

## The latest in scientific research: There is no gay gene

Bryan Fischer - Guest Columnist

<http://www.onenewsnow.com/perspectives/bryan-fischer/2014/06/17/the-latest-in-scientific-research-there-is-no-gay-gene>

**If homosexuality is biologically determined, then the rest of us don't have much choice but to accept it as a sad and unfortunate reality. But if homosexual conduct is ultimately a matter of choice, then the homosexual lobby has nothing.**

Even the rabid left-wing *Guardian* newspaper in the UK is retreating like the outgoing tide from the lie that homosexuals are born that way.

One of the reasons that homosexual activists bludgeon people into accepting biological determinism with regard to homosexuality is that they must have it. If homosexuality is not in fact genetically caused, they have nothing. Their entire argument, their entire movement, is predicated on the utterly false premise that gayness is the genetic equivalent of race. The foundation on which they stand is their claim that just as no one can do a thing about skin color, so no one can do a thing about sexual orientation.

Without a genetic causation, sexual preference in behavior is clearly a choice, a choice which no one is compelled to make. And that choice can be evaluated in any number of ways, including whether or not it is good for human health and whether or not same-sex households are sub-optimal nurturing environments for vulnerable young children.

If homosexuality is biologically determined, then the rest of us don't have much choice but to accept it as a sad and unfortunate reality. But if homosexual conduct is ultimately a matter of choice, then the homosexual lobby has nothing, because homosexual conduct is clearly harmful to human beings in any number of ways, not the least of which is serving as the leading cause of HIV/AIDS, which can leave young men disease-ridden and destined for an early grave.

We don't want that future for anyone. We believe that every human being is made in the image of God, is of infinite worth, and is a free moral agent capable of making life-affirming decisions and refusing life-destroying ones. This is true with regard to sexual behavior, drug and alcohol use, and interpersonal relationships.

Along comes the *Guardian* with [its piece](#) that blows the entire foundation of the gay "rights" movement completely out of the tub.

Note just the first three paragraphs and the fifth (emphasis mine throughout):

"A study of gay men in the US has found fresh evidence that male sexual orientation is **influenced** by genes. Scientists tested the DNA of 400 gay men and found that genes on at least two chromosomes **affected** whether a man was gay or straight.

"A region of the X chromosome called Xq28 had **some impact** on men's sexual behaviour – though scientists have **no idea which of the many genes in the region are involved**, nor how many lie elsewhere in the genome.

"Another stretch of DNA on chromosome 8 also **played a role** in male sexual orientation – though again the precise mechanism is unclear...

"Michael Bailey, a psychologist at Northwestern University in Illinois, set out the findings at a discussion event held in conjunction with the annual meeting of

the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Chicago on Thursday. 'The study shows that there are genes **involved** in male sexual orientation,' he said."

The *Guardian* is hoping readers won't notice how deliberately and intentionally the paper has purposely avoided any word that might even suggest biological causation.

"Influenced by, affected, some impact, played a role, involved." Not exactly a rousing case for the "born that way" crowd.

It even gets worse from there:

"The gene or genes in the Xq28 region that influence sexual orientation have a **limited and variable impact**. Not all of the gay men in Bailey's study inherited the same Xq28 region. **The genes were neither sufficient, nor necessary, to make any of the men gay.**"

I'm not sure it gets any clearer and less ambiguous than that: "**The genes were neither sufficient, nor necessary, to make any of the men gay.**"

One problem all along for gay activists is that even a cursory survey of sexual orientation among identical twins makes the "born that way" meme impossible to accept.

Identical twins have identical DNA, which is why they are called identical twins. If one has blue eyes, so will the other. If one has black hair, so will the other. If one is tall, so is the other.

If sexual orientation is genetically determined, then the concordance rate among identical twins should be 100%. If one twin is gay, so should be the other. Alas, the concordance rate, according to researchers Peter Bearman from Columbia and Hannah Bruckner from Yale, is somewhere between 5% and 7%. Oops.

The *Guardian* swallows hard, but notes this fact:

"The flawed thinking behind a genetic test for sexual orientation is clear from studies of twins, which show that **the identical twin** of a gay man, who carries an exact replica of his brother's DNA, **is more likely to be straight than gay**. That means even a perfect genetic test that picked up every gene linked to sexual orientation would still be less effective than **flipping a coin.**"

In other words, the genetic evidence for biological causation is so poor you'd have better luck predicting orientation by throwing darts blindfolded.

Bailey adds, "We found evidence for two sets [of genes] that affect whether a man is gay or straight. But it is **not completely determinative**; there are certainly other **environmental factors** involved."

We have often argued that environment has by far the largest impact on a young child's sense of sexual identity. The nature of a young boy's relationship with his father and with his mother can play an outsized role. Same-sex abuse at an early age can leave a lasting imprint on a boy's sense of his sexual identity.

One of Bailey's colleagues, Alan Sanders chimes in this way: "When people say there's a gay gene, it's an oversimplification. There's more than one gene, and genetics is not the whole story."

Bearman and Bruckner put it this way: "[O]ur results support the hypothesis that less gendered socialization in early childhood and preadolescence shapes subsequent same-sex romantic preferences."

Another way to put it is that Rick Perry was exactly right, when he said this in San Francisco:

"Whether or not you feel compelled to follow a particular lifestyle or not, you have the ability to decide not to do that. I may have the genetic coding that I'm inclined to be an alcoholic, but I have the desire not to do that, and I look at the homosexual issue the same way."

It looks like Gov. Perry is the progressive one here, articulating a view that is much more in line with the latest biological and scientific thinking than our friends in the gay lobby. I am not persuaded that genes are even a contributing factor – but even if they are, the great news is that if individuals are not biologically predetermined to pursue the homosexual lifestyle, then change is possible as a matter of scientific fact. This leads to one simple, salient truth: there is hope for the homosexual.

---

*Bryan Fischer is director of issues analysis for the American Family Association. He hosts "Focal Point with Bryan Fischer" every weekday on AFR Talk from 1:00 - 3:00 p.m. (Central).*

- See more at: <http://www.onenewsnow.com/perspectives/bryan-fischer/2014/06/17/the-latest-in-scientific-research-there-is-no-gay-gene#sthash.1edQ1Y58.dpuf>