

# HOMOSEXUALITY AND POLITICAL CORRECTNESS

## The Great Media Deception

By John Smyth

**John Smyth is a Queen's Counsel who practised as a barrister for 20 years in Britain before moving to the Mission Field in Zimbabwe.**

Whatever the causes, and wherever the truth lies, none will gainsay me in asserting that *political correctness* has been enormously successful in silencing any and every dissenting voice when it comes to the topic of homosexuality. With the notable exception of the Pope and a small number of other Roman Catholics, only the brave and exceptionally bold, and those, like the Archbishop of Canterbury, with such well established reputations that they have nothing to lose, have dared to question the prevailing mantra that to be 'straight' or 'gay' is simply a matter of how we are made. So effectively has *political correctness* brainwashed us all that the majority of the population no longer question this assumption, or so we are assured by the media and the opinion polls.

What has brought about this extraordinary change of attitude in so few years?

In 1959, during the debate on the Wolfenden Report on Homosexual Offences, the distinguished British judge, Lord Devlin, was delivering the Maccabaeian Lecture in Jurisprudence, in these terms:

**Those who are dissatisfied with the present law on homosexuality often say that the opponents of reform are swayed simply by disgust. If that were so it would be wrong, but I do not think one can ignore disgust if it is deeply felt and not manufactured. Its presence is a good indication that the bounds of tolerance are being reached. Not everything is to be tolerated. No society can do without intolerance, indignation, and disgust. They are the forces behind the moral law.<sup>1</sup>**

I do not think it would be far wide of the mark to say that in 1959, and for perhaps 25 years thereafter, Lord Devlin spoke for the vast majority of the people; they *did* regard the practice of homosexuality with ‘intolerance, indignation and disgust.’ Many still do, but are afraid to say so. There is still, and always will be, a ‘moral majority’ who know in their bones that homosexual practices are both unnatural and immoral. But that majority has been silenced by a small but vociferous minority, who aided and abetted by the media, and shielded from any form of dissent by *political correctness*, have carried the day.

How has such a *volte face* come about? We need to go back to the late 1960s. But before doing so, let me interpolate one word that is all important to any discussion of this topic from a Christian viewpoint.

## **Compassion and Understanding**

Those who have read the foregoing introduction with care will have noticed that I have studiously referred to ‘the *practice* of homosexuality’, not simply ‘homosexuality’. No one is more concerned than I that those who struggle with homosexual orientation, for whatever reason, should be honoured in every respect as human beings made in the image of God, and persons for whom Christ died, for that is what they are; and indeed that is what we all are, regardless of sexual orientation or any other condition that some may regard as out of the ordinary. That is the only right context for any proper discussion of this topic.

As John Stott points out in his introduction to his chapter on this topic in *New Issues Facing Christians Today*, we are all human beings, all sexual beings, and all sinners.<sup>2</sup> Sexual *inclination* must be distinguished from sexual *behaviour*. There can be no ‘holier-than-thou’ attitude of moral superiority because we all stand under the judgement of God; we have all sinned sexually and in so many other, probably worse, ways.

Should the Christian, prayerfully guided by his study of scripture and the Holy Spirit, come to the conclusion that some particular sexual practice is contrary to God's word, his first and paramount duty is to love the sinner, not simply condemn the sin.

It is exclusively in this context, with the desire to be sensitive at all costs to all my fellow men and women, that I embark on this topic.

### **Tracing the History of the Change in Public Perception**

Psychiatrists are extraordinarily influential people. They are experts in a field that the layman finds unusually difficult. They are prone to speak in gobbledegook, and as I over and over again discovered as a barrister in Court, there is never a consensus view. Lawyers thrive, and accused persons occasionally escape justice, because there is invariably another opinion to take issue with the expert who has already spoken.

In Britain and North America, juries are entrusted with the task of sieving such contradictory evidence, and to their credit, the combined intuition and common sense of twelve laymen usually comes up with the right answer. But of course they are guided by an impartial judge, and assisted by counsel on each side operating in our adversarial system. Everything in a court of law is designed to help the jury arrive at a just and fair answer. The system does not allow for truth to be suppressed; the debate is always in the context of 'the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.' There is a propriety and dignity of behaviour designed to ensure measured and reasoned debate, but always an adversarial system with advocates representing both sides of the argument, and an independent referee. That is the genius of the law courts, and the explanation for the success of our jury system.

So I do not blame the psychiatrists. The problem is that when they pontificate *outside* the cloisters of justice, their views are so easily misrepresented. There is no referee and no advocate for the other side; the result is that it is all too easy for misrepresentation to flourish and disinformation to multiply in a way that would be impossible in a court of law.

Homosexuality has always been an emotive subject; it is a highly charged arena of debate at the best of times. Psychiatrists are human beings with their own agendas; gay-liberation crusaders are ruthless in pursuit of their goals regardless of the truth; put them together and you have a recipe for disinformation, misrepresentation and ultimately, quite simply, the wrong answer. This is what happened in America, as I shall seek to show; and what happened in America soon crossed the Atlantic.

Dr Jeffrey Satinover is a very distinguished American psychiatrist and psychoanalyst. He holds degrees from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the Universities of Harvard and Texas. He has been a fellow in Psychiatry and Child Psychiatry at Yale University and the William James lecturer in Psychology and Religion at Harvard. His book *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*<sup>3</sup> was awarded the accolade of a citation in the American Congressional Record that read ‘The best book on homosexuality written in our lifetime’. As a psychiatrist he has followed the agenda of gay-liberation and *political correctness* from the inside. His book has not received the publicity it deserves on this side of the Atlantic. I shall quote from it extensively.

Satinover writes of psychiatrists, of whom he is one, in these terms:

**Because Americans have become a nation dependent on experts, the same psychiatrist is at once lampooned and consulted for direction. For better or for worse, mental health professionals exert influence that greatly exceeds the actual wisdom we demonstrate. In the early years of ‘gay liberation’, this reality was used for the fledgling gay activists’ advantage. They anticipated that if the influential American Psychiatric Association (APA) could be convinced to redefine homosexuality, the other guilds would follow shortly thereafter and then *so would the rest of society*. Their plan was implemented with swift and near-total success.<sup>4</sup> (my italics)**

Satinover charts the chronology of change beginning in the late sixties:

**1963:** The New York Academy of Medicine’s Committee on Public Health reported:

**Homosexuality is indeed an illness. The homosexual is an emotionally disturbed individual who has not acquired the normal capacity to develop satisfying heterosexual relationships.**

This had been the scientific and medical view for over a hundred years.

**1970:** A homosexual faction within the APA emerges and ‘plans a systematic effort to disrupt the annual convention of the APA.’ Although recognising that no new evidence had emerged since the 1963 report, they defend their stratagem on the grounds that the APA represents ‘psychiatry as a social institution’ rather than a scientific or professional body.

**Later in 1970** their plans begin to be seen in action. Irving Bieber, an eminent psychoanalyst and psychiatrist is abruptly interrupted at an APA meeting. His efforts to explain himself are met with orchestrated derisive laughter and one member barracks: ‘I’ve read your book, Dr Bieber, and if that book talked about black people the way it talks about homosexuals, you’d be drawn and quartered and you’d deserve it.’

**1971:** Faced with threats of violence and disruption at the annual conference, the APA agrees to permit a special panel *by* homosexuals about homosexuality.

**May 1971:** The APA homosexual faction organises a demonstration in collaboration with the Gay Liberation Front collective in Washington, DC. On May 3, a meeting of the profession is disrupted by protesting psychiatrists and outside gay-activists. An outsider grabs the microphone and declares: ‘Psychiatry is the enemy incarnate. Psychiatry has waged a relentless war of extermination against us. You may take this as a declaration of war against you.....We’re rejecting you all as our owners.’

**1973:** The APA is pressurised behind closed doors **to delete from their manuals every suggestion that homosexual behaviour is an illness or sign of psychiatric disorder.** At the formal meeting of the Committee the objectors to this proposal are offered fifteen minutes to present 70 years of previously unchallenged psychiatric and psychoanalytical opinion. The matter is referred to the 30,000 members of the APA.

The activists send out a *separate* mailing to the members funded by the National Gay Task Force. Faced with this intimidation only one-third of the APA members respond to the poll and the change is carried.

(It is significant to note however that in 1977, four years later, the journal *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality* conducted a survey that showed 69% of psychiatrists disagreed with the vote and still considered homosexuality a disorder. Dr R Bayer in his book *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis* makes this comment on the 1973 APA members poll: **‘The result was not a conclusion based upon an approximation of the scientific truth as dictated by reason, but was instead an action demanded by the ideological temper of the times.’<sup>5</sup>** )

**1975:** The American Association of Psychologists with a membership three times that of the APA, voted to follow suit.

**1994:** A vocal gay-activist psychiatrist, now chairman of the APA Committee on the Abuse and Misuse of Psychiatry, proposes making it a violation of professional conduct for a member to help a homosexual patient change his orientation *even at the patient’s request*. The APA Board approves the request and sends it to the Assembly, its legislative body for final approval. A huge battle ensues, and the gay-activists only back down when therapists who work to help homosexuals change threaten to file a lawsuit against the APA reopening the original decision to exclude homosexuality from its list of disorders.

Although this battle for the moment was lost, the Chairman of the APA Gay and Lesbian Task Force made it clear that the activists had in their sights all who were committed to reparative therapy, not only psychiatrists, but social workers, pastors, counsellors and ministers.

Of these groups, the guild of social workers in the USA has already travelled a long way down that road. In 1992 the National Association of Social Workers’ Committee on Lesbian and Gay Issues issued a paper stating:

Efforts to “convert” people through irresponsible therapies ... can be more accurately called brainwashing, shaming or coercion ...The assumptions and directions of reparative therapies are theoretically and morally wrong. <sup>6</sup>

## The Great Media Deception

Satinover goes on to quote an article in Atlantic Monthly (March 1993 issue ‘Homosexuality and Biology’) by Chandler Burr as an illustration of the way the press and media *create* the impression that there is nothing more to be said on the issue of homosexuality; scientifically, they would pretend, the matter is closed:

**Five decades of psychiatric evidence demonstrates that homosexuality is immutable, and non-pathological, and a growing body of recent evidence implicates biology in the development of sexual orientation.** <sup>7</sup>

In a later piece in the New York Times, Burr asserts that ‘ science has long since proven that homosexuality is biological and unchangeable, and that *there is simply no disagreement on this among scientists.*’ <sup>8</sup>

Satinover’s research discovered that Burr interviewed a number of scientists and clinicians who expressed the view that homosexuality is neither genetic nor immutable, but he simply did not cite them. <sup>9</sup>

Here then is the great deception of the public. The professional psychiatric bodies were intimidated by the gay-activists, some from within, many from without, as we have seen. But the responsibility for the deception of the public must lie fairly and squarely at the door of the media and press for their selective reporting, and their deft use of the rapier of *political correctness.*

Of course the *homosexual* press will use subversive tactics and a campaign of disinformation. That is only to be expected. But why does the *New York Times*, a newspaper committed to the highest ethics of journalism, support the deception? Let

me provide a very recent example of the same irresponsible, one-sided, journalism, again from a very reputable paper, *Time* magazine. Here, if ever, as we shall see, *Time* was provided with a golden opportunity to set the record straight, and give both sides of the argument.

### **‘Can Gays Switch Sides?’ Time Magazine May 21 2001**

No complaint about the headline. It seems fair! But what about the sub-heading?

***An inflammatory report rekindles old arguments about whether homosexuality is a matter of choice*** (my italics)

Why prejudge it by labelling it ‘inflammatory’? Why ‘rekindles’ and why ‘old arguments’? Obviously to suggest that the fires were long since out and the arguments long since out of date!

The editors, rather than the author, may have been responsible for the sub-heading; we don’t know.

This is how the author, Jeffrey Kluger, begins:

**More than a generation ago, psychiatrist Robert Spitzer helped millions of Americans get instantly well. In 1973 Spitzer, a professor at Columbia University, led the charge to have homosexuality removed from diagnostic manuals as a mental disorder. In a stroke, a segment of the population once considered sexually deviant was declared mentally sound.**

Well, he’s got his facts right. He’s talking about the 1973 APA decision that we have discussed above.

Kluger continues:

**Last week Dr Spitzer appeared to take a troubling step away from that clean bill of health. In a study presented at the convention of the APA, he argued that some ‘highly motivated’ homosexuals may be able to turn themselves into heterosexuals.**

Pausing there, what an opportunity for a fair-minded journalist to commend Dr Spitzer for having the courage to change his mind and say so, be he right or wrong. Why a ‘troubling step’? Surely if that’s what these highly motivated persons want, how wonderful that they may be able to change. But no such sentiments are expressed; instead Kluger continues:

**The APA quickly distanced itself from the study, and gay-rights groups condemned it. In the days since, the work has sparked a firestorm in the psychological community, one that may say more about questionable science than it ever could about sexual orientation.**

Am I alone in hearing the message that Spitzer’s scientific research *must* be wrong? Is he to be condemned without even a hearing? Let’s see how the article continues before we accuse Kluger of any more slanted journalism.

**The *biggest problem* with Spitzer’s study is the way he conducted it. Relying on telephone surveys, he interviewed 143 men and 57 women who had sought help – in some cases through religious groups that openly oppose homosexuality – to change their sexual orientation. His surveys convinced him that 66% of the men and 44% of the women had achieved ‘good heterosexual functioning.’**

Why is that a problem and why use words suggesting it is only one of many problems? What are the other lesser problems? Do the telephones not work properly or are we driven to conclude that Kluger wants us to believe that it is because help had been sought through *religious* groups that the research was flawed?

Kluger continues: (I am not being selective but quoting every word of a short article)

**Those are surprising numbers – until you consider the sample group. Drawing conclusions about homosexuality from gays trying to go straight is like surveying public opinion about one religion by polling people converting to another.**

What an absurd analogy! It's just a smoke screen. What other sample group would be appropriate for this survey? What on earth would be the point of asking those who did not want to change? And it brings in religion again! What's more, if I had Kluger in the witness box, I wouldn't be able to resist tweaking him about 'choice'. Does the analogy not suggest that just as people have freedom of choice over their religion, they have the same freedom with sexual orientation? Anyway, let's allow Kluger to continue:

**Spitzer argues that since the goal of his work was simply to show that heterosexual conversion is possible, contacting people working to make the change was the only sensible method. The question wasn't, 'Does everybody change?' he says. The question was, 'Does anyone?' Fair enough, but did anyone? Spitzer measured his 'good heterosexual functioning' with decidedly subjective standards – asking the respondents if their heterosexual experiences were satisfying. More rigorous studies might have looked for signs of physical arousal in the presence of various stimuli. What's more, his work has not yet been published or peer reviewed, two basic stripes that studies usually must earn to be taken seriously.**

Yes, but he presented his paper to none less a body that his APA peers. And Kluger has no quarrel with Spitzer's 1973 efforts to have homosexuality removed from the manuals as a mental disorder.

Kluger's article concludes with this paragraph (my italics):

**Spitzer is clearly the same researcher he was in 1973, and nothing in his study suggests that he believes homosexuality has any place in a manual of disorders. The new work, however, does feel oddly out of place with mainstream thinking. *Most scientists stress that everything from brain architecture to environment help determine sexuality. While gays may be able to swear off one kind of sex and grimly slog away at another, that doesn't alter their basic orientation. 'It's possible to change almost any human behaviour,' says geneticist Dean Hamer of the National Institutes of Health. 'But***

**changing the underlying mechanism is a different matter.’ A study presented at the same convention addressed the same topic and found that of 202 homosexuals who sought to change, 178 failed. Spitzer stands by his findings and insists they should never be used to justify coercive or discriminatory treatment of gays. In a culture in which homosexuals already face so much of both, however, his work certainly doesn’t help.**

Let me deal with the part I have italicised.

Is it true that *most* scientists stress that *brain architecture* helps determine sexuality? Kluger quotes just one expert in support of this extraordinary statement that we shall see in our next paragraph is patently misleading. The same quotation appears in large bold font below a drawing of two gay men that is used to illustrate the article. Who is this expert? Let me tell you. He and some colleagues published a study on July 16, 1993 that claimed to have discovered ‘*the gay gene*’. It was of course trumpeted by the media. The basis of the research – from which the conclusions were drawn – was the discovery that *in a small number of families the maternal uncles of homosexual men, but no other relatives, were disproportionately homosexual*.<sup>10</sup> For a variety of reasons that need not trouble us, within four months, in the same journal (*Science*) that had published the original study<sup>11</sup> there appeared a critical commentary taking issue with the assumptions and questionable use of statistics that underlay Hamer’s conclusions, although not with his research methods and raw data which met acceptable standards for linkage studies. Genetic researchers from three prominent American Universities attacked the study’s results as being inconsistent with any genetic model. In a reply published in the same issue of *Science* (Issue 262) Hamer and his associates in effect conceded their findings had little statistical significance. Nevertheless Hamer was brazen enough to give sworn expert evidence in a Colorado Court that he was “99.5% certain that homosexuality is genetic.” On June 25, 1995, it was reported and later confirmed in *Science*<sup>12</sup> that Hamer himself was under investigation by the Office of Research Integrity at the Department of Health and Human Services, suspected of ‘selectively reporting’ his data. Satinover comments, ‘There was no fanfare this time on National Public Radio’.<sup>13</sup> Such was the quality of the one expert witness Time Magazine called to support its stinging attack on Spitzer!

## **The Gay Gene Theory: Does Research Support it?**

The attempt by the activists to show that homosexuality is genetic or biological, has been based on two types of study.

### **(a) Post Mortem studies on the brains of known homosexuals.**

In 1991 the Press broke the story that the scientists had discovered brain differences between homosexuals and heterosexuals. The best known of the very few studies conducted is by LeVay, a San Francisco neuroanatomist. He reported finding a localized cluster of cells in the brains of homosexual men twice as large as in heterosexual men. At the same time LeVay conceded that the Sexually Dimorphic Nucleus (SDN) which takes distinct forms in male and female was found in its typically masculine form in male homosexuals.

Two prominent geneticists, Billings (now head of Internal Medicine at the Palo Alto Veteran's Administration Hospital) and Beckwith (American Cancer Society Research Professor in the Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics at Harvard Medical School) comment as follows:

**LeVay could not really be certain about his subjects' sexual preferences since they were dead. His research design and subject sample did not allow others to determine whether it was sexual behaviour, drug use, or disease history that was correlated with the observed differences among the subjects' brains. LeVay's very method of defining homosexuality was very likely to create inaccurate or inconsistent study groups.**<sup>14</sup>

Satinover makes a number of comments; first, he says that 'it would take hundreds, perhaps thousands, of such studies before meaningful trends emerge.' Secondly, he says that even if such brain differences were convincingly demonstrated, their significance would be analogous to the discovery that athletes have bigger muscles than non-athletes. A genetic tendency toward larger muscles may make it easier to become an athlete; but becoming an athlete will certainly give one bigger muscles. One study found that in people reading Braille after becoming blind, the area of the brain controlling the reading finger grew larger. Press accounts often assume that

brain differences must be innate and unchangeable; the misleading analogy of the mind as software and the brain as hardware suggests the former is malleable, the latter fixed from birth. Satinover concludes his chapter with the cautionary words, ‘Remember, one of the fundamental principles of research is that correlation does not necessarily imply causation.’<sup>15</sup>

### **(b) Studies with Twins**

If, as gay activists and the media would like to have it, homosexuality is genetic, then *identical twins* should always be either homosexual or heterosexual. There should be, as the scientists call it, a 100% *concordance rate*. There should never be one homosexual and one heterosexual twin in the same identical pair.

A small number of studies have been done *all of which show the concordance rate is less than 50%*, and yet they have been claimed as proving homosexuality is genetic! To an open-minded person these studies prove that homosexuality is caused not primarily, if at all by genes, but by something else! And one only has to reflect on the upbringing of twins to realise that the high rate of concordance (approaching 50%) is most likely to be caused by environmental factors. The only study of twins, where one had been adopted into another family soon after birth, showed a concordance rate of zero, again making the same point.

There have been two well known studies, one in America at Northwestern University by *Bailey and Pillard*, who openly acknowledge that they were motivated by social-policy considerations; they set out to demonstrate that homosexuality was predominantly genetic and counter claims that it was largely environmental. Even with this axe to grind, at the end of the day these researchers admit disappointment that their work demonstrated ‘a far smaller genetic contribution to both male and female homosexuality than they sought.’<sup>16</sup> Two studies found that the concordance rate for identical twins raised together was approximately 50% where one twin identified himself as a homosexual. The other half of the pairs consisted of one homosexual and one heterosexual. The concordance rate for non-identical twins was only 22%. The researchers took some comfort from this comparison because it is consistent with the hypothesis that inherited factors play some part, although it is also

consistent with the fact that identical twins reared together share greater environmental influences than non-identical twins.<sup>17</sup>

The British study was conducted by *King and McDonald* and published in the British Journal of Psychiatry in 1992. They found lower concordance rates than the North American studies but with a similar difference between identical and non-identical twins. They concluded:

**Discordance for sexual orientation in the (identical) twins confirmed that genetic factors are insufficient explanation for the development of sexual orientation.**

King and McDonald went on to look for non-genetic factors and found unexpectedly ‘a relatively high likelihood of sexual relations occurring with the same sex co-twins at some time, particularly in (identical) pairs.’<sup>18</sup>

### **Scientific Conclusions compared with the Media Conclusions on the ‘Gay Gene’ Issue**

Billings and Beckwith (quoted earlier) in their book ‘*Born Gay?*’ express particular concern about the conclusions drawn by Bailey and Pillard from their research:

**While the authors interpreted their findings as evidence for a genetic basis for homosexuality, we think that the data in fact provide strong evidence for the influence of the environment.**

**On average, both non-identical twins and non-twin siblings share 50% of their genes. If homosexuality were a genetic trait, the pairs in these groups should be homosexual a similar percentage of the time. They certainly should (both) be homosexual (if one is) more often than adopted siblings. But Bailey and Pillard’s data do not fit those predictions.<sup>19</sup>**

*Byne and Parsons*, researchers at Columbia University, reviewed 135 research studies, reviews, articles, books and chapters of books, to produce their paper. Satinover comments that their study must rank as ‘by far the best available assessment of the current status of this research.’<sup>20</sup> Here are some extracts from their findings:

**What is most intriguing about the studies of Bailey and Pillard and of King and McDonald is the large proportion of monozygotic (identical) twins who were discordant for homosexuality despite sharing not only their genes but also their prenatal and familial environments. The large proportion of discordant pairs underscores our ignorance of the factors that are involved, and the manner in which they interact, in the emergence of sexual orientation.**

**Recent studies postulate biologic factors (genetic, hormonal) as the primary basis for sexual orientation. However, *there is no evidence at present to substantiate a biologic theory*, just as there is no evidence to support any singular psychosocial explanation.**

**Critical review shows the evidence favouring biologic theory to be lacking. In an alternative model, temperamental and personality traits interact with the familial and social milieu as the individual’s sexuality emerges.**<sup>21</sup>

The determination of the media to propagate the gay-activist view regardless of scientific research has already been demonstrated by Chandler Burr’s writings in *Atlantic Monthly* and the *New York Times*, and the *Time Magazine* article of May 2001. Satinover tells another story. When *Byne and Parsons* published their assessment from which we have quoted, they were accused, predictably, of having a right-wing agenda. *Byne* told the *Wall Street Journal*, ‘I’m told my criticism is not *politically correct*. What they’re saying therefore is that I should subjugate scientific rigor to political expediency.’<sup>22</sup>

## Summing Up the Nature/Nurture Debate

I am of course not qualified in any way as an expert in these matters. But as a lawyer I spent 20 years in practice as an advocate and 6 years as a part-time judge. Analysing evidence, distilling it, and presenting a summary to a jury in digestible form was part of the job.

Let me for a moment put on my wig and gown again and attempt to do that with this issue. I suggest the evidence shows:

1. No scientific research has come anywhere near proving even on a balance of probabilities that homosexuality is caused by 'brain architecture', or biological genetic traits.
2. Such research as there has been suggests that environmental factors are of much greater significance.
3. All reputable scientists agree that homosexuality is multifactorial, and many scientists consider it better to speak of 'homosexualities', rather than using the term in the singular.
4. It is vital to remember that correlation does not imply causation, so that a genetic correlation may have developed primarily as a result of the practice of a life-style rather than being the cause of the lifestyle. A person born with a combination of height and athleticism is not genetically programmed to become a basketball player. But if he chooses to make that choice, we may say 'that choice clearly has a genetic component.' What is more, the more he plays basketball, the more he will develop an athleticism that is genetically appropriate for a basketball player. But in no way was he ever forced to play basketball. Alcoholism is generally thought to have a genetic component, but nobody ever contends that an alcoholic has no choice as to whether he drinks. (Alcoholism is estimated to be between 50 and 60% inheritable.)

5. Very few people are created with one hundred percent heterosexual inclinations. Most have genes that place them somewhere along a fairly broad spectrum; many have some homosexual inclinations that may surface at some stage in life, if only for a short time in adolescence. Sometimes environmental or social factors, such as child-abuse or a mismatch relationship with one or both parents, will increase the tendency for these inclinations to surface.

However, experience tells us that very few people will indulge in homosexual behaviour unless their inclination or appetite is aroused at some stage by an *external human agency*; it may be a group of peers at school, or some older man or woman either in the teens or even middle-age. In other words, although some people have a greater *inclination* than others, an *appetite* for homosexuality is almost always *caught*, not inherited.

Some people have a greater *susceptibility* to certain diseases than others. This is part of genetic make-up. But there will be no *manifestation* of the disease without *infection* from someone else. So it is with the practice of homosexuality; there may be *inclination*, even *orientation*, but the *practice* or *behaviour* does not begin without a human catalyst. That is the story I have heard over and over again for forty years both in the criminal courts and during my ministry with teenagers and students. Hence there is always an opportunity to make a choice and exercise the God-given gift of free-will. Even if the point has been reached where there seems to be no real opportunity to choose heterosexuality, there is the choice, by God's grace, to choose abstinence.

Let me conclude with one final 'jury' point that I believe to be devastating. Since homosexuals, as a matter of practice and common sense, procreate to only a very limited degree, ***if homosexuality were significantly genetic or hereditary, its presence in the population would progressively fall.*** Indeed unless it were continuously 'redeveloped' by environmental causes it would eventually disappear.

Gay-activists stress, rightly, that the incidence of homosexuality in the population is not declining, and this argument in itself is an argument against homosexuality being directly genetically determined.

## Notes

1. Reprinted in 'The Enforcement of Morals', Devlin, Oxford, 1965, p.17
2. New Issues Facing Christians Today, Stott, Marshall Pickering, 1999, pp.382-4
3. Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth, Satinover, Baker Books, 1996
4. Opus cit. p.31
5. Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis, Bayer, New York: Basic Books, 1981, pp.3-4
6. Reported by C. Cornett, 'Gay Ain't Broke; No Need to Fix It', Insight Magazine 6 Dec 1993, p.27
7. Homosexuality and Biology, Chandler Burr, Atlantic Monthly, March 1993
8. Satinover, opus cit. p.38
9. Satinover, opus cit. p.38
10. Satinover, opus cit. p.110
11. A Linkage between DNA Markers on the X-Chromosome and Male Sexual Orientation, DH Hamer et al. , Science, Issue 261, pp 321-327
12. NIH's 'Gay Gene' Study Questioned, Marshall, Science, Issue 268, 1995, p.1841
13. Satinover, opus cit. pp.111-113
14. Born Gay? Billings and Beckwith, Technology Review, July 1993, pp.60-61
15. Satinover, opus cit. pp. 78-81
16. Satinover, opus cit. p.84
17. A Genetic Study of Male Sexual Orientation, Bailey and Pillard, Archives of General Psychiatry 48, 1991, pp.1089-1096
18. Homosexuals who are Twins: A Study of 46 Probands, King and McDonald, British Journal of Psychiatry 160, 1992, pp.407-409; and Satinover, opus cit. pp.84-88
19. Ibid p.61, quoted Satinover, opus cit. p.89
20. Satinover, opus cit. p.114

21. Human Sexual Orientation: The Biologic Theories Reappraised, Byne and Parsons, Archives of General Psychiatry 50, No.3, pp.228-39
22. Wall Street Journal, 12 August 1993, p.1