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Introduction In his essay “ The case against same-sex marriage crumbles,” Andrew Sullivan has put forth the argument in favor of same-sex marriage, and has proposed that same-sex marriages should be made legal. To prove his point, he has used the so called disadvantages and problems of heterosexual marriage as his weapons. However, his points completely fail to appeal the reader as they not only show his narrow minded approach but also his inability to see the other side of the situation. Unfortunately for Sullivan, the points that he uses to degrade the heterosexual marriage are the same points which prove why heterosexual marriages are a need and necessity of the society. In an attempt to show the positive aspects of gay marriage, he has ended up disclosing the negative and harmful practices that gay marriage can potentially inculcate in adults.   
Weak points in Sullivan’s argument   
The first point that is disagreeable in Sullivan’s essay is his comparison of heterosexual people with gays. The point he makes is that gays are asking for the equal status similar to that of the heterosexuals asked for during 1970’s. By this, he means that gays should be included in society without any hesitation and should be treated equally. However, what he fails to understand is that when heterosexuals were asking for equal status, they were asking for equal status ‘ and’ respect for the ‘ opposite’ and ‘ unique’ responsibilities that women were carrying out in their married life. Females were never given importance and respect for their role in the development and growth of their families. Hence, they were asking to be given ‘ equal’ status to men. However, in gay marriages there is no such friction as gays cannot fulfill the role of female no matter how feminine a partner is. Hence, comparing gay people’s demand for equal status to the demand of equal status by heterosexuals is absurd.   
Secondly, Sullivan talks about the psychological wounds that gay men suffer due to heterosexual marriages they are forced into. However, Sullivan fails to look into the future of same-sex marriage. The same-sex marriage can cause immense psychological problems and deeper wounds on children as child needs both, a father and a mother, for healthy emotional and psychological growth.   
Third point that is unacceptable in Sullivan’s argument is his idea of sexual freedom that gays enjoy. Sullivan is saying that sexual freedom is in having sex with anyone and anytime you want to. According to him, more partners mean more freedom. It is difficult to understand how he has come to this conclusion. He says that monogamy creates stress and strain in heterosexual marriage, indicating that if one partner indulges in sexual relationship out of marriage, then other partner feels jealous and does not accept it. However, the point is, this is also applicable in gay marriages. Sullivan is ‘ assuming’ that gay people do not harbor any emotional or psychological attachments to their partners the way heterosexual people do. However, every human being, no matter what sexual orientation he is of, develops emotional attachment to his partner. Hence, it is absurd to assume that gay people do not have emotional, physical and psychological attachments with their partners. However, one can find many cases where infidelity has caused stress and strain in gay unions.   
Conclusion   
The discussion above proves that Sullivan’s attempt to prove gay marriages as happy unions compared to heterosexual marriages has backfired severely and in fact, has convinced the reader that gay marriages are nothing but demand of those people who are not capable of understanding the importance and necessity of commitment and union between male and female and hence, not capable of being a responsible part of the society.   
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