

# SPECTRUM

## Ignoring the Truth

## Reclaiming the Truth

freedom free of any restraint. Also in his book, Gairdner writes that the US National Gay Rights platform of 1972 attempted to remove all laws governing age of consent. The reasoning behind this attempt being, so long as the child is in agreement, child sex is not wrong.

Although not all homosexuals are pedophiles, more radical homosexuals are a different matter. Liberal homosexuals demonstrate that moral normalities are only put in place to control us and keep us subservient to those in power. Drawing again from Gairdner, we find that sexologist Alfred Kinsey, in the course of his famous *Kinsey Report on Sexual Behaviour*, had one-year old babies masturbated in his sex laboratories to prove that they could be sexually aroused. Kinsey approved of sexual relationships between children and adults as a healthy part of child development. These ideas, when incorporated with the liberal mind, have resulted in the notion that "consent" is the validation that any freely chosen behaviour, be it pedophilia, abortion or sadomasochism.

Upon arguing from a more emotional viewpoint, one might suggest that homosexuality is justified because of the "love" felt between two partners. This in turn, should allow them to portray and act out their lives together in the same way heterosexuals do. Every society and culture, however, distinguishes between healthy love and unhealthy love. There are hundreds of types of love. Loving one's self in excess, or narcissism, is unhealthy love. Incest is declared unhealthy love universally. Sexual love of children, or pedophilia, is also unhealthy love.

In contrast to these the book *On Higher Ground* brings forward the point that our Judeo-Christian tradition teaches. This point being that, healthy love ranges in quality from it's most basic to it's more complex. This begins with innocent affection for plants and animals, upwards to the love of close friends, neighbours, and family, on to the love of our spouse and the spiritual love of God. Therefore, Gairdner is saying that the mere claim to a feeling of "love," in other words, is not automatically a sanction for the action it is used to justify.

The argument favouring homosexuality is part of an ideology that assumes we are all good by nature, so therefore, all consensual sex is good in nature. This argument presents any feeling of guilt, shame, disgust or disapproval towards homosexuality, pedophilia, and incest as a sign of sexual frigidity and should be purged from existence.

The progressive result of the argument favouring homosexuality brings us to where those holding these beliefs would want to replace our Judeo-Christian sexual idea of selectivity and procreation with ideals of self-satisfaction and unrestrained recreation. In a world where gender doesn't matter, neither does the sexual activity of children, the number of spouses, or their blood relationship.

The last portion of this writing will address the issue of homosexuals who claim to be Christians and followers of the Christian faith and yet remain firm in their belief that homosexuality is perfectly good in the eyes of God. "Christian" homosexuals claim that, nowhere in the Bible does it say that homosexuality is wrong. Even areas where acts of homosexuality are sighted in the Bible with negative remarks or connotations are explained as being unrelated to the act of homosexuality and more related to the reason for the act, or how the act was carried out. Granted, the line of logic used to explain some passages of Scripture has presented a worth argument, although very debatable for a few specific areas of the Bible. The majority of all the arguments, however, are a weak attempt to justify what cannot be justified if one is to call themselves a Christian and believe the Bible to be the inspired word of God.

The first passage that arises in Scripture pertaining to homosexual acts is Leviticus 18:22, "you shall not lie with a male as with a woman; it is an abomination." This verse comes out of the laws of the old testament written by Moses. The argument used against this passage by the homosexual community is one which can only be said to be a good attempt at distorting the truth. The basis of their arguments stands on the fact that after the death and resurrection of Christ, in the New Testament, Christians were no longer required to follow certain Jewish laws (the most major law of which was animal sacrifice) because Jesus was the replacement for those laws. It was in the book of Acts that Peter the apostle had a dream about a blanket, being lowered from heaven, which was full of all the meats which were considered unclean for consumption by the Jews according to the Old Testament. God told Peter that all of these meats could now be eaten because Christ's death and resurrection was all that was needed to keep these meats from making man unclean. The argument that the homosexual community uses, however, is that just as eating pork and other meats was an abomination and now no longer is, so also homosexuality which was described as an abomination now no longer is. The problem is

that seen right away with this argument is that God was very specific in the New Testament about all the changes the New Covenant would result in. He spoke of there being no more need for animal sacrifice or sacrificial ritual and he spoke specifically of the meat no longer being restricted. But in no part of any of the New Testament is there any mention of the removal of God's view of homosexuality being an abomination.

The second passage that arises in Scripture pertaining to homosexual acts is Judges 19:22. "While they were enjoying themselves, the men of the city, a perverse lot, surrounded the house, and started pounding on the door. They said to the old man, the master of the house, 'Bring out the man who came into your house, so that we have intercourse with him.'" This passage of Scripture is probably argued over more than any other Scripture in the Bible as to whether or not it is condemning of homosexuality. Homosexuals would argue that this passage refers not to a wrong of homosexuality but of inhospitality. This idea is explained by saying that the men of the city were guilty of attempting to humiliate the visitor by raping him. This view, unfortunately, does not explain why, in the following verse, the old man offers his own virgin daughter up to the crowd of rapists instead of allowing his two male guests to be sodomized. The indication here is that homosexual rape of a stranger is considered to be far worse than the heterosexual rape of a virgin daughter.

The last Scripture against homosexuality of which I speak are found in the New Testament. They are both written by the apostle Paul and both pieces of Scripture have basically the same content. The first is found in 1 Corinthians 6:9 and the second in 1 Timothy 1:9,10. The following quotation is from the former: "Do you know that wrong doers will not inherit the Kingdom of God? Do not be deceived! Fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes and sodomites..." This piece of Scripture appears to be quite clear on its stance against homosexuality. Yet, the homosexual community attempts yet another maneuver around the obvious. The argument used here is that

during the time of Paul, large numbers of young boys were kept as slaves to the older and richer men of the cities. Many of these boys were used by their masters for homosexual sex. As this seemed to be a common practice, the argument cannot stand very well due to the fact that actual Greek texts and English texts speak only in certainty of homosexual relationships as being wrong. To stretch the interpretation to a specific type of homosexual relationship would be a false interpretation of the authentic text. Also, as a true Christian, one is to see the Bible as the inspired Word of God, and as such, should speak for itself without the need for examining the history at the time of the writing. God's Word is to be seen by all true Christians as the same yesterday, today and tomorrow. Upon honestly considering the truth of the Bible, the homosexual community, in the church, needs to decide if they really want to be a true Christians. This would require that they reject the idea that homosexuality is part of the faith and begin living by that belief.

Otherwise, they really ought to consider creating a religion that won't constantly remind the, every time they push to get married in a "Christian" church, that they are denying the truth of their faith.

In conclusion to examining all the evidence, both practical and theological, I hope we now begin to see the deception laid down on society in order to accept homosexuality as a natural activity. This lie is and will be one that will hurt both those directly involved and indirectly involved, those that are wrongly exposed to it and unwilling exposed to it. If anything is to change, it must be through understanding the problems faced by people struggling to find out who they are through all the lies thrown at them by society. Homosexuals are the victims of a massive lie that keeps them from acquiring the help they need to find themselves again.

homosexuality with pedophilia. If anything, heterosexuality would contain more accounts of pedophilic tendencies than would homosexuality. Dr. Benjamin Spock in the 1970's accounted for 95% of child molesters as being heterosexual. The DSM III-R (1987) and DSM IV-R (1994) found that attraction to girls (heterosexuality) is apparently twice as common as attraction to boys (homosexuality). In either case, the particular focus of pedophilic sexuality is the sexual urges/arousal involving sexual activity with a prepubescent child. Homosexuality deals with sexual urges/arousal involving members of the same sex. The two are not mutually inclusive, nor should they be associated. Just as not all heterosexuals are child molesters, justifiably not all homosexuals are child molesters either.

This assumption has been given mistaken credence in W.D. Gairdner, *On Higher Ground*, when he examines the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual IV-R's criteria revision of pedophilia. The DSM IV-R's disorder criterion for pedophilia now reads as "The fantasies, sexual urges, or behaviours cause clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning." It is reactive and nonconductive to assume that this opens the avenue for the social acceptance

children can be found in...*Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male*. For details on the nature of the research project in which Dr. Kinsey and his co-workers collected the data for that publication see Wardell Pomeroy's, *Dr. Kinsey and The Institute for Sex Research (1997)*. Gairdner's statements appear to lack credence in his claims made regarding pedophilic and homosexual associations and examinations.

Psycho-social emphasis is also placed within the context of love and sexual orientation. There is the assumption that the love that same-sex couples have for each other is unhealthy, and does not warrant the justification of "homosexual" behaviour and activities. In what way is holding hands, kissing, expressing one's love for their partner, being together and a host of other behaviours/activities part of the repertoire of a specific sexual orientation? Heterosexual and homosexual couples behave similarly across all types of behaviours, both sexual and non. The ONLY difference is in the gender of the person's partner. What then is the justification of calling homosexual love "unhealthy?" Once again Gairdner's *On Higher Ground*, comes up with the answer in the form of the Judeo-Christian tradition of healthy love as being varied and limited to heterosexuality. As the interpretation



of pedophilia, and its subsequent association with homosexuality in light of several things. First, this is a psychological diagnosis and criterion for treatment, not the judicial treatment of the pedophile. Second, despite the criterion of distress to the person as the motivating factor in pedophilic diagnosis, there is also the consideration of the victim's state following a pedophilic activity. The harm to the child would be a large factor in larger social scheme. Third, this criterion does not necessitate equal placement within the judicial system, wherein the activity itself is legally perceived as wrong. Fourth, as previously stated, pedophilia is also socially unaccepted within the larger lesbian/gay society. It is erroneous and misleading for Gairdner to assume that the lessening of the age of consent for homosexual sex automatically links homosexuality with pedophilia. Society does not seem to question the veracity of this statement if the subject of the low age of consent was for heterosexual sex. I wonder why? Perhaps due to social acceptability? Of equal misrepresentation are Gairdner's statements with regard to the lack in total information regarding the North American Man-Boy Love Association's protest during the 1994 Gay and Lesbian Association Conference. The majority of homosexual members at the conference did not accept NAMBLA's assertions. Furthermore, the use of Gairdner's book to argue the validation of the homosexuality-pedophilia association via the use of Kinsey's 1930 Report on sexuality is mistaken. The supposition that Kinsey approved of sexual relationships between children and adults and the negative views of his research, by Gairdner are questionable. Kath Pennavaria from the Kinsey Institute in Indiana has this to say regarding Gairdner's findings. "The statements made by W.D. Gairdner as quoted in [Mr. MacLean's] article are all unfounded. The details about Dr. Kinsey's findings regarding sexuality of

in Mr. MacLean's article states, "Gairdner is saying that the mere claim to a feeling of 'love'...is not automatically a sanction for the action it is used to justify." Yet, who is to say that homosexuals do not feel love? It is mistaken to assume that just because the focus of a person's love is of the same sex, that it is no more real or sanctioned than that between heterosexuals. This and many of the previous issues against homosexuality appear to stem from religion; especially from a Judeo-Christian doctrine.

The religious perception of homosexuality in the first paragraph of Mr. MacLean's article hints at the misunderstanding, and misinterpretation, of the Bible and homosexuality. The argument states that the perceptions of homosexuality's wrongness and immorality are due to ignorance and religious fanaticism. I would argue both sections as the belief in separate interpretations of the Bible and not necessarily just religious fanaticism or pure ignorance per se. Christianity itself is rife with different interpretations of the Bible, from Anglicanism, Protestantism, to Roman Catholicism. No Christian religion is absolutely right or wrong in their perception of Biblical truth; merely a difference in religious interpretation of the Bible creating disagreement. Boswell (1980) is one of the prime proponents of interpretative qualities of the Bible. According to him, the Bible has been interpreted by people to fit particular heterocentric assumptions of Judeo-Christianity. For instance, the presumption of Sodom and Gomorra as being destroyed through unnatural sexual transgressions (one of which was supposedly homosexuality) has been challenged by Boswell to instead refer to sins of inhospitality. Furthermore, homosexuality as it stands within the texts of the Bible is not actually mentioned within the confines of actual homosexual persons, but instead refers to mistranslated

Continued on Page 8

## What's/Who's Out There?



**Metanoia**  
John Valk

Space fascinates me. The night sky is full of wonder, of which the Hale-Bopp comet is but the latest. A study of our universe is as scientifically enticing as it is spiritual alluring. The "heavens" beckon the human mind as much as it does the human soul.

The vast expanse of space is astounding, and not least to the amateur. We can only barely fathom the immense distances, even with the best telescopes and computers. Measurement in light years, not kilometres, is needed to locate galaxies and stars. The distance from one end of the universe to the other, if such is possible to estimate, is simply mind (if not computer) boggling.

The numbers of spatial bodies are even more astounding. With the naked eye we are dazzled with the seemingly endless array of stars. The Milky Way, of which our solar system is but one small dot, is itself only one of an endless number of galaxies. Telescopes reveal even more than the naked eye.

The (now properly focussed) Hubble Space Telescope has provided us a new window of

insight into space. It has returned (computer enhanced) images to earth that are simply breathtaking. We now have even more astounding views of space; the birth of galaxies, the destruction of galaxies, even the complexities of galaxies.

Hubble has also discovered spatial bodies where none were thought to exist. In one of the "emptiest" regions of space — a dot in space from our perspective, that is, a region the size of a grain of sand held at arm's length — Hubble detected layer upon layer of galaxies, with each galaxy containing billions of stars.

The age of the universe is also perplexing. Infinity and eternity are difficult for finite and temporal beings to comprehend. We measure things in terms of beginnings and endings. So we struggle to determine the origin of the universe. Scientists attempt to gain more and more insight into this origin, postulating a concept of a "Big Bang". The lapse of time since this initial "explosion" is estimated to be as much as eleven billion years, against which our own individual "four score and ten" seems utterly

insignificant. And what of the future of this universe, let alone our own little planet Earth? Will it be for all eternity, expanding infinitely? Or is it retracting, at lightning speed?

For science the "mystery" and fascination with space is largely, if not exclusively, in terms of distance, objects, and time. The challenge to the scientist, qua scientist, is in terms of that which science can detect and measure. And, I am awestruck, as many are, by what science has uncovered, and not only in terms of astronomy.

Yet, that which science can uncover is limited. It cannot, for example, explain why, and for what purposes, the universe exists. It cannot explain why and for what purposes humans exist. For that reason, I wonder whether science's wonderment, as great as it can be, is nonetheless limited.

Fortunately, humans are not determined solely by the discoveries of science, in spite of what some are inclined to think. We have other dimensions that also serve to constitute our being. There is more to life than meets the scientific eye. We are increasing realizing this in our paradigm shift from the modern to the post-modern. For that reason, the study of the stars and planets (astronomy) is as much a challenge to the human soul as it is to the scientific mind.

When astronomers probe the origin, or the limits, of the universe, do they hope to find anything in addition to more of the same —

more galaxies, stars, planets? What "secret" of the universe, what "Holy Grail", do they hope to find "behind" the "Big Bang", or beyond the furthest reaches of space? Will the discoveries be of "something" detectable or measurable only, or not at all, by the instruments of science?

Will science fail us here? Science, and astronomy, can tell us of the "heavenly" bodies out there. But can science tell us if God is also "out there"?

Perhaps this is where, and why, we necessarily bump up against another realm — the realm of the human soul or spirit. It is the human spirit, not scientific quests and probings, that will "discover" God in the vast expanses of space or behind the "Big Bang." The quest to determine whether we are cosmic orphans or creations of God, made by accident or with purpose and design, is a spiritual not a scientific one.

That quest, or journey, is one that actually begins here at home. In the depths of our souls, not in the depths of space, is the place to search for God. If we cannot or do not find God here, chances are unlikely that we will find God out there. On the other hand, if we do find God in the depths of our souls, we will also find God in the depths of space.

Space fascinates me. The very possibility of the vast distances, the numbers and complexities of galaxies, the origin of the universe, continues to amaze me. And, the very possibility that

science, with its precision instruments and measurements, has brought that so much closer to my gaze, also amazes me. I am in constant awe.

That awe is heightened by my spiritual journey. It is heightened because my spirit recognizes that God "stands" behind it all. The more I become awe-inspired by the vast complexities of the universe, hidden or otherwise, the more I become awe-inspired by the God who put it all together.

And then there is something more. I read it in the Scriptures. The Hebrew Scriptures state that the God who put the universe in place and in motion is not indifferent to me (Psalm 8). In fact, the ancient Hebrews affirmed that the universe, but especially the earth, was put in place by God for me — to use, to share, to appreciate. Furthermore, the Christian Scriptures affirm that that same God also dwelt on earth, in human form, for me. All of this simply astounds me.

Perhaps the scientific probings into the universe is indeed related to the spiritual search into one's own soul. What one uncovers in one's soul will ultimately be uncovered also in the vast expanses of the universe. Space can be dark and cold. Or it can be filled with the warmth and glory of God. The difference in what one sees, uncovers and experiences depends on the "eyes" (telescopes?) one uses.

DER  
Editor  
ty  
green

society, part of the  
ult to get people to  
sight, out of mind  
don't rectify our  
simply bury it.  
am cup when you  
throwing out what  
ce setting in plastic  
or lunch, don't put  
containers in the  
ing things you don't  
zes the need for  
are numerous ways  
waste— bring a mug  
our lunch, don't buy  
ive or unrecyclable  
le— consider where  
ing. Consciousness  
is imperative to  
lem. In an aim to  
his consciousness  
students, faculty and  
to support the  
what has been called  
Day. People are  
to one day without  
s. As the first step  
s, Reduce-reuse and  
your support.

truth  
by reason of sexual  
due to associations  
orientations" which  
very notion, then,  
small than the other  
perceives the sexual  
ld also be rather  
uality with such  
nd pedophilia. One  
uality within this  
describe all sexual

genetic dispositions  
the acceptance of  
homosexuality is  
dispositions and the  
ons (e.g. alcoholism,  
to explore the actual  
genetic disposition  
the naturalness of  
nature. Unlike the  
of alcoholism and  
uality has not been  
n or others, except  
homosexual person to  
on of homosexuality  
ual orientations" is  
n and contribution  
negative attributions.  
recreative aspect of  
The promotion of  
their species is not  
to survive. There are  
organisms that do  
the survival of their  
helpmates to the  
are not necessarily  
specially in humans.  
is or ailment in  
omosexuals live as  
society. The attempt  
tic due to the fact  
y may be curtailed,  
on. Besides, the few  
after these so-called  
to their previous  
es of the study. The  
support for sexual  
that disregards the  
ple make to society.  
are differentiations  
osexual acts and  
ntention because, as  
do not necessarily

ial ramifications of  
MacLean's argument.  
ning association of  
7

ent publication. We  
Online is an ongoing  
ub.es/web/bruns.  
I do not necessarily

Brunswickan. While we  
use any submission  
ure. The Brunswickan  
300 words in length  
or be printed.  
e legible. If we can't  
ors we've seen... The  
icles printed in The  
hing we want to be

n. This week's paper  
een snow days!  
e Sales Manager  
362-6468.