|  |
| --- |
| **BEGIN 1**  Turn No: 1: S1:  Opposing same-sex marriage is hate. Society has never opposed a group's equality, with no rational reason, when that reason isn't hate, insecurity, fear. And it isn't long when debating with opponents that their hatred comes out very blantantly. Archangel's argument is laughable. He says they don't hate us as individuals, just everything we represent as being wrong, unnatural etc. That boils down to the same thing! Gansao condescends to us by calling us spoiled children because the majority group with power won't "let us have", what they have.  Turn No: 1: S2:  Its not hate. It is drawing a line where pandering to sexual deviants stop.  Turn No: 2: S1:  They said the same garbage during debate on inter-racial marriage. They tried to say those relationships were only about naughty sex. It was just bigotry, and it is in the case of same-sex marriage.  Turn No: 2: S2:  Inter racial couples do not practise deviant sex.  Turn No: 3: S1:  Neither do gay people. You have failed to show that. Most people do not care what gay people do sexually. At any rate, you don't have a problem with gay persons having sex, I believe you said. Why does it suddenly make a difference because it's happening in a marriage? Why should the official recognition of gay relationships affect you? It's your own insecurity coming to light.  Turn No: 3: S2:  We should be tolerant of gay deviant sex. We shouldnt welcome it.  Turn No: 4: S1:  Because it just might look TOO GOOD to yourself and/or others?  Turn No: 4: S2:  Yeah yeah. When the gay paints himself in a corner he throws out the same old insults |

**Summary Pilot**

**Imagine you are trying to summarize the following debates for a friend. Please read each of the following 5 short debates carefully, summarizing the main points in your own words at the end of each debate.**

**S1 and S2 indicate the different writers of these typed debates. The Turn numbers indicate turns of each writer. Turn 1: S1 indicates the first turn by Writer 1, and Turn 1: S2 indicates the first turn by Writer 2). The writers across the 8 debates are not the same people.**

http://www.4forums.com/political/gay-rights-debates/13537-gay-marriage-opponents-keep-streak-alive-16.html

Ganaso , **gayhumanist**

**Your summary of Debate 1**

<http://www.4forums.com/political/gay-rights-debates/13537-gay-marriage-opponents-keep-streak-alive-16.html>

ganaso,jitobear

|  |
| --- |
| **BEGIN 2**  Turn No: 1: S1:  Gays..you wont let me have everything I want so you must hate me. Spoil child..you wont let me have everything I want so you must hate me.  Turn No: 1: S2:  And who made you master daddy that you think it is your place to grant or disallow anything to your fellow citizens?  Turn No: 2: S1:  Did I say that I was and it is?  Turn No: 2: S2:  You implied it when you compared gays (and their supporters) fighting for rights to spoiled children. For the analogy to work there has to be a parent figure for the gays as well.  Turn No: 3: S1:  The public is the 'parent' figure and the law makers are ( or should be) the public's servant.  Turn No: 3: S2:  This then implies that homosexuals are are not part of the public and the law-makers are not their servants as well, and that you do indeed believe it is your right to allow and disallow things to your fellow citizens. That they are lesser group than you. You just proved your hate.  Turn No: 4: S1:  Homosexuals are a deviant minority. |

**Your summary of Debate 2**

|  |
| --- |
| **BEGIN 3**  Turn No: 1: S1:  Its nothing like racial segregation....  Turn No: 1: S2:  It's everything like racial segregation and every kind of segregation throughout the course of history. Every time prejudice/racism/sexism/anti-semetism/homophobia/etc. is challenged the perpetrators always claim "this is nothing like the last". But it always is. This is no exception.  Turn No: 2: S1:  What are you talking about? Tell me what I contend is not segregation? I dont think you know, I think you are just running at the mouth/ keypad without knowing what you are actually commenting on!  Turn No: 2: S2:  You think wrong. What makes you think this kind of discrimination is any different?  Turn No: 3: S1:  So what did I contend was not segregation?  Turn No: 3: S2:  You said "Its nothing like racial segregation....", which implies that if society did the same thing to gays that they did to blacks it would be different, or less wrong.  Turn No: 4: S1:  Wrong! Try again. What did I actually contend was nothing like segregation not what you thought I did. You jumped in with your silly little rant without actually knowing the point I made.  Turn No: 4: S2:  Then you should've said "It's nothing like segregation". Don't blame me for your mistakes.  Turn No: 5: S1:  You still dont know what you are talking about do you? My response to Addison was correct. This is why you cannot be taken seriously. You are wrong  Turn No: 5: S2:  \*Facepalm\* I didn't say your response wasn't correct, I said it was phrased wrong. What makes you think throwing a temper tantrum will validate your argument? Funny how you call me an immature child yet you are the one slinging insults and personal attacks when you don't get your way.  Turn No: 6: S1:  So I will ask you once again.... So what did I contend was not segregation? I you dont know that then you dont know whether my responce was correct or not You dont know do you? Thats why I am not insulting you, I am just stating a fact |

**Your summary of Debate 3**

|  |
| --- |
| **BEGIN 4**Turn No: 1: S1: So when Gay marriage is finally allowed. what's the next step? Positive discrimination? A campaign for more gay congressmen teachers, police etc etc Insisting that a more postive approach to gay sex should be taught in schools..maybe insisting that equal time should be given to gay sex in schools sex education. Where will it end?Turn No: 1: S2:What's the problem with any of that? Where will it all end you ask? Equality.Turn No: 2: S1:I thought so.You will not be happy until an old man will be able to sodomise a young boy without being criticised, let alone prosecuted. And that is just the start of it.Turn No: 2: S2:Well, of course, that's exactly what I was saying. Because an old man can now rape a young girl without being prosecuted. That's what I meant by equality. But by the way, pedophilia has nothing to do with sexual orientation, gay or straight. I don't want your ignorant little brats, gansao, if indeed you have any. That's a fear tactic. At one time people were prejudiced against Jewish people, by advancing "blood libel" myth. It was said that Jews kidnapped Christian children and used them in human sacrifices. This is the same idea, connecting pedophilia to gay people.Turn No: 3: S1:Who said anything about rape? Peter Tatchell , a British gay activist advocated the age of consent being changed to 14 years old. You see all the straight people know that whatever ther gays get, they will want more..and you just proved it. You will never be happy to be tolerated..you want to be in a position that YOU will tolerate straightsTurn No: 3: S2:Did he say it should only be lowered for gay relationships? Probably not. Are there straight people who would advocate for changing the age of consent? Yes. There are different arguments for and against lowering the age of consent which have nothing to do with gay equality rights.Turn No: 4: S1:Peter Tatchell the gay activist ..was campaigning for GAY people. The fact that straights would be included would be incidental.Turn No: 4: S2:He doesn't speak for every gay person. It's not at all incidental, if straight relationships were included. It's a separate set of arguments at any rate, from the ones that apply to gay equality. He was campaigning of the issue of age of consent. He was also campaigning for straight people who believe the age of consent should be lowered. It is possible to not lower the age of consent, and have gay marriage, or other gay equality issues.Turn No: 5: S1:Tatchell did not campaign for straight people. He may even have said he did, I dont care if he did or didnt. I do not know of any prominent gay person who dissagreed with him.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**Your summary of Debate 4**

|  |
| --- |
| **BEGIN 5**  Turn No: 1: S1:  It never changed, homosexual advocates are trying to change it. In your example you proposed that churches could be forced to only open at one time, you don't have the right to force that as opening a church is not a violation of rights. However it is perfectly justified to force you not to take others money through force or use force to extract submission, respect, recognition etc...  Turn No: 1: S2:  I see you're still spewing this lie. Marriage never had a official definition as between a man and a woman until you religious fanatics felt the need to define it. Gay people are trying to go back to the way it was before DOMA, where there was no definition... and for your information the Constitution gives Congress the Power to lay taxes on you as well as everyone else. They are within their rights as elected officials to use force to make you pay your share ... and we already know you will because you only talk big but will not back up your position with action.  Turn No: 2: S1:  What did marriage mean before DOMA?  Turn No: 2: S2:  Technically it didn't have an official definition. It was just looked at as Marriage. Go back and do some reading, you might learn something. A Gay Couple in Hawaii decided to get Married, they were denied a Marriage license, they filed a Lawsuit and the State Supreme Court granted them the license and said it was unconstitutional to discriminate on the basis that they were gay. In fear that other states would be required to recognize Gay Marriages due to the Full Faith and Credit Clause DOMA was passed, Applying a Definition to Marriage as being between one man and one woman. It also changed the wording of the Fair Faith and Credit Clause relieving the states from having to recognize Gay marriages from other states. DOMA is and always has been Unconstitutional and it's just a matter of time before the Supreme Court hears the case . For someone who claims to be all about Liberty and Freedom you sure have a stick up your XXX about Gay rights.....  Turn No: 3: S1:  First answer my question, what did it mean. You've attempted to engage me before so you know full well that if you don't answer that question I will simply ask it again and I will keep asking it until you either shut up or give the answer. You could call it childish but that would make about as much sense as last time given that it was you who was refusing to answer the question and not I who refused to ask it. Second, how is it that a word without an official definition can be used in law? Even so far as to define rules for inheritance and taxation?  Turn No: 3: S2:  What part of NO DEFINITION do you not understand? You have to remember we're talking about the Constitution here. In the Original Constitution of the United States of America Marriage was never Defined as being between a man and a woman. They applied no definition because they probably didn't think in the 1700's that Marriage needed a definition. They passed DOMA to specifically apply such a definition to discriminate against a group of people. Before DOMA the definition of Marriage would be .... 1 a : being in the state of matrimony 2 : united, joined Nothing about a man and woman , that was added for the purpose to discriminate.  Turn No: 4: S1:  The self-contradictory part where it was used for communication yet had no meaning. If it has no definition homosexuals cannot meet the criteria of null, therefore they can never be married. Is 1913 before DOMA? http://1913.mshaffer.com/d/search/\_words.word,marriage What about 1828? http://www.1828-dictionary.com/d/word/marriage Or how about ancient rome? http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/...trimonium.html and hey look it's that whole rascal nero again, 'marrying' pretty much anyone he wanted regardless of roman law .  Turn No: 4: S2:  You really are dense aren't you. There was no Definition as applied to the LAW or the Constitution. So how long did it take you to find the dictionary definition that fit your position, not long I'm sure. You're still wrong, as far as the Constitution and the Laws of the United states there was no "Legal" definition before DOMA. |

**Your summary of Debate 5**

|  |
| --- |
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