

Consider these two arguments:

(H1) Homosexuality is unnatural

(H3) Therefore, it's wrong.

And:

(E1) Eating meat is natural.

(E3) Therefore, it's not wrong.

I've heard arguments like this many times, so there must be people out there that find them persuasive. But they're both pretty bad arguments when you evaluate them carefully.

It's important to carefully consider ALL of the premises, including those that are left unstated. Sometimes, an argument looks plausible until you take a closer look at the suppressed premises.

So what premises are suppressed here? Well, the first argument needs this premise:

(H2) Anything unnatural is wrong.

And the second argument needs this premise:

(E2) Nothing natural is wrong.

Now that we've made these premises explicit, I hope it's clear how bad these arguments are. Let's ignore the fact that H1 is open to objections—after all, there's evidence of homosexuality in nature. Let's focus only on the second premises. Both of these are open to obvious counterexamples.

For instance, riding the elevator is unnatural. So is using a computer or watching tiktoks. But clearly none of those things are wrong. So H2 is false.

And sexually forcing yourself on another, dominating the weak, and killing rivals over a mate are all natural, but they're clearly wrong. So E2 is false.

So, when evaluating an argument, make sure to scrutinize *every part of it*, including the parts that are hidden, since that's often where the mistakes slip in.