

you were saying

In reply to "Who was Jesus?"

To the Editor:
Re: Muslim-Christian exchange
(see last week's Gazette, p.6)

Mr. Miller said that improper arguments hinder Christians from understanding what their own scriptures say about Jesus. Let's examine his argument and see.

The Muslim tradition says that Jesus was a prophet and that a prophet always speaks the truth. Mr. Miller quoted several statements of Christ's divinity out of context to make them sound ambiguous. John Chapter 8 verse 24 certainly isn't ambiguous. Jesus said, "That is why I told you that you will die in your sins. And you will die in your sins if you do not believe that 'I am Who I am'."

In Exodus Chapter 3 verse 14 God said to Moses, "I am Who I am." The Lord's audience was well acquainted with the Old Testament. Jesus made a definite statement of His divinity and His role as Redeemer, so definite they killed him.

How can Miller say this doctrine was the invention of men when it was first taught by Christ? Doesn't his Quran say Christ always spoke the truth? How can Miller call him a prophet then deny His most important message? I take Christ's Word over Miller's interpretation because He doesn't just speak the truth, He is the Truth.

Happy Easter
Philip Chisholm

Rusty and Dave lick their wounds

To the Editor:

While not myself a student in the Faculty of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, I am impelled, nonetheless, to comment upon the crude and unoriginal nature of the latest Rusty and Dave attempt to be funny (Dal Gazette, March 29, 1984).

To attribute to all those in a particular field of study some uniform standard of achievement or behaviour, in accordance with some established notion of popular wisdom, is not only an act of unkindness and chauvinism (whether done "in good fun" or not), but also calls into question the validity of popular wisdom. Popular asininity, more like!

I suspect what must really have happened was that Rusty and Dave, attracted by what they perceived to be the prospect of an untrammelled libidinous experience (the kind, with tongues hanging, they seek perpetually) with a couple of fair female members of the aforementioned faculty, were unable to contain their rapacious fantasies within the normally-accepted bounds of civilized decorum, and suffered the consequences. That is to say, their erstwhile

escortees unceremoniously crushed their gonads with a couple of swift, well-placed knees, and threw them both out of the pool-hall.

Licking their wounds, as it were (all animals are able to do that), they crawled back to their office and retaliated in the only way they could, by writing scurrilous junk and having it published - much as would any other self-respecting writer of hate literature.

Do I make myself clear?

Sincerely,
Michael Guravich
Student, Faculty of Graduate Studies

Dawson says goodbye

To the Editor:

Another year moves headlong towards its inevitable close; spring makes itself felt, and long-dead emotions are revived. "April is the contest month." So, just for the record ...

Mar kFeldbauer (I know you didn't really burn the Reichstag); by writing another letter about me, aren't you just compounding the offense? And I'm not defending Imperialists—only Canadians.

Hugh Paton; tolerance is a virtue—one much misunderstood in our society. Think about it.

Charles Spurr; you will never convince me, I will never convince you—we are probably both more interested in convincing others. But it can be enjoyable. Try to have more of a sense of humour.

Tupper Lounge Supporters; a couple good points—but don't you think that it will only increase the isolation between health professions and others? The Gazette *did* present a bit of a narrow-minded argument for it.

Debeut Protesters; I'm still curious ... but maybe I will never know why.

So, that just about sums it up. There are no answers, only more questions. Good luck, and God bless you all.

P.F. Dawson
3rd Yr. Hons.
Political Science

Burke pulls strings

To the Editor:

It is an ominous sign when, after proclaiming "a vow for a new face for The Gazette," that the first two editorials are generated by ex-editor, Ken Burke. What good is a new face if it merely fronts the same old voice? Whether it was Charlie McCarthy, Mortimer Snerd, or both sitting on Bergen's knee, it was still old Edgar's lips that were actually moving.

Bryan D. Fantie
Arts Editor

Arts and science bend to part-time students

To the Editor:

An article on page 3 of the March 29th Gazette "Mature students sing the blues", mentions the unfairness to mature students of the ten year time limit to complete an undergraduate degree.

I would like to point out that undergraduate regulation 1.2.1 "duration of undergraduate studies" has been amended, fairly recently, to state that "...the appropriate Committee of the Faculty concerned may grant permission to continue studies for a reasonable further period, subject to such conditions as the committee deems appropriate..."

Within the Faculty of Arts and Science the "appropriate Committee" is the Committee on Studies, and, to my knowledge, this committee has been particularly sympathetic to the problems of part-time students. Since the change in regulations, the Committee has merely required the applicant to show a schedule for the completion of the degree within a reasonable time period. It is appropriate to mention also that there is the further stipulation (in 1.2.1) that the degree requirements in force at the time the extension is granted must be met.

I hope that this clarifies the present situation, at least as far as Arts & Science is concerned.

Yours sincerely,
D.A. Tindall
Member and former Chairman
Committee on Studies

Penfriends wanted

To the Editor:

Would you kindly put me in touch with some students of your college, both boys and girls, about 18, 19, 20 or 21 years old?

Please provide me with the names and addresses of pen-friends and tourist bureaux which I can contact direct. Besides, send me some magazines or brochures about your programmes on your university.

I'm looking forward to hearing from you very soon.

Yours faithfully,
Peyman Nazari,
student of Tehran University
Bldg. 18.47
Tehran University Dorm.
North Kargar Ave.

commentary

Christian responds to "Who was Jesus?"

by Greg Glazov

In response to the review contained in the last issue of the Gazette on the Muslim-Christian exchange entitled "Who was Jesus?", I would like to begin by recalling the way in which the Catholic Church in the Second Vatican Council encouraged Christian-Moslem relations. Concerning Moslems, the Council said that "professing to hold the faith of Abraham, they along with us adore the one and merciful God, who on the last day will judge mankind." And noting that there have been many quarrels between the Christians and Moslems, the Council urged that "all forget the past, and strive sincerely for mutual understanding and, on behalf of all mankind, make common the cause of safeguarding and fostering social justice, moral values, peace and

freedom."

To be more loyal to dialogue, however, one must make clear the differences that separate people. This makes life a cross, but that's life.

In the review, Mr. Miller expresses the Moslem acceptance of Jesus as a holy man but not as God. But Mr. Miller adds that the Christian's interpretation of Jesus as God is "unwarranted". Mr. Miller is kind enough to note that he "knows the same Jesus as Christians because he has read the Bible." He develops his argument not by questioning the authenticity of the Gospels, but the interpretation made of them by theologians.

Let us assume, then, as he does, that the Gospels are authentic and see if we come to the same conclusion about the character of Jesus, by noting var-

ious statements made by Jesus in the New Testament.

Among these we find many comparisons between Jesus and the created world which point to Jesus' superhuman vocation and nature. For example, he is greater than Moses and Elias, the witnesses at his transfiguration (Matt 17:3), and in him the disciples behold what prophets and kings had in vain longed to see.

We note further Jesus' many utterances comparing himself to God. With the same absolute authority with which God in the Old Testament sent out bearers of His revelation, Jesus also says: "I send you prophets and wise men and scribes."

With the right to forgive sins and the sin destroying work of redemption, there is logically connected the right which Jesus reserves to himself *alone* of pro-

nouncing the final sentence on the living and the dead as Judge of the World (Matt 7:23, Jn 5:22). The Old Testament shows in many passages that this right is reserved only for God.

We also find clear testimony made by Jesus to his own divine nature. He claims to have shared the glory of the Father before the world was created (Jn 17:5), and when the pharisees mock him for having said that he saw Abraham, he replied: "Amen, amen I say to you, before Abraham was I am." (Jn 8:56-58), which is what God said of himself in the Old Testament. (Exod 3:13-16)

Jesus does not only claim to be Eternal Being but also the Light of the World (Jn 8:12) and says this at the end of the Feast of the Tabernacles, which recalled the miraculous leading of Israel through the desert and the reve-

lation of God in a cloud of light.

Likewise, he claims to be the dispenser of Life and Truth and so, by being Eternal Being, Light, Life and Truth, he is like the Father and claims to be one with Him (Jn 10:30), for which affirmation he was then threatened to be stoned and finally crucified.

It becomes obvious that the appearance of Jesus after his death would not have been sufficient to call forth the faith for which his disciples went to their death. Their faith points to the corresponding revelation of Jesus before his death.

It also becomes clear that the Jesus described by Mr. Miller is nowhere to be found in the pages of the New Testament. The Man one sees is not just a holy man. He is clearly, either a lunatic, a liar or God Himself. There is no alternative.