

An Analysis of SSR in Science, Culture, and Law

📖 The Bible and Homosexuality

👤 Pastor Jeremy Thomas

📅 September 23, 2015

🌐 fbgbible.org

📍 Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin Street

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

(830) 997-8834

Kirsten Powers, a professing Christian, weekly writer for USA Today and occasional contributor of Fox News asks, "Could there be a future where most American Christians support same-sex relationships? If so, it will be due to the emergence of conservative Christians who say orthodox believers can support life-long, monogamous gay relationships without undermining their commitment to biblical authority."¹ Powers statement is precisely why I took you through the Scriptures and showed that commitment to biblical authority and support of SSR are incompatible. The overarching theme of Scripture concerning God's design for marriage is that it is between one man and one woman. The six or seven passages most commonly brought into the discussion definitely connect to the issue of modern, committed, loving SSR. Careful analysis shows that God condemns SSR in any and every context. They also show that SS behavior can be modified if an individual believes in Christ and learns to depend upon the Holy Spirit. There are literally hundreds and thousands of testimonies available on the internet, in books and audio recordings that support this conclusion. Tonight we want to analyze the available evidence as it relates to biblical teaching.

Is Changing Sexual Orientation Possible?

Commonly the argument is made that one is born gay and there is nothing that can be done to change one's sexual orientation. This amounts to saying that sexual orientation is basically genetic, that there is either a single 'gay gene' or it is epigenetic, a result of varied gene expressions. That is to say that behavior is determined by genetics. What does the evidence say? The first study to make this claim was done by Kallman in 1952, one year before Watson and Crick discovered the helical structure of DNA by X-Ray crystallography and postulated that DNA and not protein was the genetic material. Kallman reported that among male twins sexual orientation showed a 100% concordance rate. In other words, if one twin was homosexually oriented the other twin was always homosexually oriented. This report, if true, would prove almost beyond any shadow of doubt that homosexual orientation was directly linked to genetic material. However, Kallman's research was skewed in that his subjects were all mentally ill and institutionalized men. His research, nevertheless, resulted in the beginning of twin studies.

In 1991 the first significant study was published in the scientific literature. This work was done by LeVay. LeVay reported subtle differences in size of the interstitial nuclei of the anterior hypothalamus between homosexual men and supposedly heterosexual men. If the size difference was due to genetics then a link between genetics and homosexual orientation would be confirmed. However, LeVay's research has been highly criticized in many respects. First, his method of measuring the size differences of various interstitial nuclei is not accepted by all scientists. Second, the size differences are averages only and did not always reflect the same differences when only individuals were considered. In other words, as an average, the group of men who were homosexual had smaller interstitial nuclei than heterosexuals but as individuals that was not always the case. Third, all but one of the homosexual subjects died of complications related to AIDS. AIDS reduces testosterone levels and so we would expect them to have smaller interstitial nuclei. In other words, the smaller size was possibly not due to genetics at all but decreased testosterone levels. Fourth, many scientists have argued that the smaller interstitial nuclei were the result of prior behavior, not the cause of the behavior. Breedlove, a researcher at the University of California at Berkeley, demonstrated that sexual behavior has an effect on the brain. Breedlove commented: "These findings give us proof for what we theoretically know to be the case—that sexual experience can alter the structure of the brain, just as genes can alter it.... [I]t is possible that differences in sexual behavior cause (rather than are caused by) differences in the brain" (as quoted in Byrd, et al., parenthetical item in orig.). These discoveries show that the smaller size of the interstitial nuclei could be the result of homosexual behavior rather than the cause for homosexual behavior. This is consistent with brain research that shows plasticity. In other words, it was once thought that because neurons cannot regenerate the brain then its connections were fixed. However, it was discovered that neurons can generate new processes and synapses and are therefore flexible. Behavior has been shown to be the cause of these types of changes in the brain. LeVay's research doesn't take into consideration these well-known findings in science. These findings are consistent with Romans 12:2 if Romans 12:2, "do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind," relates in any way to transformational changes in the brain. Finally, LeVay himself later admitted, "It's important to stress what I didn't find. I did not prove that homosexuality is genetic, or find a genetic cause for being gay. I didn't show that gay men are born that way, the most common mistake people make in interpreting my work. Nor did I locate a gay center in the brain" (as quoted in Byrd, et al., 2001, emp. added).

In the same year, 1991, Bailey and Pillard carried out another twin study similar to Kallman's from 1952. The hypothesis of this famous study was that if homosexuality is genetic then twin brothers would be more likely to have the same sex orientation than non-twin or non-biological brothers. They reported that 52% of identical twins were homosexual, 22% of non-identical twins were homosexual, 11% of adoptive brothers were homosexual and 9.2% of non-twin brothers were homosexual. They thus concluded that homosexual orientation was substantially genetic. Bailey and Pillard's conclusion is highly suspect for several reasons. First, if homosexual orientation was genetic then we would expect 100% of identical twins to be homosexual, not 52%. This is a statistically significant difference. Second, another similar study resulted in a percentage of only 10-25%

which is much lower than claimed 52%. Third, the subjects for the study were gathered through advertisements in homosexual publications rather than randomly. This method of finding subjects could give inflated percentages since twins who are both homosexual would be the most prominent readers of such literature. Fourth, others who read the report concluded that the results reflected that homosexuality was due to environmental factors and not genetic. Researchers Billings and Beckwith wrote, "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 (1993, p. 60)."

In 1993 Hamer claimed to link male homosexuality to a gene on the X chromosome. Hamer's group had studied family histories and concluded that gay men had many gay relatives through maternal lines. Thus they concluded that a gay gene may be transmitted through the mother alone since she always contributes an X chromosome. Hamer's group reported that out of 40 homosexual brothers 33 exhibited a matching DNA region called q28. The most significant and glaring deficiency in Hamer's study is that he did not check any heterosexual men within these families to see if they had a matching DNA region. Such a lack of control renders the data highly questionable. Second, Hamer gives no explanation for why 7 pairs of homosexual brothers did not have a matching DNA region. If a gene in this region was the cause of homosexuality then it must be found in all pairs of homosexual brothers. Third, Rice and his colleagues tried to replicate Hamer's study but the results were highly discrepant. They conclude, "Because our study was larger than that of Hamer et al., we certainly had adequate power to detect a genetic effect as large as was reported in that study. Nonetheless, our data do not support the presence of a gene of large effect influencing sexual orientation at position Xq28 (284:667)." Others such as Sanders in 1998 also were unable to replicate Hamer's results. Most have concluded that the linkage is so weak that it is not statistically important.

In 2003 the Human Genome Mapping Project was completed two years ahead of schedule. Miller and Harrub point out, "The one piece of information that never materialized from the Human Genome Project was the identification of the so-called "gay gene."² In 2015, after decades of research, "Eight major studies of identical twins in Australia, the U.S., and Scandinavia during the last two decades all arrive at the same conclusion: gays were not born that way."³ Whitehead notes, "At best genetics is a minor factor... Because they have identical DNA, it ought to be 100%." But the studies reveal something else. "If an identical twin has same-sex attraction the chances the co-twin has it are only about 11% for men and 14% for women."

In conclusion, many scientists have stated outright that homosexuality is not rooted in genetics. Evan S. Balaban, a neurobiologist at the Neurosciences Institute in San Diego, noted that "the search for the biological underpinnings of complex human traits has a sorry history of late. In recent years, researchers and the media have proclaimed the "discovery" of genes linked to alcoholism and mental illness as well as to homosexuality. None of the claims...has been confirmed" (as quoted in Horgan, 1995). Charles Mann agreed, stating: "Time and time again, scientists have claimed that particular genes or chromosomal regions are associated with behavioral

traits, only to withdraw their findings when they were not replicated" (1994, 264:1687)." "Geneticists, anthropologists, developmental psychologists, sociologists, endocrinologists, neuroscientists, medical researchers into gender, and twin study researchers are in broad agreement about the role of genetics in homosexuality. Genes don't make you do it. There is no genetic determinism, and genetic influence at most is minor."⁴

What Causes Homosexuality?

We move then to what is the actual cause. Researchers have something to say about this as well. Most argue that individual responses to situations are the leading cause in the development of homosexual attraction and behavior. One author writes, "Individualistic reactions to random factors are very important."⁵ Dr. Whitehead believes "same-sex attraction (SSA) is caused by "non-shared factors," things happening to one twin but not the other, or a personal response to an event by one of the twins and not the other. For example, one twin might have exposure to pornography or sexual abuse, but not the other. One twin may interpret and respond to their family or classroom environment differently than the other. "These individual and idiosyncratic responses to random events and to common environmental factors predominate."

Another writes, "There is no one cause. No single genetic, hormonal, social, or environmental factor is predominant. There are similar themes, e.g. childhood gender non-conformity, sexual abuse, peer and family dynamics, sexual history, but the mix varies with individuals, *making individual personal responses the single overriding factor*. Two children from the same family and social environment can interpret the same incidents very differently. So random reaction, if it structures itself into self-image, can become a significant contributor to homosexuality—as twin studies show." Still another writes, "Often, from early on, there is a felt inability to find acceptance in same-sex groups, often a defensive withdrawal from those groups warring with a longing to belong that can begin to intensify around some admired same-sex figure. After puberty that intense emotional focus gets confused with sexual feelings and activity, a response that, if the pattern continues for some years, can lead to self-identification as homosexual or lesbian and sometimes intentional adoption of a gay life-style." This is in agreement with what Paul taught in Romans 1, that homosexuality is a behavior that God gives someone over to, not something they are born with. No one is born gay. It is a result of choices made to certain stimuli.

Can Same Sex Orientation Change?

There are many evidences that it can change. First, Dr Robert Spitzer, chair of task force for third edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, otherwise known as the DSM-III, published a paper in 2001 in the prestigious *Archives of Sexual Behavior* titled, "Can Some Gay Men and Lesbians Change their Sexual Orientation?" He concluded that "there is evidence that change in sexual orientation following some form of

reparative therapy does occur in some gay men and lesbians."⁶ This conclusion, coming from such a well-recognized authority in psychology, caused outrage in the gay community. After years of coming under fire, "in a 2012 interview, Spitzer said he asked to retract the study, stating that he agreed with its critics: "In retrospect, I have to admit I think the critiques are largely correct," he said. "The findings can be considered evidence for what those who have undergone ex-gay therapy say about it, but nothing more." This seemed to satisfy the gay community who commended Dr Spitzer for rejecting his study. Second, shifting of sexual preference is common and even more common among adolescents. Dr Whitehead says, "Neutral academic surveys show there is substantial change. About half of the homosexual/bisexual population (in a non-therapeutic environment) moves towards heterosexuality over a lifetime. About 3% of the present heterosexual population once firmly believed themselves to be homosexual or bisexual." This percentage of the population is larger than the homosexual population. In other words, the present ex-gay community is larger than the gay community. This is striking evidence in favor of changing sexual orientation. The change among adolescents is even more pronounced. The study of Bearman and Brueckner "...found that from 16 to 17-years-old, if a person had a romantic attraction to the same sex, almost all had switched one year later." Even more remarkable, most of the changes occur without counseling or therapy. "These changes are not therapeutically induced, but happen 'naturally' in life, some very quickly..." and almost all are "towards exclusive heterosexuality."

Nevertheless, there are reparative therapies for those who desire them such as that developed by Joe Nicolosi. Nicolosi is a reparative therapist who started the Thomas Aquinas Psychological Clinic. He claims to help homosexuals "diminish unwanted same-sex attractions, while exploring...heterosexual potential." The website is full of interviews with men and women in the ex-gay community.⁷ Nicolosi has also published many peer-reviewed journal articles⁸ as well as books on reparative therapy and homosexuality.⁹ Though many consider him dangerous, the number of people who have changed to exclusive heterosexuality are greater than the current number of bisexual and homosexuals combined. Third, examples such as Rosaria Butterfield coming to faith in Christ can be multiplied for hours on end. What I'm going to show you now is a brief discussion between Rosaria and Janet Merkel regarding her conversion to Christianity out of a lesbian lifestyle.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gyvKmmQ1Jps>

Further, hundreds of thousands of testimonies are available on the internet. Whether these testimonies are credible or not is not verifiable. So while the idea that homosexuality is hard-wired into one's genetic is a common idea in popular culture, it is a misconception. Dr Whitehead says, "The academics who work in the field are not happy with the portrayals by the media on the subject...But they prefer to stick with their academic research and not get involved in the activist side." Perhaps they saw what happened to Dr Spitzer. Despite all this, "Homosexuality, as a genetic inevitability, has probably been gay activism's most effective PR initiative in the campaign for equal rights and special protections. Although it is no longer politically correct or fashionable in many circles to say that homosexuals can change, it is scientifically accurate to say so." And not only is it

scientifically accurate it is biblically accurate. Paul says in 1 Cor 6:11 to Corinthian believers who had been passive or active partners in a same sex relationship, “such were some of you, but you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.”

Homosexuality is not an engrained human trait, there is no gay gene, it is not something one has to do, it is usually the result of how one responds to the stimuli in his environment. The same is true for other behaviors such as alcoholism, schizophrenia, et. al.

What Are the Legal Issues?

However, because it is popular to conceive that homosexuality is due to genetic causes homosexual rights have been linked to the civil rights movement. “The fight for the acceptance of homosexuality often is compared to “civil rights” movements of racial minorities. Due to America’s failure to settle fully the civil rights issue (i.e., full and equal citizenship of racial minorities), social liberals, feminists, and homosexual activists were provided with the perfect “coat tail” to ride to advance their agenda. Using this camouflage of innate civil liberties, homosexual activists were able to divert attention away from the behavior, and focus it on the “rights.””¹⁰ The entire issue is built on a false premise. Yet even the majority opinion of our Supreme Court in *Obergefell vs Hodges* propagates the false idea that the gay nature is immutable. They state, “Far from seeking to devalue marriage, the petitioners seek it for themselves because of their respect—and need—for its privileges and responsibilities. And their *immutable nature* dictates that same-sex marriage is their only real path to this profound commitment.”¹¹ This is strange considering the fact that if it were an immutable nature then genetically speaking the genes existence would have worked its way out of existence long ago. They cite the many changes in marriage over the course of American history and cite how the American Psychiatry DSM of 1952 categorized homosexuality as an illness until its revision in 1973 and state, “Only in more recent years have psychiatrists and others recognized that sexual orientation is both a normal expression of human sexuality and immutable.” Again, if it is immutable then why does it exist? We can imagine that some would go contrary to nature but even then the other partner is not gay and so why are we producing more gay people? This is nothing more than making it up.

The consequences of changing the definition of marriage from one man and one women to two people are many. First, marriage is a divine institution such that when changed results in catastrophic results for society. Yet remarkably, Scalia, as prized as he is by conservatives, in his dissent opined that marriage is no more than a social convention that matters no more than many other issues. He writes, “The substance of today’s decree is not of immense personal importance to me. The law can recognize as marriage whatever sexual attachments and living arrangements it wishes, and can accord them favorable civil consequences, from tax treatment to rights of inheritance. Those civil consequences—and the public approval that conferring the name of marriage evidences—can perhaps have adverse social effects, but no more adverse than the effects of many other controversial laws. So it is not of special importance to me what the law says about marriage.”¹² Scalia himself

does not recognize the structure of marriage as having any special relationship to society. For him it is a mere social convention and the change will have a few adverse effects but nothing we won't work through. This shows a lack of understanding of what is truly immutable, God's design of male and female to complement one another and the resulting divine institution of family. With this kind of lackluster approach to the concept of marriage we are in for a lot of trouble down the road.

Second, as implied, a change in the definition of marriage necessarily results in a change in the definition of family. Look at this strange passage in the majority opinion. "In the late 20th century, following substantial cultural and political developments, same-sex couples began to lead more open and public lives and to establish families."¹³ What this means is that the child is not related biologically to at least one of the parents. Who then draws the line as to who can be a parent and who cannot? Can eight people be parent to one child? Such scenarios are already in the news. The consequences of this for children has already been shown to be devastating. The testimony of Dawn Stefanowicz may rarely come out in the open but its existence is not rare. Dawn Stefanowicz says, "From infancy, I was unwittingly identified under the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transsexual (GLBT) umbrella. During the first 30 years of my life, I garnered many personal, social and professional experiences with my father, whom I always loved, and his partners...I was exposed to a lot of expressed sexuality in the home and subcultures. I experienced uncountable losses. Gender was supposed to be boundless; yet, I did not see my father and his partners valuing, loving and affirming women. My father's preference for one gender (male) created an inner sense of inequality for me...As a dependent child and teen, I was not allowed to say anything that would hurt the feelings of the adults around me. If I did, I could face ostracism or worse...Due to media silencing, political correctness, GLBT lobbying efforts and loss of freedom of speech, it is very hard to tell my story...But I am not alone. Over 50 adult children from alternative households, plus ex-spouses with children, and parents who have left the "gay" lifestyle have contacted me. Very few children will share their stories publicly...For many of us adult children of gay parents, we have come to the conclusion that same-sex marriage is more about promoting adults' " "desires" than about safeguarding children's rights to know and be raised by their biological parents." This can do nothing but damage children. But who cares, as long as we have our desires as adults satisfied.

Where is this going? The results in Canada pave the way for understanding the results that are coming in America and indeed are already here. Stefanowicz says, "Statements like this are lies: "Permitting same-sex couples (now also throuples) access to the designation of marriage will not deprive anyone of any rights." She explains, "In Canada, freedom to assemble and speak freely about man-woman marriage, family and sexuality are restricted." It has restricted freedom. She notes, "When same-sex marriage passed in Canada in July 2005, parenting was immediately redefined, removing parentage from its biological origins. Canada's gay marriage law, Bill C-38, included a provision to erase the term "natural parent" and replace it across the board with gender-neutral "legal parent" in federal law. Now, all children have "legal parents," as defined by the state, which means parental rights have been usurped by the government."

"In effect, same-sex marriage permits state powers to override the autonomy of biological parents. Necessary parental rights to teach children your beliefs, express your opinions, and practice your personal faith are infringed upon by the state when your beliefs, opinions and or faith practices are in opposition to what is taught and promoted at school. In fact, in Ontario, Canada, the Human Rights Commission regulations permeate and surround all public education.

For example, if you teach your children that same-sex sexual relationships are wrong and that every child has a father and a mother, and that only man-woman sex in marriage is allowed, you run the risk of thought police questioning your beliefs, especially if your children discuss these subjects in the classroom."

"Additionally, since the undefined term "sexual orientation" was added as a protected category under Canada's hate crime law in 2004 and same-sex marriage became legalized in 2005, guaranteed fundamental freedoms of the Canadian Constitution have been reinterpreted, eroded and/or nullified by activist courts and quasi-courts with no real juries, also known as the Human Rights Commission. The federal Human Rights Commission (HRC) has had a three-decade 100 percent conviction rate for hate speech. Human Rights Tribunals/Commissions in Canada police speech, and penalize upstanding citizens for their speech and expressions in opposition to particular sexual behaviors. It takes only one complaint against a person to be brought before the tribunal, costing the defendant tens of thousands of dollars in legal fees. The Commissions have the power to enter private residences and remove all items pertinent to their investigations, checking for hate speech."

"In reality, these freedoms have been restricted. Businesses must provide goods and services to all customers, without regard to business owners' conscience rights. Employers' hiring practices cannot discriminate, even if a potential employee's sexual practices and relationships are frowned upon." This is not coming to America, it is already here. We have the case of Barronelle Stutzman, owner of Arlene's Flowers, who had a consumer protection lawsuit filed against her for illegally discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation. This lawsuit is still in the system but shows that it is already here. We have the case of Jon and Elaine Huguenin and their Photography business. We have the Houston Pastors case and the ongoing problems in Houston due to the homosexual mayor. We have Donald and Evelyn Knapp and their Hitching Post Wedding Chapel refusing use of their facility by homosexuals. These are all just normal everyday American people who are losing their freedoms every day and paying a heavy cost.

What about consequences for our church, gathering and teaching the word? Hate crimes legislation is coming. In Canada "Activists often sit in on religious assemblies, listening for anything discriminatory towards GLBT, so a complaint can be made to the Human Rights Commission. Most faith communities have become politically correct to avoid fines and loss of charitable status." I know this firsthand since my brother and his wife and a good friend and his wife lived in Canada for many years in the ministry. They both report to me that the pastors are silent when it comes to issues related to the LBGTQ+ community and that they will not address homosexual

texts. The pastors have capitulated. Hate crimes legislation will eventually put a muzzle on churches here too or the churches that speak out will go out of business here as the march goes on to create a new nation...

But it's really nothing more than what happened to Sodom and Gomorrah which was reduced to moral chaos and came to an end as a society, it's really nothing more than what happened to Rome when it was overrun with sexual license and run over by the Visigoths, it's really nothing more than what Paul explained in Romans 1, that God is giving people over to their lusts to the point that wrong is declared right and as such is storing up wrath. What has happened before is happening again and as a nation we should expect the same. As Christians we are to keep our focus on heavenly things and not earthly things, we are to store up treasures for ourselves in heaven and not on earth, we are to keep our eyes focused on the blessed hope of Jesus Christ which purifies us. We are to seek and pray for God's kingdom to come on earth as it is in heaven. We are to continually remember what Christ has done by His blood of the new covenant. We are to know in whom we have believed and that He is able to keep that which has been entrusted to Him until that day. We are to persevere through our obstacles and show ourselves loyal to Jesus Christ in whom are found all the riches of wisdom and knowledge. We are to walk by the Spirit so as not to fulfill the lusts of the flesh. We are to be kind to all, able to instruct, patient when wronged, and with gentleness correct those in opposition. We are to continually be transformed by the renewing of our mind in accordance with truth. Therein lies true freedom. As Jesus said, "If you continue in My word, then you are truly disciples of Mine; and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free." (John 8:32)

¹ <http://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2014/06/03/christianity-catholic-church-gay-homosexuals-column/9926489/>

² Dave Miller, Ph.D. and Brad Harrub, Ph.D., "This is the Way God Made Me"--A Scientific Examination of Homosexuality and the "Gay Gene".

³ <http://wdtprs.com/blog/2015/03/8-major-studies-of-identical-twins-prove-homosexuality-is-not-genetic/>

⁴ <http://www.mygenes.co.nz/summary.htm>

⁵ <http://www.mygenes.co.nz/summary.htm>

⁶ Robert L. Spitzer, M.D. "Can Some Gay Men and Lesbians Change Their Sexual Orientation? 200 Participants Reporting a Change from Homosexual to Heterosexual Orientation," *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, Vol. 32, No, 5, October 2003, p. 403.

⁷ <http://www.josephnicolosi.com/interviews-2/>

⁸ <http://www.josephnicolosi.com/published-papers/>

⁹ <http://www.josephnicolosi.com/books/>

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/14pdf/14-556_3204.pdf Majority opinion, p 4.

¹² http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/14pdf/14-556_3204.pdf Scalia dissent p 2.

¹³ http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/14pdf/14-556_3204.pdf Majority opinion, p 8.