

Evolution and Homosexuality

Robin Calamaio - Copyright 1999 (Edit 2020)
freelygive-n.com

Introduction

The emotions are high, the battles are intense, and the war is growing all across America. We are witnessing an unprecedented push by the homosexual community for recognition and position in society. The cries for legal protection and non-censorship arise on all sides. Homosexual activists are working for governmental rulings that recognize homosexuals as a minority group with full civil rights protection (As of 2020 edit, a lot has changed in this respect). In this struggle for political and social power, the evolutionist must become involved. That is the issue now addressed. The primary goal is this: the common sense application of established evolutionary principles toward the subject of homosexuality. This is long overdue. While convinced that the central positions forwarded are consistent with the basic tenants of evolutionary theory, the material presented *should only be the beginning* of true scientific assessment of the homosexual phenomenon. This work is not intended to be filled with statistics or questionable research results from the soft “*sciences*” of sociology, psychology, political “*science*” etc. Science is a word that should be reserved for the hard sciences of chemistry, biology, genetics, physics, etc. Relevant research and statistical studies from the hard sciences may indeed become a part of this work, but as endnotes so as to avoid bogging down the flow of the discussion. But, before proceeding, it is important to define some of the terms used in this article.

Homosexual: Males and females who practice sexual relations with those of the same gender.

Heterosexual: Males and females who practice sexual relations with the opposite gender.

Homo sapiens: The scientific species name for man.

Evolution: The scientific theory that maintains all current life forms evolved from previous life forms. By means of profitable adaptations over, perhaps, a billion years, we now see the earth’s current species. Those who derisively reject Evolution because it teaches man came from apes, demonstrate their ignorance of evolutionary theory. Evolutionists do not teach man came from apes. Evolutionists teach that man and ape came from a *common* ancestor. One “*branch*” in evolutionary development led to present day ape and another to present day man. Some hold to a “*ladder theory*” while others promote a “*bush theory*.” The ladder theory asserts man and ape have a *recent* common ancestor - the famous “*missing link*.” The bush theory asserts the common ancestor could have occurred at any point. The common ancestor could even be as far back as some simple celled creature. Therefore, there is no search for a missing link. We will explore how this might relate to the homosexual phenomenon later.

Variant: For the purposes of this treatise, a variant is an observable change in a creature that makes it deviate substantially from the norm for that species. But, if the source of that change is not yet clear (i.e., an actual physical change - like a gene change that could be passed to future generations) it will be referred to as a variant.

Mutation: When a creature develops a *physical* change not possessed by its parents, this is a mutation. The creature is a mutant. These are scientifically neutral words. Each mutation must be scientifically analyzed before determining if it is a positive or negative mutation, thus producing a positive or negative mutant.

Structure of This Treatise

When examining the viability of any living thing, the evolutionist begins immediate investigation in two primary areas - the creature’s ability to survive and its ability to reproduce. These

Evolutionary Foundations will be discussed in the first part of this treatise. With this backdrop, homosexuality, and the homosexual, will then be assessed from an evolutionary standpoint in three basic areas. These include 1) **The Homosexual Physically**, 2) **The Homosexual Emotionally**, and 3) **The Homosexual Mentally**. This will be followed by **Challenges to the Evolutionist Community**. Several **Other Considerations** will then be forwarded before a **Conclusion**. Two appendices offer some further considerations.

An Appeal to The Reader

Evolutionary science is *in a state of evolution itself*. Many concepts, and terms, are not universally agreed upon by evolutionists. For example, some say a true mutant is one that gives rise to offspring like itself *with* the inherited mutation change. But what if a creature develops a change that does not get passed on? Or what do you call *behavioral changes* that may have no physiological base? (I have used the term “*variant*”). As another example, evolutionists vary in their opinions about man’s mental and emotional evolution - its development and direction. But my appeal is this - if you find a premise with which you disagree, please *do not miss the main points* of this treatise. Weigh the importance of your contention against the whole.

The article you are about to read is written from an atheistic, evolutionary viewpoint. It should be read as such, thought of as such, and responded to as such. The word order of the title itself is deliberate – it is written to all evolutionists without any concern for that evolutionist's sexual preferences or activities. This article is directed at, and is a challenge to, evolutionists. Reactions to, or responses to, *the issues* raised are to be directed at the theory's scientific assertions itself. Any other responses are irrelevant to this discussion.

The Evolutionary Foundations

From the evolutionary standpoint, the two most important physical functions of any creature are its ability *to survive* and its ability *to reproduce*. If one does not survive, his/her traits *cannot* be passed on, and if one does not reproduce, his/her traits *are not* passed on. The successful creatures of evolution, and the only successful ones, are those who survive and reproduce. Evolution rests on these two foundations.

Survival. It has been said, “*only the strong survive.*” But evolution sees survival from a different angle. Evolutionists opt for “*survival of the fittest.*” There is an important distinction between “*strongest*” and “*fittest.*” A proper understanding of this distinction is critical when seeking to determine if a variant (or mutation) is positive or negative. Evolution maintains that a change which makes a creature *more fit* to some niche in the environment is *a positive mutation*. Evolution is dependent upon myriads of these profitable adaptations being developed and passed on. But, it does not always follow that the new creature with the profitable adaptation *is stronger* than its predecessors or contemporaries. It *might be* stronger, but this is an incidental consideration. The real question is, “*Does this mutation make this species more fit to survive?*” This concept is a bedrock to evolutionary theory.

When man entered an age of reason and invention, a serious danger entered man’s *natural* evolutionary progress - the inventing of *unnatural means* to kill those of the same species. Now the one *most fit naturally* may not be the survivor. This has seriously, perhaps fatally, interrupted the millions of years of man’s natural evolution. To illustrate, consider this. A healthy, strong, attractive male can now fall dead before an obese, rabid, three hundred-pound moron with a 44 magnum, who goes on to rape and impregnate that fallen one's mate. Evolutionarily speaking, the wrong man survives and reproduces. The development of *artificial* survival means has only appeared in one species (ours) and

is a very late development. The intense seriousness this indiscriminate cleaver brings is even more alarming when one considers how many unnatural death instruments now exist. This unnatural intrusion in the millions of years of “*right survivors*” has surely hampered our species progress. In fact, the variant who initially developed the capacity to reason, create, and invent, may have introduced a lethal mutation to our species - hurling us to extinction. Time will tell. Interestingly, those societies with the highest level of this variant quality (reason, create, and invent) are also the societies that have developed weapons capable of extinguishing everything on the planet.

So, what does this have to do with the homosexual? In light of the above material, the true evolutionist must identify, promote, and protect *positive* variations and mutations in our species. Conversely, *negative* variations and mutations must be exposed as such. I do not believe the homosexual phenomenon has not been scrutinized objectively and scientifically from an evolutionary point of view. This is an inexcusable failing by the evolutionary community.

Reproductivity. This is the other bedrock of evolutionary theory. It is not enough for a creature to develop some positive variant, or mutation, making it more fit to survive. It must pass on the adaptation. Reproduction is *the vehicle* through which a positive change is transferred.

Against this backdrop, let us now assess the homosexual; physically, emotionally, and mentally.

The Homosexual Physically

An initial examination of the homosexual does not expose any readily apparent mutation(s). All reproductive organs in both males and females are present and in working order. While some mannerisms may differ from their heterosexual counterparts, such changes are not at all universal and may simply be individual behavioral expressions and not physiological in nature. So, a cursory look at the body of the homosexual reveals no immediately observable physical mutation(s).

The Homosexual Emotionally

In this section, “*emotions*” will be limited to those linked with sexual activity. But before examining the homosexual in this area, it will be of profit to comment briefly on sexual “*emotions*” in the animal kingdom. Even cursory animal behavioral studies witness strong “*emotions*” centered around sexual activity. Males, in many species, fight competing males to the death in order to gain sexual rights to a female. Other species engage in extravagant struttings and seducings as a prelude to sexual relations. In many of the more complex species, social needs are met by the presence of a mate. In our species, homosexuals have these latter emotional expressions, but they are directed toward members of the same sex. Just as heterosexuals go to great lengths to arouse and bait their target, so also homosexuals do among themselves. They even fight, sometimes to the death, over a prized “*mate*.” As to social needs, homosexuals have developed intricate networks among themselves for all kinds of interaction - both business and pleasure associations. From an evolutionary standpoint, this change is alarming. It results in *no offspring*.

In an attempt to grasp the gravity of the situation, picture a homosexual standing in front of you. *That creature* is the product of millions and millions of phenomenal mutations with a probable billion-year history. It began as some simple living structure and has evolved to this tremendously complex creature. But that same creature now stands *at the end* of that particular evolutionary lifeline. Homosexuality ends it - *forever!* Furthermore, no other creature in that billion year life-line ever developed homosexuality. If it had, the individual before you would have never come into existence. This is a terrifying development - and should be sounding tremendous alarms in every evolutionist.

Homosexuals often accuse heterosexuals of being homophobic. It is possible this is correct, but for this reason. As homosexuality is a lethal change to a creature's evolutionary line, heterosexuals may be reacting with an *instinctive* fear. They may instinctively realize that if every individual developed this trait simultaneously, the entire species would disappear in *one generation!* Evolutionarily speaking, one cannot think of a more hostile change in any species. The evolutionist must declare this, and shudder at the realization that *one change* could destroy an entire species virtually overnight.

Maybe this is the place to address the concept of a "*hate crime*." This is often alleged when a heterosexual confronts homosexuality - even verbally. To begin, the entire concept of "*crime*" is a humanistic imposition on nature. It is a metaphysical concept (beyond physical). What reigning lion is a "*murderer*"? What ruling rooster is a "*whoremonger*"? What hyena, who steals a cheetah's kill, is *criminalized* as a "*thief*"? These are evolutionary victors and science recognizes this fact. So, why does man criminalize himself? In our evolution, "*morals*" are a very late metaphysical development. It is questionable if they have any place in the study and understanding of natural evolution at all. Furthermore, when two male lions do fight, do we think it is because they "*hate*" each other? To first criminalize their fight - and then add a crime of "*hate*" is a *double* metaphysical imposition! Yet man does this to himself? Upon what grounds? Heterosexuals may simply be reacting *instinctively* against homosexuality on a very rudimentary, primordial, instinctive, evolutionary level.

Getting back to the homosexual's emotional change, here is another rather chilling thought. We know our species is plundering the earth's resources. Maybe the dinosaurs, at their zenith, were doing the same thing. Is it possible the various dinosaur species became homosexuals - thus explaining their sudden extinction? Could it be that the forces that drive planetary evolution are somehow at work in this homosexual phenomenon? Is this nature's way of restoring balance? Are we witnessing the early steps toward *removing our species completely* from the scene? These questions need contemplative attention and unbiased research. Maybe heterosexuals are instinctively fighting this change in our species - at depths below our "*rational*" thinking.

By the way, appeals to other higher mammal species engaging in homosexual behavior as an evidence that homosexuality is an acceptable norm rings hollow. At one time, dinosaur species dominated land, air and sea. But they vanished *as a whole class of animals*. Reptiles are now a remnant of what they once were. Maybe mammals are on the way out. A tiny gene change would have been much more effective than some random meteor.

The Homosexual Mentally

As far as our present generation is concerned, this section on the mental processing of the homosexual is probably the most important. In view of pressing world needs, the necessity for right thinking is imperative. Persons displaying *provable* mental flaws are not the ones needed in power positions. When major mental malfunction can be scientifically demonstrated, those clinging to error must be relegated to arenas that will not interfere with our species progress. Science does have limits in this area. For example, some philosophic and religious assertions are not subject to objective, empirical verification one way or the other. Therefore, scientific censorship cannot be rightfully employed. But where science *can conclusively* expose error, it has the responsibility to do so. When metaphysical assertions or practices cut across known evolutionary principles, the error(s) must be exposed. If the errors cannot be stopped, they must at minimum be reasoned against. Is there anything wrong with the thinking of the homosexual? Consider the scientific, physiological data. From the evolutionary view, the male sex organs have been developed for one primary purpose; *to enter and impregnate the female*. Conversely, female sex organs have evolved for that reception. Our species' reproductive systems are extremely complex, intricate and well defined. Indeed, the entire procreation process is incredible. The coupling of these two reproductive systems bring forth offspring *similar* to the parents and continue the

evolutionary chain. As homosexuals have divulged their sexual activities, the evolutionary scientist is confronted with *an aggressive sexual creature* that uses his/her sex organs in many, many ways *except for their one evolved purpose*. Indeed, the sex organs of the pure homosexual are *never* used for their evolved purpose. But the error compounds. The homosexual *also misuses and abuses other physiological systems*. One primary example is the abuse of the highly developed alimentary canal among male homosexuals. This musculomembranous tube begins at the mouth and ends at the anus. It changes raw materials into nutrients the body uses to energize, develop, and repair itself. There is no scientist of any age who believes the anus has evolved for the reception of the penis. From a scientific perspective, this behavior is beyond understanding. But even more troubling than the thoughts that occur before and during homosexual activity, are the thoughts that occur when in a cool mind set. The homosexual movement, and their supporters, declare this as a *“viable alternative lifestyle.”* This is even more perplexing (and dangerous) than the actual sexual activity. Homosexuals have organized political and educational movements so as to be in the mainstream of human rule and progress. Many have obtained leadership positions in various realms. But the evolutionist must ask, *“If the homosexual’s reasoning processes are this skewed in such a fundamental area of existence, isn’t it possible other reasoning processes are also at enmity with species progress?”* If we were to observe two males of any other species engaged in this behavior, we would not hesitate in stating there is something fundamentally amiss with those animals. No evolutionary scientist would even entertain the thought this is somehow an *“acceptable viable alternative”* for that species. There is nothing *“viable”* about it. Indeed, it is totally *“unviable.”* Any *evolutionary* scientist stating otherwise would become a laughingstock inside and outside the profession.

In a capsulized summary, here are some conclusions. Physiologically, the homosexual appears normal. But, the homosexual’s emotional and mental processes relating to sexual activity are not normal. It appears the homosexual only has what might be called *“behavioral variations.”* Of course, it may be discovered these variations are caused by some genetic change (thus a physiological mutation) presently undetected. In one sense, the source of the deviancy is irrelevant, because all that really matters is the resultant activity. But with the advent of artificial insemination, there is an urgency to find out if this is a physiological problem or not. This concern will be addressed in a moment.

Challenges to the Evolutionary Community

It must now be asked, *“What are the practical outworkings of these observations?”* There are many, but first, we should consider the individual evolutionist. We are living in one of the first generations that has discovered evolutionary science. As evolutionists believe the process of adaptation is ongoing in all species, humanity is included. With our newfound reasoning and creative capacities, we are plunging headlong into all kinds of procedures geared toward steering our own evolution. These procedures are great departures from the processes that made up our earlier natural evolutionary development. While it seems inevitable we will rapidly move into generic engineering and various kinds of human gene manipulations and therapies, it is clear we are embarking on these ventures because we believe we *can improve* evolution’s processes. But it is hard to become part of this optimism when most *professing* evolutionists obviously do not *understand* the foundational principles of the science. This will be demonstrated in the ensuing paragraphs. The true evolutionist must do more than *learn* the science - the true evolutionist must also *understand* it - at least the basics.

Once the evolutionist understands the science, it is of the highest importance that the right and profitable variations/mutations among us are recognized, declared, protected, propagated, and passed on especially in view of the artificial death means discussed earlier. *Evolutionists must jealously guard our species.* The evolutionist must also expose harmful deviant changes in our species and seek to hold those at bay. The evolutionist must not be swayed by human desires, wishes, or emotions, but come to

proper scientific conclusions. In view of this, the evolutionist should be the very first to expose homosexuality as an evolutionary unsound development. But this is not happening. Instead, just the opposite. Much, most, maybe all of the evolutionary minded community *supports* homosexuality.

Consider the adherents of the *Humanist Manifesto II*. While this document claims there are many different kinds of humanists, all the signatories “*affirm a set of common principles,*” which includes a belief in physical evolution. “*Science affirms that the human species is an emergence from natural, evolutionary forces.*” They also predict that humanists will “*alter the course of human evolution.*” They declare themselves *evolutionists*. But when addressing human sexuality, they state,

“In the area of sexuality, we believe that intolerant attitudes ... unduly repress sexual conduct While we do not approve of exploitive, denigrating forms of sexual expression, neither do we wish to prohibit, by law or social sanction, sexual behavior between consenting adults. The many varieties of sexual exploration should not in themselves be considered ‘evil’ Short of harming others or compelling them to do likewise, individuals should be permitted to express their sexual proclivities [inclinations, proneness, tendencies] and pursue their lifestyles as they desire”

Please reread the above declaration with these questions in mind. “*Are these assertions based upon scientific assessment? In fact, is there any science undergirding these positions?*” Also ask, “*Is sexual activity an important topic in the science of evolution?*” So, are these “*evolutionists*” honoring evolutionary science with sound, empirical claims? Or, are we to believe that just as there are many types of humanists, it is okay to say there are many types of evolutionists?

I submit to you that the assertions in this section of the Manifesto are entirely philosophic, based on the writers own political, civic social or religious morals, *without a single thought to science*. For example, the writer is reacting to “*intolerant attitudes*” and the branding of certain sexual activities as “*evil.*” This is a reaction probably directed at religious or moralistic positions with which this writer disagrees. But does the writer/signatories refute the moralist with a scientific argument? No, not at all. In fact, these “*evolutionists*” simply forward their own moralistic position. References to “*exploitive denigrating forms of sexual expression*” and “*consenting adults,*” are all based on the author’s own philosophic or moral values. How is it decided what is “*exploitive*” sexual expression? Or what are “*denigrating forms*” of sexual expression? We will soon see that the author and signatories of this Manifesto *do not* think homosexuality falls into these categories. And what scientific base makes “*consenting adults*” a touchstone to *evolutionary* procreation? A male lion knows nothing of these concepts - and neither did man before mutating into the age of reason. In a similar vein, the writer is driven by civic or social considerations when reacting to “*laws*” or “*sanctions*” that would prohibit free sexual expression. Here again the author/signatories only forward their own social philosophy without a thought to the hard sciences of naturalism.

For the evolutionary scientist, any moralistic position based on some philosophic framework constitutes irrelevant wrangling. The scientist views these philosophies, and their ensuing morals, as curious wrinkles in our species “*ability to reason.*” For the scientist, these are little “*sideshow*” that will hopefully be outgrown if we can harness this “*ability to reason*” function. For the evolutionary scientist, any valid concept of “*right*” or “*wrong*” can only arise from accurate science. But are the “*evolutionists*” of this Manifesto really in support of homosexuality? Signatories included Betty Friedan, founder of National Organization of Women (NOW), Alan Guttmacher, president of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, and Norman Fleishman, executive vice president of Planned Parenthood World Population.

In the ensuing years since the *Humanist Manifesto II* was written (early 1970's), the political

and educational activities of these organizations have confirmed their interpretation of this phrasing in the Manifesto - homosexuality is promoted as a viable alternative lifestyle and is a civil rights issue. This position is *at odds* with evolutionary science. Any “*evolutionist*” who accepts or promotes homosexuality does not understand even the basics of evolution.

The true evolutionist operates on scientific grounds and only recognizes *scientific rights* of man - not fabricated *civil rights*. Those creatures best adapted to the progress of our species must be recognized, protected, and promoted - and only those compatible with basic scientific evolutionary principle can constitute this group. The true evolutionist rejects the premise that civil rights form the primary basis for human valuation and promotion. Even a cursory glance at the world’s cultures reveals great confusion on human civil rights. Philosophic and religious precepts vary markedly all over the world. Civil “*rights*” and civil valuations are more unstable than the winds of the planet. History is littered with the inadequacy and failure of civil valuing. One reason evolutionary thought is appealing is because it is based on *objective, scientific* data - thus giving hope for deliverance from the arbitrary, subjective opinions of man which permeate all the cultural systems. *If* there are legitimate civil rights, they must spring from valid *scientific rights* that a creature possesses. Indeed, these “*evolutionists*” who embrace creatures who are *at odds* with evolution have created yet another arbitrary valuing system. What are non-evolutionists supposed to think of such irrational, unscientific hypocrisy? May this article serve to right this humiliation. Undoubtedly, future generations will judge this generation of “*evolutionists*” as stone-aged individuals, ignorant of the science they discovered. True evolutionists ... where are you?

In fairness to those who wrote and signed *The Humanist Manifesto I and II*, they did name it properly. They are indeed what the title states - humanists. An examination of both documents reveals a *humanistic* cultural philosophy that jettisons theistic morals and replaces them with humanistic ones. It is time for scientific evolutionists to put together “*The Evolutionist Manifesto.*” Perhaps it should be patterned after the “*The Humanist Manifesto II*” - but corrected to reflect the true positions of evolutionary science (see www.humanism.net/documents/manifesto2.html). Evolutionists need to rescue their theory from these humanists.

Ultimately, the burden of proof for being included in the progress of *Homo sapiens* lies with any deviant. The homosexual community has only appealed to *civil grounds* for their acceptance. The true evolutionary community now calls upon the homosexual community to give a scientific accounting of itself. Civil cries are inadequate, improper, irrelevant, insufficient, and unsatisfactory.

Homosexuals - a New Species?

For those favored by evolutionary fate to operate inside the bounds of acceptable evolutionary parameters, it is extremely difficult (if not impossible) to enter and follow the homosexual’s sexual thought patterns leading to their conclusions. In fact, as one considers this objective material carefully, a strange realization begins to occur. Because of the walls between heterosexual and homosexual thought, coupled with emotional and social separations, maybe we are witnessing a new branch on the evolutionary tree. But, this “*new branch*” will never develop as the variant change leads to an immediate dead end. Actually, one can contend that pure homosexuals *already are* a different species because even though it is *theoretically* possible for them to breed with heterosexuals and produce reproductive offspring, the very nature of their deviance effectively severs that occurrence. From a *practical* aspect, they are a different species, but from a *theoretical* perspective, they are still *Homo sapiens*. But what is most valid – a practical or theoretical reality? It is at this juncture that some thoughts about artificial insemination seem most appropriate.

If the source of this behavioral variance is found to be caused by a physical mutation, artificial insemination becomes a major issue for the evolutionist. Here is why.

If our species survives long enough, we may one day find that our planet's evolutionary process is unrivaled in the universe. Evolution used natural forces to promote the most fit to fill ecological niches in our air, water and land. This planet teems with plant and animal life - from microbes to massively complex organisms. All along the way, evolution weeded out creatures whose adaptations did not progress the line from which they arose. This removed the aberrant creature's genes from the gene pool. No votes were taken on this. No philosophical moralisms were consulted. Artificial insemination thwarts this *natural* process. If homosexuality does arise from a physical mutation, the responsible agent(s) (at least in the dominant form) would be immediately eliminated from the gene pool in natural circumstances. (We may find that homosexuality resides all through our species in a recessive state and only becomes dominant when the right combinations occur. This might explain why homosexuality keeps occurring.) But if dominant homosexual reproductive cells are used in artificial insemination, then what would have been naturally purged from our gene pool is artificially retained - in that dominant form. The effect this will have on our gene pool is unknown. All that *we do know* is that we have embarked on a course foreign to evolution's billion-year track record. The current approach to this invented procedure is reckless at best. Combining known homosexual reproductive cells with heterosexual reproductive cells is consistent with evolutionary science? And if the sperm and egg both come from homosexuals? If homosexuality is physiological, these inventions are keeping it around past its time. These are uncharted waters.

Where Does this Leave the Homosexual?

It must be asked, "*Where does this leave the homosexual, especially if he/she is an evolutionist?*" First, excessive despair should be avoided. That will avail nothing. In fact, the homosexual should not be overly surprised that he/she has changed in a negative way, as most observed variations do prove detrimental to their species progress. This ill fate is the primary lot of the variant. But with solid scientific research, we may discover that the homosexual *is not* the true evolutionary failure. The "*fault*" may lie with one, or both, parents. Maybe there is something in *their* genetic code that produces non-reproductive offspring (non-reproductive in a practical sense). If the evolutionary culprit is the parent(s), the scene may be somewhat akin to a horse and donkey producing a mule. The horse and donkey are the "*troublemakers*." While this example does have two different species cross breeding, it's possible something along this line is occurring in the homosexual's parents, but in a more subtle form. None of this should be taken personally, as science is not interested in assigning fault or guilt. These are irrelevant concerns. Any variation in our species should be pursued with scientific fervor, but void of cultural valuations, personal prejudice, or some imposed metaphysical moral framework. And in one sense, all creatures are evolutionary failures in that none have developed the capacity to survive indefinitely. All still ultimately fail at survival.

Second, the homosexual evolutionist *should make sure they are not negatively influencing or hampering heterosexual Homo sapiens evolutionary progress*. The homosexual evolutionist should be *the very first one* to mistrust his/her own thought patterns and readily remove himself/herself from power positions in the mainstream of heterosexual Homo sapiens. This should be done by the dedicated homosexual evolutionist - without external pressuring from heterosexual evolutionists. In fact, it seems reasonable that the homosexual evolutionist should make an earnest endeavor to persuade fellow homosexuals of their true evolutionary condition. They should convince them to abandon promotional activities forwarding normalcy. Any other course pursued by the homosexual evolutionist is yet another evidence of an inability to reason rationally.

Further Considerations

Any time a negative variation occurs in our species, the evolutionary community must take *the responsible lead* in properly evaluating the variation. Anyone carrying the variant who also promotes an agenda hostile to *our* evolution, must be stopped. Homosexual activists fall into this category. I address this assertion in the two Appendices. True evolutionists have not responded to this challenge. Here are four possible reasons for this failure.

- 1) Current evolutionists may actually be stone-aged scientists ignorant of the basics of the science.
- 2) It is possible there are not many true evolutionists around. While many *claim* to believe in evolution, it is just talk backed by little thought - therefore, even less action.
- 3) Cowardice may be a major culprit. Many evolutionists will learn nothing new in this treatise. In fact, many could write a much better work. But cowardice has paralyzed them. They are politically and culturally bound - not scientifically bound. They take no offensive measures to protect our species progress, nor do they take defensive measures to protect evolutionary science from pseudo-evolutionists - like the ones who promote homosexuality under the evolutionist's flag. This is inexcusable.
- 4) It is possible the entire evolutionary community *has been deceived* into wrong thinking and actions. This is a particularly chilling consideration because it means the evolutionarily correct creature has been *mentally overpowered* by the evolutionarily lethal one. Appendix 1 addresses this possibility.

Here is the challenge to all evolutionists: If you integrate and support the homosexual in our species fold, upon what grounds are *you* doing this? Examine and see. Use the hard, physical sciences.

Conclusion

Regardless of emotion, opinion or contention, one thing is undeniable. Evolution, in its silent, efficient course, *has placed an "X" on this "branch" from Homo sapiens*. Evolution boasts a billion years on its side with millions of successful evolved species in operation. How perilous it is to override evolution's "*decree*" on these individuals. The homosexual is a doomed, solitary creature. Emotionally we might cringe at this, but denial of reality is not the lot of the scientist. We must assess as evolution assesses. Evolution turns a deaf ear to the civil cry of the homosexual. So must the evolutionist. As long as homosexuals continue promoting the current normalcy programs, their errors must be challenged and exposed until they rightfully acknowledge their evolutionary fate - however painful that might be. Also, until a right mind set is adopted, it is very foolish to allow them to press other claims of philosophy or values on the heterosexual community. It is unacceptable that homosexuals dictate the terms of their participation in human progress - indeed it must be the other way around.

In this treatise, I have dealt with the homosexual as one "*born that way*." I have not entertained the thought that homosexual behavior may be a *learned activity*, as some suggest. If homosexuality is a learned behavior, then the mental and emotional deviancies take on a new dimension that cannot be dealt with here. But the first homosexual had no one to learn homosexuality from, and since most homosexuals claim they have been born that way, I have operated from that base. Genetic investigation may one day confirm or dislodge this assumption.

It is clear there are many *pseudo-evolutionists*. One can hope that some will now right themselves and join the ranks of true evolutionists. **If** there are future generations of our species, I am sure they will be asking these questions; "*Did our forefathers properly analyze the world around them and take the necessary acts to ensure our progress?*" "*Did they react emotionally or scientifically*

when confronted with various deviants in our species?” “Did they recognize deceptions and their own erring thoughts?” I wonder how these questions will be answered.

APPENDIX 1 Delusion and Deception

The element of *possible deception* by homosexuals brings up several important - and alarming - points. When man entered the age of reason, two mental phenomena occurred. First, man could reason correctly or incorrectly. As he thought on things, he arrived at right, or wrong, conclusions. Second, man's capacity to deceive others became enhanced. Man can now devise sophisticated plans aimed at directing others into error. The capacity to employ deception is not in itself a negative mutation. Many species use deception to lure prey or to lead predators away from themselves or their young. But deceptive power used *to the detriment* of one's own species **is** negative. However, it is foolish to assume that one negatively mutated in this reasoning capacity is unintelligent. Indeed, the most insightful of minds belong to master deceivers. Deceivers must know how to bait, lead, and trap the victim. They must know the victim's thought patterns and skillfully enter those thoughts and lead the targeted one in the desired direction. And consider the intellect required to deceive an entire group of people. Millions have been led down roads they would have never traveled if deceiving abilities had not been employed. The deceiver must anticipate, and neutralize, the victim's objections even before they surface. The deceiver who relies solely on mental powers to overcome the victim is truly brilliant. So, what has this to do with the homosexual? Reflection on the movement's formal agenda may be revealing. While it is probable most individual homosexuals simply live in innocent error, there are two planks of the *organized movement's* platform that employ deceptive tactics. The two areas are sex education and abortion.

Sex Education. Early evolutionists made incredible victories in this country. In just a few decades, the entire public school system was brought into the evolutionary fold. This was an amazing feat. A tremendous stronghold was established for the propagation of evolutionary theory. But now, right in the middle of that stronghold, homosexuality is promoted as acceptable and somehow consistent with evolutionary principles. Nothing could be further from the truth, *yet this is going unchallenged*. Pseudo-evolutionists are propagating this error. For example, the New York City Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers declare they will protect the rights of homosexuals to teach in the schools. The San Francisco School Board has already voted that the family-life curriculum recognize homosexual lifestyles. But the “*Gay Rights Platform*,” drawn up by a National Coalition of Gay Organizations in Chicago, goes further. It demands that, “*Federal encouragement and support (be given) for sex education courses, prepared and taught by gay women and men, presenting homosexuality as a valid healthy preference and lifestyle as a viable alternative to heterosexuality.*” (Schools in Crisis: Training for Success or Failure?, by Carl Sommer, Cahill Publishing Company, Houston, Texas, 204). Many public education leaders are *heterosexual* evolutionists. So, how can they embrace these homosexual demands? While some may just be operating in error, *it cannot be* the entire hierarchy of our national public education is in simple error. They have either *fallen prey to deception* or *are not evolutionists anyway*. How can any *evolutionist* maintain that homosexuality is “*a valid, healthy preference...and a viable alternative to heterosexuality*”? Are evolutionists saying it is “*valid*” to practice sex in such a way that the extinction of the species is guaranteed? And are homosexual sex practices “*healthy*”? Evidence is mounting that male homosexuals have significantly shorter life spans than heterosexual males because of the abuse to their various physiological systems. Can any hard science evolutionist say that homosexuality is a “*viable alternative to heterosexuality*”? This is not possible. To promote homosexuality on these grounds in the public school system *will have grave*

consequences for evolutionary science. The stronghold evolutionists have enjoyed in the classrooms may be lost. Support of homosexuality under the protective umbrella of evolution is an error that cannot prevail much longer. If evolutionists do not stand up and renounce the embrace of this extreme contradiction, *know that* anti-evolutionary forces will soon seize this and discredit evolutionary science in untold ways. Homosexuals have been refused in most creationist circles (see Appendix II) but they seem to have successfully integrated their errors into evolutionary circles. This is astounding.

Abortion. From an evolutionary point of view, present abortion practices are rash, irresponsible, and totally unacceptable. Let's take a cursory look at abortion and then see how the homosexual agenda may be wrapped up in this.

The current *indiscriminate* fetal destruction is not based on scientific grounds at all. It is based on *civil valuations* and *fear tactics*. Overpopulation is one fear tactic. Simple mathematics reveals that every human on this planet could live in Australia in families of five on a 1.898-acre lot! (Five billion people in families of five equals one billion households. Multiply Australia's 2,966,150 square miles by 640 acres per square mile and you have 1,898,336,000 acres, which equals 1.898 acres per family). Resource management, technological improvements, and sane governance constitute the right call to Homo sapiens - not indiscriminate destruction of pre-born humans. A second unacceptable ground for justifying abortion is one based upon the child's prospective socioeconomic position. It is unscientific and irrational to interrupt our evolutionary cycle because of money or social position. Economics, and the arbitrary values attached to paper money (or other substances) is an extremely late development in our evolutionary journey - even later than our "*age of reason.*" It has taken a billion years to evolve to our current stature, and are we now going to use some frivolous, shaky economic system to decide who is born and who is not? *Natural endowments* are the Evolutionist's standard of rule, not money. It may be that the human evolutionary equation will prove to be the following:

A billion years of successful evolution + a few thousand years of the age of "*philosophical reason*" = extinct Homo Sapiens.

But a third justification for this indiscriminate fetal destruction is promoted under the banner of *civil rights*. A woman is told she has rights to her own body and can destroy the developing baby inside her body at any time prior to its birth. As seen earlier, this same "*rights*" argument is employed by homosexuals to justify their own scientifically errant sexual conduct. This *civil rights* philosophy is void of scientific inquiry, fact gathering or assessment. These "*rights*" are based on a fabricated philosophical system. In the case of abortion, a pregnant female is reasoned through the abortionist's table and out the office door with reassurance she has acted within legitimate parameters of rights of choice and self-determination. Homosexuals employ this same reasoning process toward their own sexual activities. "*Consenting adults*" can engage in homosexual acts and then be assured that he/she has acted within the parameters of valid rights of choice and self-determination. From inception to conclusion, no scientific reasoning has been employed. But here is the point: Homosexuals are encouraging heterosexuals to adopt this errant reasoning. Homosexuals are reinforcing a false premise - uncensored rights to one's own body - so as to encourage heterosexuals to kill their own offspring. Whether there is intentional deception involved here or not is irrelevant. The bottom line is that the evolutionist must not allow homosexuals to interfere with, *or influence*, heterosexual reproduction on any level. Evolutionists must guard human life from conception forward. Our survival and progress are linked with our reproductivity. The homosexual has apparently evolved outside of the reproduction circle and must be kept outside.

For the evolutionist, abortion is not a question of "*what*" is being aborted but "*who*" is being

aborted. The “*what*” is a human life in its early lifeline. That is already known. Whether a fertilized egg, embryo, or fetus, abortion is ending a particular evolutionary line that has a billion-year history. That is “*what*” is being aborted. But “*who*” is it? That is another huge question. The evolutionist understands that profitable adaptations in any species arise randomly - and that aborted human may possess *the next needed adaptation for the species*. This fact alone makes the true evolutionist pro-life, adamantly pro-life. As you can see, the evolutionist’s concern is scientific.

On the other hand, a sensible *humanist* wonders if the world might be losing its next great statesman, first woman president, or next great inventor, doctor or teacher. While these are simply cultural/philosophical worries, these aborted preborns still are the “*who*” the humanist is concerned about losing. Then there are the pro-life Biblical theists. They worry about culpability before the Creator of these “*whos*.” But, the bottom line for the evolutionist is this: With millions of casual abortions already committed, a price will surely be exacted upon our development for this indiscretion. Evolutionists must halt this errant destruction - and stop any individual or group advocating any philosophy justifying or encouraging this activity. Evolutionary science demands it.

Whether advocates of homosexual normalcy know of the evolutionary condition of this position and are using deception to overpower heterosexuals to participate in abortion - or whether they are simply welded to an errant, brutal humanist sect without much thought, is ultimately irrelevant. Again, homosexuals have evolved outside reproductive humanity and should be kept outside. *The scientific evolutionist* is responsible for correct thinking, deductions and actions. This work is dedicated to this.

For a challenging, in depth discussion about abortion, go to <https://freelygive-n.com> and get a copy of, “*Abortion: How (and Why) Abortion Resides in the Weakest Form of Human Thought and Valuation.*”

APPENDIX II

Creationist’s and Evolutionist’s View of the Homosexual

It is a great irony of life that those who are diametrically opposed in philosophy and practice can sometimes find themselves in agreement on a specific issue. While the reasoning and arguments might differ, the final conclusion is agreed upon. For example, Prohibitionists and the Mafia were both in favor of alcohol being illegal, yet for entirely different reasons. When the question of origins arise, there are two primary beliefs - evolution and creationism. While some attempt to have a foot in both camps, purists of each system are on totally opposite poles. A pure evolutionist is an atheist who believes the universe is billions of years old and everything that exists is the result of natural forces. The pure Biblical Creationist is a theist who believes the universe is ten to fifteen thousand years old and everything that exists is the result of the Creator’s activity. Both systems forward scientists who study the natural world and universe in which we live (i.e., icr.org). They disagree about the past, the present, and the future. They disagree about the purpose of life, occurrences in life, and the reason and purpose of death. When examining the same scientific data, they come away with different interpretations of that material and then integrate it into their respective system. Yet in the midst of two systems that are as different as night is from day, one finds a great irony. Neither system has a place for homosexuality. We even find that the rejection of the homosexuality is for many of the same reasons - although there may be some slight variations in emphasis at times. For example:

- 1) Evolutionists and creationists agree the reproductive system exists for propagation purposes. Both camps agree that homosexuality is a negative deviance from that end.
- 2) Evolutionists and creationists agree the alimentary canal *has not* come into being for sexual purposes. Both camps stand confounded at male homosexual abuse of this physiological system.

Homosexuals themselves offer no reasonable explanation for such behavior. Indeed, both camps doubt a one even exists.

3) Evolutionists and creationists both reject civil cries as a base for homosexual acceptance and integration into society. Both camps recognize the flawed arguments and emotions associated with this sexual behavior, and are concerned other reasoning functions are awry. Until the homosexual is proved harmless in varied areas of concern for each camp, both camps will turn a deaf ear to civil cries.

The unavoidable conclusion is that the homosexual is outside both systems. Heterosexuals who try to accept the homosexual in either system demonstrate their ignorance of the system in which they are trying to integrate the homosexual. The burden for reasonable responses to the objections of evolutionists and creationists lies with the homosexual. For the homosexual to expect inclusion by evolutionists or creationists apart from a satisfactory accounting of this behavior is unreasonable, unfair, and without merit. The homosexual must define himself/herself in relation to nature and evolutionary science. The homosexual must define himself/herself in relation to the Creator and Creationism. The homosexual must define himself/herself physiologically, philosophically, and morally - according to the objections of those in the evolutionary disciplines or Creationist disciplines. Anything short of such undertakings by the homosexual is unacceptable.

* * * * *

This is clearly a non-Biblical article and argument. For a Biblical perspective on homosexuality get either *“The First Homosexual and the Bible”* or *“Sex and the Bible”* at freelygive-n.com

If interested in [the Bible and Abortion](#):
or a [visual Gospel Presentation](#):
[All are free!](#)