

# Williams, Gantt, Christensen, and Tubbs: Illuminating The Untenable Nature of the “Born That Way” Argument

David A. Nelson\*

Brigham Young University School of Family Life

## Abstract

*For decades, our society has entertained the idea that people are born with sexual orientations which are innate and immutable. The natural effect of this approach is to sideline discussions of agency in sexuality, and to hinder the application of traditional morality to diverse sexual behaviors. The approach is also inherently non-developmental and therefore cannot explain the shifts in behavior that we frequently witness in human beings. The article by Williams, Gantt, Christensen, and Tubbs (this issue) helps us to refocus our attention on agentic sexuality. In my response, I focus on empirical research and societal trends that provide direct or indirect support for the fundamental position of agency in the development of human sexuality. The emphasis of Williams et al. on embodiment is also critical to the ongoing debate over trans identities.*

**Keywords:** sexual orientation, sexual fluidity, expressive individualism, religiosity, suicidality, mixed-orientation marriage, GWAS, trans identities

---

Williams, Gantt, Christensen, and Tubbs (this issue) have provided key arguments which, if heeded, may finally help move society away from the old “Born That Way” justification for the uncritical embrace of diverse sexualities. Combined with relevant empirical research, we may eventually foster an appreciation for the nuance and complexity behind sexual development. In particular, to center agency is the only way to properly challenge the liberal orthodoxy that has long dominated human psychology (what the authors call, “the tyranny of the invisible”).

As a developmental psychologist, I have found it strange that so many of my colleagues have long favored the “innate and immutable” framing of

such a complex set of human behaviors over a developmental, transactional perspective (which is often the default in most areas of behavioral development). What we are dealing with here is the ongoing societal definition of “behavioral” minorities (and an increasingly chaotic array of such). In my response, I want to highlight some of the empirical research and societal conversations which buttress, directly or indirectly, an agentic perspective.

Ironically, as the “Born That Way” argument has gathered strength in the past few decades, the research arrayed against such a deterministic position has become increasingly prevalent. Societal discussions are often ignorant of the latest re-

---

\*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to David A. Nelson, School of Family Life, Brigham Young University, 2102C JFSB, Provo, UT 84602-6720. Email: david\_nelson@byu.edu

search or actively disregard it. In addition, the notion of “embodiment” is immediately relevant to the current expansion of behavioral minorities into gender identities (also addressed below).

The biological determinism approach to sexuality (“sexual orientation”) has been popular for many reasons. First and foremost, it seeks to shift the moral debate. In particular, the argument has been critical in formulating a novel civil rights movement (which directly challenges the confines of traditional sexual morality). If sexual and gender identities are biologically fixed, then the only moral issue is that people are enabled to embrace behaviors that accord with “who they authentically are.” As long as consent is honored in all sexual interactions, then all sexuality is inherently good (a central tenet of the “sex positivity movement”). From this perspective, a primary focus of queer ideology is “the end of repression of all sexual expression.” The argument takes on all of the trappings of a civil rights focus and presses urgently forward in search of liberation.

### **Sexual Fluidity and Identity**

If sexual and gender identities are in flux, however, then the civil rights argument is undermined. Dr. Lisa Diamond, a professor of developmental psychology, has been at the forefront of research on “sexual fluidity,” which is highly relevant here. Williams et al. (this issue) briefly touch on this topic, and I will say quite a bit more about it.

In a talk given over a decade ago (Cornell University, 2013), Diamond demonstrated with large, representative samples of adults (followed over developmental time in several nations) that those who experience same-sex attraction rarely report it to be an “exclusive” attraction. Rather, it is usually bisexual in nature and most bisexuals self-describe as “mainly heterosexual.” Substantial shifts between sexual categories are also unexpectedly common over the course of human development.

Speaking in 2017 of her original sample of women that she has personally followed over time, Diamond stated that she expected fluidity to settle down as women mature and find their “true” selves (To The Best of Our Knowledge, 2017). In contrast, she stated that, “...I found that the longer I followed them, the more women started to

change, so that by the time I reached the 10-year point, and now I’m at the 20-year point, “change is substantially more common than stability” [emphasis added].”

Diamond considers fluidity to be a general feature of human sexuality and, by extension, that sexual “orientation” is an imprecise heuristic that inadequately explains a messy developmental phenomenon. From a sexual fluidity perspective, one should not talk about one’s sexual orientation, as if it is some stable, natural state of being. One could more accurately refer to what one “currently” thinks, says, or does about sexual matters (as Williams et al. propose). Diamond has herself been in a same-sex relationship for more than two decades. Yet, she freely acknowledges in the 2017 interview that fluidity is always possible: “I should be the first person to say, ‘I’m a lesbian now, [but] who the hell knows.’”

When developmental shifts in human sexual behavior are likely to occur is still a mystery for science (“sexual fluidity” remains a black box phenomenon in psychology). But the possibility of change is always present. In many cases, an agentic change of heart accords with variation in how individuals respond to sexual feelings. For example, religious conversion may supplant homosexual identity with a religious world view. Fluidity may also shift gradually over time, as experiences accumulate and redefine one’s perceptions. For example, Ty Mansfield (2014) has described his own personal journey with homosexual attraction and religious identity in this manner:

“Elder Neal A. Maxwell [former leader for the LDS Church] spoke often of the need to ‘educate our desires’ because it is the desires of our hearts that will determine our destiny, not proximate human experiences. I’ve found it to be much more useful to think about the ‘education of desire’ and even the ‘education’ of my sexuality ... There was a time when my attractions to men were so strong that even though I was committed to living the gospel [of Jesus Christ], I didn’t believe I’d ever marry [a woman] because I simply didn’t feel I ever could. Over the last ten

years since that time, however, with growth in self-awareness and even addressing therapeutically factors that I believe, for me, influenced my sexuality, the way I experience my sexuality now is fundamentally, qualitatively different than it was ten years ago. While I still occasionally experience attraction to men, my *desires* are such that I can't tell you the last time I desired a same-sex relationship. I desire only to be with my wife and family."

Accordingly, although same-sex attraction may not completely fade, broadening of sexual attraction is possible.

When the case against the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) was before the U.S. Supreme Court, Diamond's research on sexual fluidity was called on to buttress arguments to maintain DOMA, rather than striking it down (Cornell University, 2013). In particular, a common test for equal protection under the law is that any group arguing for such must have a trait that is discrete and immutable. The ubiquity of sexual fluidity argues effectively against this narrow definition. Yet, remarkably, the equal protection status issue never managed to come up in DOMA arguments at the Supreme Court (as Diamond described it, "We dodged a bullet!" (Cornell University, 2013)). She then argued that "innate and immutable" is an unworkable approach and, besides, equal protection should *not* be needed to justify a civil rights movement for LGB individuals.

By 2018, Diamond explicitly called in a TED talk for the "Born That Way" argument to be abandoned (Diamond, 2018). She argued that it is scientifically inaccurate and can never account for late bloomers (who find their "true" sexuality later in life) or those who fluidly cross categorical boundaries. She alternatively proposed to affirm *all* sexual and gender identities, regardless of their potentially inconsistent nature (seemingly a nod to the "sex positivity" movement).

### **Expressive Individualism and Authenticity**

The fact that Diamond endorses an open-ended approach to defining appropriate sexual or gender expression only deepens the moral quag-

mire. A necessary moral analysis is replaced with "expressive individualism"—a felt obligation to one's "currently" desires, whatever they happen to be. The "tyranny of the invisible", whatever its "current" nature, is readily embraced with this perspective. "Authenticity" requires that old concepts and constraints of sexual expression be abandoned so that one may fully express one's selfhood.

An all-inclusive sexual morality is now trending, which constantly expands its identity groups (as exemplified by the "+" sign following LGBTQ+). As such, this argument is ambiguous and imprecise. It is unlikely that society would ever endorse *all* sexual identities. In contrast, in the case of traditional morality, religious doctrine narrowly sets the boundaries of sexual expression, consistent with an altogether different vision of human purpose and flourishing. Traditional morality rejects the symbolic LGBTQ+ rainbow with its infinite possibilities and inherent contradictions (more about those contradictions below).

As Williams et al. (this issue) profess, the expressive individualism approach "... ultimately strips all human acts and desires, sexual or otherwise, of any intrinsic meaning or moral substance—except insofar as the individual musters up some personal significant and manages to attach it for themselves to maintain some semblance of moral weight in a world of their own making, a world necessarily untethered to any outside, anchoring truth."

Williams et al. (this issue) are therefore correct to underscore the "fundamental incoherence in contemporary social science accounts of sexuality." The sexual identity movement is far more ideological than empirical in its foundations. Moreover, despite sexual fluidity research, the innate and immutable perspective remains popular and is often dogmatically defended. In particular, the "Born That Way" argument is regularly wielded as a political weapon against traditional faith groups which maintain an emphasis on genetic sexuality. In recent years, a steady drumbeat of accusation paints such faith groups with the same broad brush—they are motivated by animus and are therefore responsible for the relatively high suicidal ideation rate among individuals in LGBTQ+ groups. There is considerable

pressure placed on conservative groups to abandon their principles or doctrines and embrace expressive individualism. The argument is that such institutions need to be remodeled in order to provide a “safe space” for diverse sexual and gender identities, in particular.

### Safety in Traditional Religious Contexts

Yet current research demonstrates that traditional religious contexts may be generally considered a protective environment for all members, including those who may embrace an LGBQ identity. For example, a newly published meta-analysis by Lefevor et al. (2021) found a small but positive overall relation between spirituality/religiosity and health for sexual minorities. A couple of recent studies which particularly focus on LDS culture similarly find a protective influence.

In one study focusing on BYU students, Klundt et al. (2021) reported that religiosity (predominantly focused on the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS)) acted as a protective factor for both heterosexual and sexual minority identity groups, although the effect was weaker for the latter group. In addition, Dyer, Goodman, and Wood (2022), tapping a survey of more than 86,000 6th-12th graders in the state of Utah, demonstrate that membership in the LDS faith protects youth of all backgrounds, particularly in comparison with youth who claim no religion.

Specifically, they found that suicidal ideation among heterosexual LDS youth is half of that found for youth with no religious affiliation (12% vs. 26%). In comparison, the ideation rate for LGBQ youth is twice as high as heterosexual peers among LDS adherents (28%), but that rate is still far lower than among those claiming no religious beliefs (49%). Although any percentage of individuals deliberating suicide is troubling, it is still worth noting that the majority of LGBQ youth (72%) who are affiliated with the LDS faith are not experiencing suicidal ideation. Heterosexual youth, as well, are not fully protected by their “majority” status. Religiosity is just one factor among many in the lives of troubled youth.

The dynamic between faith and feelings is not singularly represented by one particular script. The details of this data analysis specifically point

to good family environments and low drug exposure as key protective factors against suicidal ideation. As Dyer suggested in an email exchange, “The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is, on average, very good at producing strong family ties and low drug use. In fact, given other research, it’s likely one of the very most effective organizations in doing so” (personal communication, October 27, 2021). One can argue that LDS doctrines concerning eternal families and respect for one’s bodily health (the Word of Wisdom) undergird these specific protective factors. We may also expect that doctrines pertaining to sexual morality and agency provide protection in a number of important ways.

It is important to also note that 2019 CDC data show that suicidality is higher for LGBQ youth in every state and locale across the nation. For example, in ultra-liberal (and low religious) San Francisco, suicidal ideation for heterosexual, LG, and B youth are 12.4%, 39.0%, and 45.2%, respectively. It therefore appears that living in a faithful LDS environment in Utah is actually better for LGB youth than living in San Francisco (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2019). The question must therefore be expanded to consider a broad range of factors that create risk for LGBQ youth, even in areas with very high LGBQ acceptance. Religious perspectives that embrace agentic sexuality cannot be supposed to be the sole or predominant source of tension or stress. In fact, religion appears to have an ameliorative influence for the most at risk.

### The Reality of “Mixed-Orientation” Marriages

An agentic sexuality perspective also provides a greater range of options for the future of same-sex attracted youth than the old dichotomy of affirmation vs. suppression/depression. One possibility (that is rarely celebrated) is what social scientists call the “mixed-orientation marriage”, wherein an individual who experiences same-sex attraction embraces a heterosexual marriage (as a demonstration of agentic sexuality). Note that the very label of these marriages still reflects a biased emphasis on fixed sexual orientation.

Lisa Diamond has made clear that such a phenomenon is tenable, in keeping with the research on sexual fluidity. In an interview with *KUER Ra-*

dio West years ago (Fabrizio, 2014), she spoke, referring to LDS men who experience same-sex attraction:

“Could you develop an erotic relationship with your heterosexual wife over time if you love her enough? Possibly. Now, is that a worthwhile project to undertake in a marriage, knowing that it might not work? Maybe not. But I have actually had some really profound conversations with LDS men here in Utah who have ... said ... ‘I’m basically a gay man and I’m married. And my marriage is going pretty well, and I have an unbelievable bond to my wife. And I have not been able to understand why I can have such a strong bond to my wife, even though ... I am attracted to men. And your book helps me understand why’ ... Does our kind of erotic and affectional phenomenology allow for that? Yes. I think it does.”

Ty Mansfield and his colleagues have also collected relevant data as part of the Reconciliation and Growth Project (focused on the interface of sexual and religious identities). In their Four Options Online Survey (conducted in 2016-2017), they collected data with nearly 1800 individuals (53.8% LDS) who predominantly identified as either LGB (54.4%) or SSA (Same-Sex Attracted; 37.8%). The individuals were then categorized into one of four sexual and religious identity groups. For those who were religiously orthodox, they could be (1) single and celibate or (2) in a mixed-orientation relationship. For those who were religiously liberal, they could be (1) single and not celibate, or (2) in a same-sex relationship.

In the first study to be published from these data, individuals were asked if they were satisfied with their current arrangement (Lefevor et al., 2019). Those in the single groups (celibate or not) registered lower satisfaction overall (~40%). But for the same-sex relationships and mixed-orientation relationships, satisfaction rates were high (95% and 80%, respectively). Current cultural and social science narratives suggest that individuals in mixed-orientation marriages should

inevitably struggle as there is a mismatch between their supposedly “innate sexual drive” and their actual sexual relationship. The 80% satisfaction rate is certainly not in keeping with this expectation.

There is another statistic in the same study that suggests that mixed-orientation relationships defy cultural expectations. Individuals in mixed-orientation relationships reported significantly longer relationship durations than the same-sex relationship comparison group (~2.1 times longer overall: 17.16 years ( $SD = 12.20$ ) vs. 8.05 years ( $SD = 8.59$ )). This finding suggests that agentic sexuality that is concordant with what Latter-Day Saints consider fundamental doctrine (complementary of man and woman in marriage) potentially creates the most optimal environment for relationship stability, even in the midst of same-sex attraction. It is possible that bringing children into the world may provide another layer of meaning that contributes to relationship satisfaction and stability. It may also be argued, as Williams et al. (this issue) suggest, that a sense of agentic sexuality creates meaning, purpose, and proactive, self-initiated change that promotes enduring marital relationships.

### In Search of a “Gay Gene”

Another area of evidence that argues against the oversimplicity of the “Born That Way” argument is the genetic research that has been completed since the mapping of the human genome. Early enthusiasm for the possibility of finding the “gay gene” has given way to evidence-based perspectives showing that genes may play a small and limited role in influencing sexual desire. A (genetically) deterministic perspective can thereby give way to a more nuanced perspective that includes agency.

In 2019, a group of researchers conducted what is called a “Genome-Wide Association Study”, with nearly a half million genomes in their sample (Ganna et al., 2019). This was an unprecedented sample size. The authors found that no one gene alone could account for more than 1% of sexual variation in the sample. Looking across all of the genes that were simultaneously considered, genetics could only explain 8-25% of sexual variation (the wide range in this estimate reflects

the possible influence of chance (spurious) findings, given how many genes were simultaneously tested for an association). In the end, only 5 genes stood out in this analysis, and the authors concluded that there is indeed, “no gay gene.” Any genetic influence on sexual orientation must therefore be polygenic. Environmental variables (and agentic action, as well) are likely sources of influence in the development and change of a polygenic trait.

### Being vs. Experiencing

The beauty of the Williams et al. (this issue) approach is that it avoids the pitfalls of either biological reductionism or radical free choice. An agentic perspective allows for individuals to experience same-sex attraction, for example, and still allow for agency in determining what is to be done with such feelings.

The distinction is clearly relevant as in the Latter-Day-Saint context we often talk about two groups: those who “identify” as LGBQ or those who say that they “experience” same-sex attraction (SSA) but do not claim a fixed sexual identity. Lefevor et al. (2020) have probed this issue with a sample of 1,128 individuals (LGBQ or SSA) who currently identify or previously identified as members of the Mormon faith. They found that those who claim an LGBQ identity are likely to favor scientific or social perspectives about sexuality over LDS Church teachings regarding sexuality (thereby focusing on “affirming” influences). In contrast, those who self-describe as SSA tend to do the opposite—they are more likely to favor Church teachings (focusing on “traditional morality” and identity). Importantly, these data do not show any difference between these two groups in their mental health outcomes. This suggests that the SSA group may be finding a healthy alternative to the blanket affirmation perspective that is so commonly called for by LGBTQ advocates.

### Fluidity and the “True” Self

One bit of trouble that naturally arises when an individual adopts an LGBTQ identity, only to fluidly change it later, is that it is difficult to claim that the “true self” has in fact been revealed (if “authenticity” is supposed to be an innate and immutable foundation of subconscious identity). We are left to wonder if an individual has engaged in

self-deception or false consciousness if they make a switch. With a new identity, the “truth” would seem to finally emerge, but there are no guarantees that change cannot recur (fluidity is *always* possible).

Williams et al. (this issue) therefore point to something fundamental when they suggest that many sexual identities only exist because they have been thought of. They further state, “. . . our identity is largely of our own making, not hovering somewhere waiting to be discovered, realized, or obeyed.” From this angle, it is impossible to know what is or is not true if the definition of such is inherently subjective. Expressive individualism (often referred to as “living one’s truth”) seeks to supplant revealed or objective truth, yet it is susceptible to winds of change.

Many of today’s sexual and gender identities are recent creations, and more are yet to come (the potential possibilities are infinite—as numerous as the colors of the rainbow). For example, “pansexuality” has only in the past decade entered the mainstream of cultural discourse. It is often defined as “falling in love without consideration of the person’s physical attributes or gender identity.” In the 1990s, in contrast, only heterosexual and homosexual identities were presented in our culture as options. Lesbian and gay activists in the 1990s also derided self-identified “bisexuals” as closeted homosexuals (arguing that if you experience homosexual attraction, you must be gay; claiming both was considered disingenuous). Yet each of these “orientations” are now claimed to be “true” manifestations of sexual identity, because more than a few individuals have embraced any one category (thereby creating some sort of group cohesion and identity).

People are also creating sexual “orientations” that go well beyond the LGB conception of primary sexual attraction (what some people also call “genital preference”). As Mansfield (2014) has suggested, being heterosexual, in the strictest categorical sense, could be simplistically construed to mean that a heterosexual man is attracted to any and all women he may come in contact with. But that is clearly false, as most people do not declare such open-ended attraction. In contrast, we often talk in exclusionary terms about a specific type of individual we will find attractive for life (e.g.,

finding “Mr. Right”). We narrow romantic engagement to a certain “type” of individual (based on the established social psychology principle that “Birds of a Feather Flock Together”).

For example, a “demisexual” (a label subjectively coined only in 2006) focuses on sexual desire that is emergent only after deep emotional connection (Iqbal, 2019). Consider also the sexual “orientation” of a “sapiosexual”, a person who discovers sexual arousal and attraction solely in interaction with highly intelligent people. Returning to Diamond’s research, her early research focused on women (aged 16-23) who found that a deep relationship could unexpectedly lead to a shift in sexual identity or attraction (e.g., a woman who had long self-defined as exclusively heterosexual found a lesbian relationship suddenly viable with a particular female friend). Such categories and descriptions of fluidity vaguely hint at a complex interaction of agency (voluntary bonding with individuals with specific traits) and environmental or biological influences. For self-professed demisexuals and sapiosexuals, respectively, “emotional connection” or “intelligent conversation” appear to overrule the primacy of sexual “orientation” (or “genital preference”).

### **Embodiment vs. Trans Identity**

Williams et al. (this issue) have also presented arguments that are useful in considering the newly mainstreamed world of trans-identities. The whole notion of transness is that one can suggest that one’s inner self may deviate from the objective reality of one’s outer self, and fluidity may also promise shifts over time. In contrast, Williams et al. (this issue) emphasize the importance of embodiment. As they say, “...[biological] sex is instantiated in the physical body ... This biological fact seems to be immutable.”

Embodiment constrains us in fundamental ways, and any transgender-identified individual is ultimately aware of these constraints, yet hopes to override them. The transgender movement has posited that science will rectify all impediments placed by our natural embodiment through medicalization of the condition. Hormonal and surgical investments are to modify the body in a way that one’s “true” self can be “affirmed” (e.g., “passing”

for the opposite sex). But a fair number of individuals (who went through medical transition) are now reporting on all of the side effects of tinkering with the delicate hormonal balance of a body that is either biologically male or female. Natal women who take testosterone, for example, will talk about how it fundamentally changes their personalities (more aggressive, both physically and sexually, and less likely to cry) and also leads to painful physical regression (such as vaginal atrophy) and sterility. We are reminded, on a basic biological level, that natal sex (and harmonious hormonal environment) matters.

### **LGB vs. T**

Ironically, in seeking to override the immutable reality of natal sex, transgender activists simultaneously obliterate the foundations of sexual identity. The categories of heterosexuality and homosexuality are (simplistically) based on the immutability of the natal sex binary (an attraction based on fundamental anatomical differences between males and females). When transgender activists insist that our natal sex (embodiment) is overruled by a separate gender identity, they simultaneously nullify the notion of homosexuality. After all, if natal sex is not real, then there is no way to distinguish heterosexuality and homosexuality (as genitals need not accord with gender identity). Some transgender activists have even argued that a gay-identified man is actually a woman trapped in a man’s body (who desires a “heteronormative” sexual relationship). There seems to be no quick resolution to this ideological contradiction.

In the LDS Family Proclamation (published in 1995), gender is proposed as “an essential characteristic of individual premortal, mortal, and eternal identity and purpose.” From this perspective, our gender existed before we experienced embodiment. President Oaks took care to clarify, in October, 2019, “Binary creation is essential to the plan of salvation ... The intended meaning of ‘gender’ in the family proclamation and as used in Church statements and publications since that time is biological sex at birth.” The promise of coherence between one’s natal sex and expressed gender is plainly evident in this clarification (and was a mainstream perspective for the bulk of hu-

man history).

What objective evidence exists that an individual may be born in the “wrong” body? This question is instructive for all emerging trans identities, not just those dealing with gender. What would a “trans-age” identity do to fundamentally change our notions of developmental age and personal responsibility? If an adult can claim to be “perpetually” younger (say, a “feeling” that they are “fixed” at the age of 20), would we ever expect such an individual to take on the demands of adulthood? If a 50-year-old individual suddenly identified as age 25, would the events and decisions of a portion of an established lifespan (prior years 26-50) suddenly disappear? As Williams et al. (this issue) notes, the ramifications for salvation history are indeed sobering.

A unique form of chaos promises to envelop our society as we increasingly abandon agentic sexuality and a respect for embodiment. The fickle nature of expressive individualism makes it likely that sexual and gender identities will endlessly proliferate, and will also be inherently unstable over time. An example from Hollywood, in which an individual has twice found “authenticity” in LGBTQ+ identities, provides perspective. Just over a year ago, Ellen Page, a Hollywood star who first came out as lesbian in 2014, announced she was now embracing a transgender identity (and a new name of Elliot). When she originally came out as lesbian, she proudly proclaimed, “I am here today because I am gay . . . I am tired of hiding . . . I suffered for years because I was scared to be out.” And yet, remarkably, about 6.5 years later, Elliot Page said, “I can’t begin to express how remarkable it feels to finally love who I am enough to pursue my authentic self.” Page has now found the “authentic self” twice in the list of LGBTQ+ acronyms, suggesting that the prior lesbian identity was “inauthentic”—that her lesbian pride was in fact an act of self-deception. Can one “true” self really be abandoned for another “true” self? The Page saga is not the only recent example, and it is likely that many others will follow suit. When we give undue emphasis to “currently” feelings as the primary arbiters of reality, we open Pandora’s Box to allow for any and all sexual or gender identities to claim status as innate and immutable realities (until, of course,

fluidity “occurs”).

### Order vs. Chaos

Once one considers the chaotic landscape that is emergent from our current societal reliance on unstable sexual and gender forces, it seems rather simple to propose that we are best served by revealed truths which give proper focus and emphasis. As Williams et al. (this issue) rightly suggest, it is most accurate to refer to what one “currently” thinks, says, or does about sexual (or gender) matters, which also allows us to embrace divine commandments which are intended to keep us tethered to reality and on a gospel path. As we view gender and sexuality through a gospel prism, we are most likely to achieve the purpose of sexual union—eternal families and identities, properly situated. I express my thanks to Richard Williams and his colleagues for their helpful illumination of these truths.

### References

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2019). 2019 youth risk behavior surveillance system [data set]. <https://nccd.cdc.gov/Youthonline/App/Results.aspx>.
- Cornell University (2013). Lisa diamond on sexual fluidity of men and women [video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m2rTHDOuUBw>.
- Diamond, L. (2018). Why the “born this way” argument doesn’t advance LGBT equality [video]. TED. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RjX-KBPm4g4>.
- Dyer, W. J., Goodman, M. A., and Wood, D. S. (2022). Religion and sexual orientation as predictors of Utah youth suicidality. *BYU Studies Quarterly*. Advance online publication. <https://foundations.prod.brigham-young.psdsops.com/0000017b-88a0-dafa-adff-eaeb8cd40001/religion-and-sexual-orientation-as-predictors-of-utah-youth-suicidality>.
- Fabrizio, D. (2014). Sexual fluidity [audio podcast episode]. In KUER RadioWest. KUER: NPR Utah. <https://radiowest.kuer.org/health-science/2014-08-18/sexual-fluidity>.

- Ganna, A., Verweij, K. J. H., Nivard, M. G., Maier, R., Wedow, R., Busch, A. S., Abdellaoui, A., Guo, S., Sathirapongsasuti, J. F., 23andme Research Team, Lichtenstein, P., Lundström, P., Långström, N., Auton, A., Mullan Harris, K., Beecham, G. W., Martin, E. R., Sanders, A. R., Perry, J. R. B., Neale, B. M., and Zietsch, B. P. (2019). Large-scale GWAS reveals insights into the genetic architecture of same-sex sexual behavior. *Science*, 365(6456):eaat7693. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.aat7693>.
- Iqbal, N. (2019). No lust at first sight: Why thousands are now identifying as “demisexual.” *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/sep/07/no-lust-at-first-sight-day-i-finally-realised-i-was-a-demisexual>.
- Klundt, J. S., Erikson, D. M., Lynn, A. M., and Brown, H. E. (2021). Sexual minorities, mental health, and religiosity at a religiously conservative university. *Personality and Individual Differences*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110475>.
- Lefevor, G. T., Beckstead, A. L., Schow, R. L., Raynes, M., Mansfield, T. R., and Rosik, C. H. (2019). Satisfaction and health within four sexual identity relationship options. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 45:355–369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2018.1531333>.
- Lefevor, G. T., Davis, E. B., Paiz, J. Y., and Smack, A. C. P. (2021). The relationship between religiousness and health among sexual minorities: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 147(7):647–666. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000321>.
- Lefevor, G. T., Sorrell, S. A., Kappers, G., Plunk, A., Schow, R. L., Rosik, C. H., and Beckstead, A. L. (2020). Same-sex attracted, not LGBTQ: The associations of sexual identity labeling on religiousness, sexuality, and health among Mormons. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 67:940–964. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2018.1564006>.
- Mansfield, T. (2014). “Mormons can be gay, they just can’t do gay”: Deconstructing sexuality and identity from an LDS perspective. FAIR: Faithful Answers, Informed Response. <https://www.fairlatterdaysaints.org/conference/august-2014/mormons-can-gay-just-cant-gay#en13>.
- To The Best of Our Knowledge (2017). Love+evolution: The new science of sexual fluidity [video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-bje1k8XXBs>.
- Williams, R. N., Gantt, E. E., Christensen, M. R., and Tubbs, J. D. (2026). Embodied moral agency as foundation: Human sexuality as a test case. *The Sharon Institute Journal of Faith and Scholarship*, 1(1).