

## Born Gay? There Is No Scientific Proof

Our Prime Minister's remarks ("Govt more open to employing gays now"; ST, July 4) and the commentary by *The Straits Times* ("About gay tolerance"; ST, July 5) have opened honest discussions on issues relating to homosexual orientation. Before we engage in further discussion, it will be helpful to examine a fundamental assumption about the homosexual condition proposed in Singapore and accepted to various degrees in other parts of the world.

*The Straits Times* rightly pointed out that the science on whether homosexuality is genetically determined is not settled yet. Gay activists want us to believe that homosexual orientation is inborn, thus they have no choice but to be gay. However, if one looks carefully at the cited scientific studies, one would find that they support quite the opposite conclusion.

The study of homosexual identical twins by J M Bailey and J C Pillard (A genetic study of male sexual orientation. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* 48(1991), 1089-1096) is one example. Since identical twins have identical genes, we can expect that when one of them is homosexual, the other will necessarily be one too if homosexuality is truly genetically controlled; the correlation should be or near 100%. However, what the researchers found was that when one identical twin was gay, the other twin was gay in only 52% of cases, which is far from the expected 100%. This study shows that genes alone do not determine homosexual attractions. Ironically, this study has been cited to support the idea of a gay gene when it really doesn't.

In a larger and more recent study by J M Bailey *et al* (Genetic and Environmental influences on sexual orientation and its correlates in an Australian twin sample. *J. Pers. Social Psychology* 78 (2000), 524-536), of the more than 14,000 twins studied, it was found that if one twin was homosexual, 38% of the time his identical brother was too. For lesbianism the concordance was 30%. This study reveals that environmental factors have a much bigger role in the determination of sexual attraction.

The other scientific study often quoted by gay activists is that of Simon LeVay, "A Difference in Hypothalamic Structure Between Heterosexual and Homosexual Men," *Science* 253 (1991), pp. 1034-37. Neuroanatomist LeVay reported his findings that a localized cluster of cells in the brains of some heterosexual men was larger by volume (upon autopsy) than in some

homosexual men. Therefore, he postulated homosexuality to be inborn. This argument is exaggerated and misleading for many reasons:

Firstly, his small sample of 19 “homosexual” subjects were all male cadavers who had died of AIDS. There is scientific findings about behaviour leading to changes in brain structure. Therefore, it is possible that the diminished size of the homosexual’s brain structure is caused by his behaviour, rather than his behaviour being caused by his brain structure. Additionally, the AIDS disease may have caused the difference. This was never explored.

Secondly, not all of the heterosexuals’ brain structure was larger. Three of them were smaller when compared to the homosexual subjects’. Additionally, three of the homosexual subjects had larger brain segments than the average heterosexual subject.

Thirdly, Dr LeVay was not certain which of his subjects were truly homosexual and which were not. He admits that this represents a “distinct shortcoming” in his study.

Gay activists have presented scientific data selectively by citing only those that do not dash their hopes of finding a biological cause. They keep out of public knowledge the scientific results which contradict the idea that people are born gay, thereby misleading the public. Their claims have gone largely unchallenged because politicians, scientists and even medical professionals are reluctant to be labeled conservative, right wing bigots by the immensely powerful militant gay activists in the West. Dr Robert L Spitzer is an American professor of psychiatry who is now paying the price for publicly suggesting that any change in homosexual orientation is possible. He was initially hailed as a hero by gay activists for spearheading the removal of homosexuality as a psychiatric disorder in 1973. However, when he found that a group of homosexuals could change their sexual orientation and announced his findings at the annual meeting of the American Psychiatric Association in 2001, he immediately became the public enemy of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force in America. Prominent psychologists, psychiatrists and gay activists promptly lobbied for his removal from the Columbia University where he works.

Tolerance for diversity is necessary, however, genuine tolerance must encompass the freedom to discuss whether homosexuality is good and right. This freedom must be available to all. Otherwise, we will be ruled by the



tyranny of the minority, compelling us to accept what is now being championed to be a fact.

In our work, we know that the homosexual condition is changeable. The cause for homosexuality is developmental in nature (eg. inadequate same-sex parenting, weak model for gender identification, sexual abuse and experimentation etc.) Just as paedophiles do not have a master gene that makes them sexually attracted to children, homosexuals are also not genetically programmed to have same-sex attractions.

Comprehensive research information about homosexuality can be found at [www.narth.com](http://www.narth.com).