

Analysis of a television, online or radio talk show argument

[Linguistics](#), [English](#)



Argument Analysis of All New Dr. Phil's Talk Show on Same Sex Marriage The issue of same-sex marriage is severely dividing the American society today. It is a conflict between those who believe that all people is entitled to the same rights and privileges that the Constitution guarantees and those who argue that marriage should only be for a man and a woman. In All New Dr. Phil talk show the issue of whether same sex marriage is right or wrong is heatedly discussed between the two camps. Those who argue for same sex marriage are usually equality advocates and liberal policymakers, whereas those who argue against it are religiously inclined individuals. The main argument of the pro-group is that the issue of same sex marriage has been tarnished by lies and black propaganda. The opposite camp responds with a religious nuance—God only allowed a marital union between opposite sex, and it is a sin to do otherwise.

There are three components of argumentation—the claim, the support, and the warrant. The claim is the argumentation's component that responds to the issues. A claim can be categorized into three: claims of policy, claims of value, and claims of fact (Phillips & Bostian 239). The claim of policy is a form of claim that stresses the enforcement of a specific policy thinking that the specific policy will be able to resolve a specific issue. In this talk show, the claim of policy is a policy supporting same sex marriage, like that in California. According to the pro-camp, policies guaranteeing the rights of homosexuals are ought to be constitutionally justifiable for they safeguard human equality. On the other hand, the anti-camp believes that such policies will only further undermine the already threatened institution of marriage. The claim of fact is the form of claim that emphasizes that a particular

situation has confirmed to have existed, remains existent, or will continue to exist. The claim of the pro-camp is that discrimination against gays and lesbians has existed, still existing, and will continue to exist if the right to marry is denied to them. On the other hand, the claim of value is the form of assertion that is regarded as an effort to show that a specific issue is less favorable or more favorable than the others. The anti-camp claims that it is immoral or a sin to allow same sex marriage. They refer to the Bible or religious teachings to support this claim.

The support of both the pro- and anti-camp is strong. The pro-camp uses legal, scientific, and practical evidence, whereas the anti-camp uses religious, cultural, and societal values. Lastly, the warrant is the component of the argument that assures the reliability between the connection of the claim and the support. Warrants have been stated for this particular issue because the audiences are suspicious or antagonistic in the claims that were being given, especially by the anti-same sex marriage camp.

Works Cited

“ Dr. Phil-Same-Sex Marriage: Right or Wrong?” Youtube. Uploaded by SuchisLifeVideos. Youtube, 2014. Video.

Phillips, Harry & Patricia Bostian. *The Purposeful Argument: A Practical Guide*. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning, 2011. Print.