

Does Evolution Really Support Homosexuality? (Part 1)

The “lifestyle left” has waged a war against the unborn, the institution of marriage, freedom of conscience and the standards of civilization and tradition. With the talk of politicians “evolving” to support same-sex “marriage,” it is now waging a war against science and language as well.

In a testy exchange with NPR’s Terry Grossu last week, Hillary Clinton said that she now supports gay “marriage,” because she and her fellow Americans had “evolved” on the issue.

The use of that word, “evolved” in the public debate of homosexuality has become ubiquitous. President Obama started the trend in by hinting that his views on marriage redefinition might “evolve” just before the 2010 elections. Since then numerous public figures including Alaska Republican Senator Lisa Murkowski, South Dakota Democratic Senator Tim Johnson, and former Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge have said they have “evolved.” Secular progressives seem to use that syntax as a subtle form of self-congratulation, designed to contrast themselves with Christians hesitant to redefine an institution that predates written history.

The left loves to see itself as the party of science and rationality, clinging to the definitive advice of experts. But what if we examine their views by their own standard? Liberal progressives say they believe in evolution, but what would an evolutionary scientist say about promoting gay “marriage”?

The entire purpose of evolution is to assure reproduction, the survival of one’s genes, through natural selection. Evolution, the survival of the fittest, teaches that those who engage in maladaptive behaviors will eventually cease reproducing and be replaced by those whose genes or traits are better suited to

thrive in the current environment.

A handy reference on evolution produced by PBS states:

In the process of natural selection, individuals in a population who are well-adapted to a particular set of environmental conditions have an advantage over those who are not so well adapted. The advantage comes in the form of survival and reproductive success. For example, those individuals who are better able to find and use a food resource will, on average, live longer and produce more offspring than those who are less successful at finding food. Inherited traits that increase individuals' fitness are then passed to their offspring, thus giving the offspring the same advantages.

Let's face a stark yet unspeakable fact: Homosexuals do not reproduce—not because of happenstance nor infirmity, but by the design of nature. Judging it strictly by secular and scientific criteria, homosexuality is the definition of a maladaptive behavior. For a society to sanction or enshrine it is not only scientifically unwise but, from an evolutionary standpoint, devolutionary to the point of being suicidal.

Some may object that homosexuals *can* reproduce, with the use of *in vitro fertilization* and/or a surrogate mother. In fact, the state of California passed a law last year forcing many insurance companies to cover fertility treatments for gay couples. But the ability to reproduce without recourse to slow and invasive technology that costs an average of \$12,400 per cycle and fails 75 percent of the time might be considered no small reproductive advantage in the course of natural selection.

Scientists recognize the problem that evolution poses to their support of homosexual behavior and have labored mightily to construct a plausible excuse to endorse the lifestyle. Yet they have failed.

In 2010, Paul Vasey and Doug VanderLaan of the University of Lethbridge, Canada, explored the role homosexuals play in Samoan culture, which embraces homosexuality more readily than most. They speculated that since gay men, known as *fa'afafine*, channel their resources into helping their nieces and nephews, they may offer an evolutionary benefit.

But they floundered upon the facts. In order to make up for not having children, each Samoan homosexual would have to assure the survival of two nieces or nephews who otherwise would have died without their assistance. The data simply was not there.

"If kin selection is the sole mechanism by which genes for male same-sex sexual attraction are maintained over time," Vasey said, it would require the *fa'afafine* to be "super uncles." He admits that their familial generosity is "unlikely" to "offset the costs of not reproducing."

So, homosexuality reduces the likelihood of passing on one's genes to the next generation. But how are homosexuals adapted to the environment during their lives? Unfortunately, according to multiple measures homosexuals do not fare as well as heterosexuals.

To begin with, their lives are far shorter than their straight counterparts. Two studies have found that homosexuals have the same life expectancy as someone born in 1871, dying an average of 8-21 years younger than heterosexuals. They are 44-times more likely to have AIDS, and they have elevated rates of other sexually transmitted diseases. Studies have found they are between 50 and 200 percent more likely to seek treatment for mental health or substance abuse. Gay teens are five times more likely to attempt suicide.

Critics assumed these mournful statistics are due to "homophobia." But Dr. Delaney Skerrett of Australia found the leading cause of homosexual suicides is their homosexual

relationship itself. "LGBT individuals experienced relationship problems more often" than heterosexuals, he said. A 2007 study in the *Journal of Urban Health*, published by the New York Academy of Medicine, found that 32 percent of homosexuals have been abused by at least one partner during their lifetime.

As a consequence, gay relationships do not last as long as heterosexual relationships. Less than one-fourth as many homosexuals stayed together 12 years compared with married couples.

Children raised in such homes fare more poorly than those raised by heterosexual couples or, in some cases, by only one parent. Children of gays and lesbians were more than four times as likely to report having been raped and up to 12 times as likely to have been sexually touched by a family member than those from intact heterosexual households. Dr. Douglas Allen of Simon Fraser University found that children raised by homosexuals were 15 percent less likely to succeed in school than those raised by cohabiting heterosexual parents—and 23 percent less likely than those raised by *single parents*. Perhaps this is why British actor Rupert Everett quipped, "I can't think of anything worse than being brought up by two gay dads." (See also this personal account.)

Some may say that by granting gay "marriages," society could reduce the harm by discouraging promiscuity. But many homosexuals even admit their marriages are not designed to be monogamous. Some LGBT activists have been remarkably forthright that they are pursuing a new legal status in order to become eligible for social welfare benefits such as Social Security survivor's benefits.

In what sense is forcing a society that is already bankrupt to spend significant funds promoting a lifestyle that results in higher depression, suicide and STD rates, increases childhood sexual abuse, lowers children's educational attainment and is

incapable of producing children “evolved”? Social liberals can support evidence-based science or they can support homosexuality, but they cannot support both.

As with abortion, liberals are waging a war on science in claiming support for homosexual acts is “evolution.” Don’t let them get away with it.

Someone suggested to me that if traditionalists would just accept gay marriage, the culture wars would end, because within a generation, all homosexuals would marry and die off. This prescription assumes homosexuality is entirely genetic, ignoring numerous potential contributing factors.

But my interlocutor did not realize that we oppose same-sex “marriage” precisely because we do *not* want homosexuals to die. Here is where the Christian takes a different view than the secularist. We believe every life has value and is worthy of unconditional love. That love comes with the requirement to show concern when that person is going into a dangerous or destructive path, even if those pitfalls lie along a path that supposedly leads to “love.”

Loving and caring for our neighbors. Isn’t that more “evolved”?

Ben Johnson is U.S. bureau chief of . The author of three books, he was managing editor of FrontPage Magazine from 2003-10. He is also a regular guest on the AFR Talk network’s [Nothing But Truth with Crane Durham](#).