

Free essay about responses

[Sociology](#), [Social Issues](#)



\n[[toc title="Table of Contents"](#)]\n

\n \t

1. [Text 1: Sprigg](#) \n \t
2. [Text 2: Friedman](#) \n \t
3. [Text 3: Tisdale](#) \n \t
4. [Works Cited](#) \n

\n[/toc]\n \n

For the purposes of this reader’s log, I focused on the topic of gay marriage, with the essay “ Gay Marriage Should Not Be Legal” by Peter Sprigg. The primary arguments in the essay revolve around the consequences for legalizing gay marriage, which the author believes are largely negative. Despite believing that their arguments are in the right, the article relies upon a number of incredibly broad assumptions about same-sex couples, inherent prejudice and stereotypes against homosexuals, and an openly dim view of their opponents.

The article uses language that is meant to casually dismiss advocates’ benefits as naï ve and innocent. Phrases like “ some advocatesscoff at the idea that it could harm anyone” characterize same-sex marriage advocates as sneering, smug ivory-tower intellectuals who do not take the author’s concerns seriously. The notion of same-sex marriage is always put in quotations (same-sex “ marriage”), thus indicating the author’s inability to take the issue seriously, which directly hurts their credibility.

Also, the author takes some incredible presumptions with the implications of gay marriage, such as presuming that the teaching of gay relationships with straight ones equally is a bad thing; they state that gay marriage would

<https://assignbuster.com/free-essay-about-responses/>

bring this about, but fail to adequately explain why this is a negative. Other presumptive arguments the author engages in revolve around the institution of marriage being fundamentally about procreation; the author fails to admonish childless couples or couples who adopt, making it difficult to take seriously the argument that only gay people should be forbidden from marrying because they will not have biological children.

Another particularly confusing and perplexing issue is the religious argument, relating the discrimination against homosexuals as an infringement of “religious liberty.” The author claims that gay marriage would force religious individuals to tolerate same-sex marriage, but forgets to explain how tolerating those who do not share their beliefs threatens the individual in any way; after all, non-religious people can peacefully co-exist with religious people without infringing upon religious liberty. All in all, the author’s article is full of spurious arguments, great leaps in logic, and problematic ambiguity that do not hold up to critical thinking, making it an unsuccessful and unconvincing argument against gay marriage.

Text 1: Sprigg

In “Gay Marriage Should Not Be Legal” by Peter Sprigg, the purpose of the paper is to persuade people to oppose same-sex marriage, by pointing out ten major consequences for society if gay marriage were to be made legal and accepted within society. This is made clear in passages like “there would be both immediate and long-term harms that would come from legalizing same sex marriage” (Sprigg). The tone of the article is quite presumptive and dismissive, but in a highly charged issue such as this it can read one of two ways. For example, passages that refer to legalization of

same sex marriage as a “tragedy” may be seen as triumphant, rebellious rhetoric from someone who agrees with that perspective, or as snide and judgmental from someone who opposes it.

There are many different instances of vagueness and ambiguity that hurt Sprigg’s argument. In his point that marriages would lower in longevity if gay people got married (since gay relationships are more flighty and ephemeral, he argues), Sprigg notes, “Once again, abundant research has borne out this point.” However, the use of the word ‘abundant’ is vague, as how much the author means by ‘abundant’ is left up to the reader, as well as how convincingly it has ‘borne out this point’ against same-sex marriage. These instances make the paper seem to rest on a judgmental, half-considered understanding of same-sex marriage resting on comfortable prejudices, which makes it rather limp as an argument. I would fix these issues of ambiguity, but I get the impression that adding this detail would derail these incomplete arguments for forbidding a fundamental human right.

Text 2: Friedman

In the New York Times op-ed “A Festival of Lies,” the purpose of the text is to criticize the US intervention in the Middle East, persuading its readers that America has been ineffective in its interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan. Friedman has a very cynical view of American intervention, which is conveyed through his pessimistic and dismissive tone: “What the Middle East needs most from America today are modern schools and hard truths, and we haven’t found a way to offer either” (Friedman, 2012). The different approaches to the Middle East are said to have “sadly not worked yet,” Friedman expressing his dismay at the lack of progress being made.

There are a few more instances in which this cynical tone are found, such as in some of the doom-saying phrases that Friedman draws out, such as characterizing American as “ sticking with a bad war for fear of being called wimps and selling more tanks to people who can’t read.” While these are harsh in time, they are not vague or ambiguous, as the article elucidates in detail exactly what they are talking about through examples of political maneuvering to keep us in the Middle East, and the evidence of offloading military equipment to local police without actually rebuilding infrastructure and offering education.

Text 3: Tisdale

Tisdale, in her essay “ We Do Abortions Here: A Nurse’s Story,” seeks to make the experience of being an abortion nurse relatable to people on both sides of the abortion argument. This is done by both showing how difficult she finds her job to be because of the harsh choice women have to make, but also arguing that this is often the best choice for these women: “ In abortion the absolute must always be tempered by the contextual, because both are real, both valid, both hard” (Tisdale). The tone of the story is harrowing and graphic, hoping to shock readers into the reality of abortions, as well as the begrudging issues that stem from having such an unsavory but necessary job: “‘How can you stand it?’ Even the client asks” (Tisdale).

Works Cited

Friedman, Thomas L. " A Festival of Lies." New York Times Sunday Review. 24 March 2012.

< <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/25/opinion/sunday/friedman-a-festival-of-lies.html>>.

Sprigg, Peter. " Gay Marriage Should Not Be Legal." Gay Marriage. Ed. Debra A. Miller.

Detroit: Greenhaven Press, 2012. At Issue. Rpt. from " The Top Ten Harms of Same-Sex Marriage." Family Research Council, 2011. Opposing Viewpoints in Context. Web. 15 Nov. 2014.

Tisdale, Sallie. " We Do Abortions Here: A Nurse's Story." In The Norton Reader (13th ed.).

1987. New York: W. W Norton & Company, Inc., 2012. Print.