
Same-Sex Marriage Weakens The Institution Of Marriage

Weakness in article

Strawman fallacy

Strawman fallacy is an opponent's position is misrepresented to make it easier to critique.

The first fallacy is Anderson (2015) stated that "weakening marital norms and severing the connection of marriage with responsible procreation are the admitted goals of many prominent advocates of redefining marriage." For the paragraph, the author state that many prominent advocates of refining marriage but the paragraph did not give any supporting statement of prominent to justify the weakening marriage can sever the relationship between marriage and responsible procreation. But the author makes the mean it sound like the many prominent advocates the refining marriage and easy to let people misunderstand and believe it. To avoid this fallacy, the author can give some supporting statement which many prominent advocates of refining marriage put into the paragraph, or the author needs to clarify the problem in the conclusion.

The second fallacy is Anderson (2015) stated that "for many supporters of redefining marriage, such infringements on religious liberty are not flaws but virtues of the movement." In the paragraph, the supporters have the idea of infringements are virtues of the movement, but the author did not provide a statement or evidence to prove that supporters think this violation of religious freedom is not a weakness, but a strength of the movement. The author just makes misrepresented to make it easy to misunderstand. To avoid this fallacy, the author can put the research or statement to prove that how many supporters of redefining marriages such infringements on religious liberty are not flaws but virtues of the movement.

False cause

The logical fallacy of arguing that two events that are correlated, are assumed to be a causal connection. In others words, one event causes the other.

The fallacy of false cause is Michelangelo Signorile urges same-sex couples to 'demand the right to marry not as a way of adhering to society's moral codes but rather to debunk a myth and radically alter an archaic institution.' (Signorile n.d.). This statement who using full authority to describe the issue. He said marriage was not about abiding by a moral code, but about debunking a myth. Marriage is not the same as myth. He changes the subject from marriage to myth. To avoid this fallacy, notice that tends to think that one thing causes another. Be skeptical of your assumptions, open-minded to different interpretations, and willing to change your mind. In this way, it will be less susceptible to error-cause reasoning.

Furthermore, the next fallacy is non-discrimination law may make even private actors with no legal or financial ties to the government—including businesses and religious organizations—liable to civil suits for refusing to treat same-sex relationships as marriages. In today's hostile traditional marriage culture, people who follow the tradition of marriage between a man and a

woman, private sectors can be restricted, dismissed or reject professional certification to those who express support for traditional marriage. As the author notes, it is a fallacy that traditional notions of marriage are promoted in the culture of private actors. This happen will frighten the audience's traditional view of marriage, but do not dare to resist. But there is not enough evidence to prove its absurd consequences. To avoid this fallacy, the author needs to provide enough evidence or supporters to clarify the problem.

Authority fallacy

The meaning of authority fallacy is the person which no authority or power to argue the issue.

The fallacy of authority fallacy is Andrew Sullivan(n.d.) stated that “who has extolled the 'spirituality' of 'anonymous sex,' also thinks that the 'openness' of same-sex unions could enhance the bonds of husbands and wives: Same-sex unions often incorporate the virtues of friendship more effectively than traditional marriages; and at times, among gay male relationships, the openness of the contract makes it more likely to survive than many heterosexual bonds... There is more likely to be a greater understanding of the need for extramarital outlets between two men than between a man and a woman... Something of the gay relationship's necessary honesty, its flexibility, and its equality could undoubtedly help strengthen and inform many heterosexual bonds.” The paragraph state that marriage openness can be a virtue of friendship and honesty in homosexual relationships, leading to greater understanding and strengthening of heterosexual relationships, but not every cheating marriage will have a deeper understanding, may also cause misunderstanding, there is no morality, because it is unfair to the other half because psychological and physical cheating will have a great impact on the other half, there is no friendship ethics, so there will be no sense of responsibility and left a bad impression on the other half really hurt and creating may also affect children become bad behavior in the future, which can lead to an unhappy marriage. To avoid this fallacy, do not use self-opinion to make an argument, should providing the actual evidence.

Moreover, the next fallacy is ‘in a New York Times Magazine profile, gay activist Dan Savage encourages spouses to adopt a more flexible attitude’ about allowing each other to seek sex outside their marriage.’ (Savage n.d.) The author quotes Dan savage, who is not an LGBT expert, as advising people to seek out extramarital affairs. Dan savage had no right to make such a statement because it would have convinced the audience that the affair was logical. But in reality, extramarital love is illogical. To avoid this fallacy, the author needs to provide more data and suitable reasons to support his argument.

Texas Sharpshooter fallacy

Texas sharpshooter fallacy is inventing a hypothesis after observations are made, and using the same observations to confirm the hypothesis while ignoring data that falsifies it.

The fallacy is ‘in the statement of 'Beyond Same-Sex Marriage,' more than 300 'LGBT and allied' scholars and advocates call for legally recognizing sexual relationships involving more than two partners.’ (Stacey n.d.). The paragraph state that more than 300 LGBT are calling for legal recognition of sexual relationships between more than two partners, but not all people is admitting sexual relations with more than two partners. In fact, many LGBT people do not call for legal recognition of sexual relations between more than two partners. To avoid this fallacy,

the paragraph needs to add more LGBT people to support or find out more people admit sexual relations with more than two partners.

Anecdotal

The meaning of anecdotal is using personal observation or experience to make arguments and not systematic scientific evaluation.

The fallacy is Ryan(2015) mentioned "Newsweek reported that the United States already had over 500,000 polyamorous households in 2009. The author concluded: Perhaps the practice is more natural than we think: a response to the challenges of monogamous relationships, whose shortcomings ... are clear. Everyone in a relationship wrestles at some point with an eternal question: can one person really satisfy every need? Polyamorists think the answer is obvious—and that it's only a matter of time before the monogamous world sees there's more than one way to live and love." Marriage exists to bring a man and a woman together as husband and wife. The author has no way to prove that more than 500,000 polyamorous households support that there are many kinds of polygynous life and love, nor that monogamy is not only one way of life and love, therefore all from his past experience. To prevent the fallacy, the author can put the evidence or accurate information into the paragraph to prove his statement is true and believable.

Appeal to authority

Appeal to authority is also called Ad Verecundiam. It is when someone uses an appeal to authority as an argument.

The fallacy is 'The New York Times recently reported on a study finding that exclusivity was not the norm among gay partners: "With straight people, it's called affairs or cheating,' said Colleen Hoff, the study's principal investigator, 'but with gay people, it does not have such negative connotations.' (Hoff n.d.) This paragraph state that a study recently reported that found no exclusivity between gay couples. It does not have proof of the research or statistics that a homosexual affair is not an affair and affair is no a negative meaning. The author used his power to say that cheating is cheating for straight people, but not for same-sex people. This is groundless. Because he is using his power to speak, everyone may influence and believe the argument through his authority. To avoid this fallacy, the paragraph needs more evidence of study or research to support the no exclusivity between same-sex couples or assess expert relevance and do not use authority to state something is untrue.