1. Most people think that homosexuality (HS) is immoral.
2. So, all gays are immoral.
3. So, society’s treatment (e.g., discrimination in employment, housing, careers, etc.) of all gays is morally justified.

Argument structure: 1 → 2 → 3

Problems:
1. Premise 1 is only descriptive, and one cannot deduce morality from facts. So, 1 → 2 is invalid.
2. The inference 1 → 2 also commits the *ad populum* fallacy (appeal to popularity): Just because everyone believes – for any stretch of time – that X is wrong (right, true, false) does not prove that X is wrong (right, true, false).

(B) Revision of 1 → 2: Religions condemn HS, so HS is immoral.

Problems: Premise 1 is still insufficient for 2: religions have condemned morally permissible actions (e.g., diets, clothing, gender equality), and have made serious moral mistakes, e.g., Christianity endorsed slavery, sexism.

(C) Revision of 1 → 2: Bible morally condemns HS, so HS is morally wrong.


Does anyone of any religion have a moral right to impose their religious views onto others?

(D) Revision of 1 → 2: HS is unnatural, so HS is immoral.

Problems: Meaning/criteria of “unnatural”?
If the criteria are only descriptive, the inference is invalid.
If it means “artificial” “made by humans” “not occurring in nature”, then this criteria is much too broad, for we would have to morally condemn all the sciences, arts, and even religions. If it means that sexuality in HS fails to fulfill its procreative function in nature, then the inference is still invalid. Sexual organs, like most bodily parts, can have many functions. Sexually active married couples who have no children are not acting immorally. Not conforming to bodily functions is not sufficient for immorality: if I cease to use my legs to walk, but only drag myself or pedal to different locations, I’m acting impractically, but not immorally; if I cease to use my hands and arms to hold anything, but only use them to try to fly like a bird, I’m acting stupidly, but not immorally. Nature by itself is not sufficient to provide moral models (213.2.1), e.g., incest exists for most animals.

(E) Is argument 2 → 3: all gays are immoral. So, society’s treatment (discrimination, etc.) of all gays is morally justified?
(A) 1. If sexual orientation (SO) is something over which an individual has no control, then discrimination against gays is immoral. 2. SO is something over which an individual has no control. 3. So, discrimination against gays is immoral.

Valid argument, but is 2 true?
1. One typically does not choose one’s SO, but discovers it: one does not set out and practice to become a HS.
2. If SO were a matter of choice, then given the past persecution of gays, there would be very few gays today.
   What do gays say on this matter?

(B) If one (a society) adopts actions or attitudes that prevent someone from achieving the richness of life, then one (or that society) is acting immorally (213.1.1) Such is the case with discrimination against HS.

(C) Most HS desire a permanent lover.

(D) Most HS waste a lot of psychological energy (that could be more creatively used for society) in their daily lives.

(E) If gays were socially accepted, civilization would not morally collapse. Evidence: countries where HS has been accepted have not morally collapsed; the family has not collapsed.

(A&B) imply that discrimination against HS is immoral. (C&D) imply that ending discrimination against HS would lead to a greater social good. (E) implies that ending discrimination against HS would not lead to a greater social harm.