Same sex marriage shoul be allowed



The principal issue presented by the source is that same-sex marriages should be allowed just like opposite-sex marriages are allowed, saying that there is no difference whatsoever between the two types of marriages.

The bias in the article is presented by the author and represents an opinion which is opposite to hers. That is that same-sex marriages should not be allowed since marriage leads to procreating children, something which cant be done by two same-sex people, and also that same-sex unions and acts are banned by religion and have been for thousands of years and declared as abominations.

There are no parts in the article that are vague or ambiguous. The writer clearly states her opinion and anchors it by using examples and evidence given by the Supreme Court, regional courts and rulings in specific states, as well as writings from the US Constitution.

The source is most credible since it gives abundant proof and evidence regarding previous trials and rulings regarding to same-sex marriages and unions, as well as ones of opposite-sex marriages and conception of children, and the state of children it opposite-sex marriages as proof that they are not necessarily happy or even safe in that type of family.

The article doesnt use any rhetorical devices. It is written to the point, in an interesting and fluent way. It is also very straightforward and relevant, presenting the reader with all necessary facts and opinions.

The fallacies mentioned by the author are those of those who oppose samesex marriage. She states that marriage and sex between gay people were once very prevalent and acceptable, and it wasnt until the Jewish Torah that they were banned. She also states that it is incorrect to suggest that children will not grow to be happy, healthy and safe in homes with same-sex parents, and illustrated that a staggering percentage of children who are not well taken care of come from opposite-sex homes when both parents are present (not a single parent family). Furthermore, she protests the right of religion to interfere with the institution of marriage, which is a civil right and matter.

One argument made by the writer is that marriage is a civil and most basic right which should be given to anyone who so pleases. It is a declaration of a couple who wants to be together, spend their lives together in a close and intimate relationship. Seeing as how it is a basic human right, there shouldnt be a ban on it for a segment of the society. It even predates the constitution of the US as a basic right for all human beings wherever they are, and that is exactly what the constitution is based on.

The conclusion of the author is that same-sex marriages and ability to adopt and raise children should by no means be banned since these are basic, fundamental human rights that cannot be excluded from a sector in society, especially not by religion which has no right interfering with a civil matter, and since the evidence only shows that children in same-sex families do grow to be happy, healthy and safe.

The authors arguments are most valid, sound and strong. She uses evidence from the US Constitution and rulings of the Supreme and other regional courts, while also stating the boundaries between civil and religious matters. She brings to writing every possible explanation and reasons why these basic rights should be granted indiscriminately and justifies it very well. The author uses moral reasoning. She claims correctly that to deny a segment of the society such fundamental and important human rights is a terrible injustice, one that should not under any circumstances be allowed. It is wrong and unjustified to discriminate against same-sex people, especially

when all evidence points to their being more than able to maintain good marriages and raise happy, healthy and safe children. Therefore, a persons right to marry his loved one and have a family is not to be banned.