator who is an agriculturist, someone who will represent that large portion of Nebraskans who have been practically ignored by our present representatives.

I also believe this would be good for both the state and the farmers, but I can't feel sorry for the Nebraska farmers when Washington gives them the shaft because these same farmers keep sending Curtis and Hruska back to Congress.

Frank Morrison gave Hruska a good scare in 1970 but as more and more of the farm vote came in it became apparent that the "agriculturists" wanted good old Mr. Mediocrity himself to stay in Washington doing nothing for them.

Jim Balters

Day of judgment

Dear editor:

This is in reference to the editorial of Monday, Jan. 27, by Wes Albers.

Albers stated the appearance of Josh accurately when he said "God help us." Josh McDowell is but one of millions of Christians in the world today who believe that God is real and wants to show others the facts.

God has helped me many, many times and there will be several students praying this week that God will also help Wes Albers.

I pray that when the day of judgment comes and I'm enjoying heavenly peace, that Wes Albers won't be left behind enjoying his own "inner peace."

Mark Tats

Cliche-ridden

Dear editor:

The comments made about Josh McDowell's meeting on campus in the "editorial" seem to hinge on the theoretical positions of the writer: (1) "ain't I right, everybody?" and (2) "after all, am I not an example of intellectual status on a campus of pure intelligence?"

To liken a pervasive and enthusiastic promotional campaign to an expected result like Josh's walking on water or parading through palm fronds is to confuse the message with the medium, something that shouldn't happen with a true intellectual. The column also seemed to imply that someone with the talents of a John O'Leary would, of course, be offended by "the multitudes of cardboard boxes that were sliding their way around campus proclaiming the wonders of Josh."

The entire "editorial" seemed to be saying: I know every so-called popular expression and idea of today, and by surrounding these cliches with any kinds of words, grouped together into sentences on a single subject, I will receive the applause and acclaim of all those who also know every trite and "in" expression of today and know how to group words together into sentences on a single subject—unless these "friends" just happen to be plugging in the name of a *Daily Nebraskan* editor as that subject.

Mark

No bears for Bella

Dear editor:

This letter is a comment on two recent editorials in the *Daily Nebraskan*. To Mr. Albers, all I can say is that "the truth hurts, doesn't it?" Your own particular fanaticism is characteristic of those narrow-minded, wide-eyed liberals that resent having their adolescent ravings and whims called into question by anyone—let alone a Christian.

In addition, the publicity campaign for Josh was no more irritating than those conducted on behalf of such creatures as Bella Abzug.

To Bruce Nelson (who did at least attempt to control his emotionalism), I would just comment that since you have never seen a Christian intellectual and think a Christian intellectual is a contradiction in terms—what are Karl Barth, Rudolph Bultman and Paul Tillich? Either they aren't Christians or they aren't intellectuals. However, since you use two of these men to bolster an otherwise lightweight editorial they just have to be intellectuals.

Paul Cooke

