**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.

|  |
| --- |
| **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 |

**Your summary of Debate 1**

|  |
| --- |
| **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** BEGINTurn No: 1: S1: Of course they would still apply. Who cares if those involved are in love or not? It's just a contract between any two people. If I want my best friend to inherit or to make medical decisions, I could marry them. I don't have to actually have any romantic feelings, since it's just a contract. The big deal is basically what you've said in this post. Marriage is meaningful. It has been a custom that has not included homosexual people (with rare if any exceptions). You want to change that meaning, this custom. When you change the meaning of something that is actually very meaningful to a great deal of people don't be surprised if you tick off a portion of that population. .Turn No: 1: S2:That is the whole point isn't it. Marriage is a contract between the state and the two people involved. The whole ironic thing is to the anti gay christianists that are so opposed to gay marries the religious marriage is what counts and is the important aspect but they can not stop gay people from getting religious marriage only the contract from the state, which to the anti gay christianists means nothing. How are they harmed if two men they do not know sign a contract with the state. Are they going to be offended If I form a corporation? It is none of their business, just as their marriages are none of my business. Yes they are forced to have to accept same sex marriages big f'n deal I am forced to accept their hetero marriages. They didn't ask my permission if they could get married so why should I have to ask their permission?Turn No: 2: S1:I suppose. I'm not religious, so what Christians do is pretty meaningless to me. I would not claim anyone is harmed. But we all have to live in this society, so the official policies are our business. Your threat here is empty since heterosexual marriage is the status quo . You have to justify changes you wish to make to the status quo, but what currently is in place doesn't need justification.Turn No: 2: S2:It was a christian organization, or group, or christianally deluded legislators in every case that gathered signatures for and put these marriage amendments on the ballot in every state. If I own a business I am legally forced, as a gay man, to recognise that hetero marriage. Your right we all have to live in this society and they demand that I respect, and acknowledge, their marriages. One could use your argument about slavery, misogyny, or any other unjust system. It is the status quo so there is nothing wrong with it.Turn No: 3: S1:Good for them. It's an issue that should be voted on "right" and "wrong" are value judgements. It is the challenger's responsibility not to show the status quo as unjust, but that their proposal is somehow better than the status quo.Turn No: 3: S2:So then all civil rights from freedom of speech to religious freedom should be voted upon? Because I would love to vote to take religious freedom away from the christianists. nonsense it is called protecting heterosexual privilege and nothing more. would love to vote to take religious freedom away from the christianists. nonsense it is called protecting heterosexual privilege and nothing more.Turn No: 4: S1:What civil rights? Are unmarried individuals denied rights? What privilege is that?Turn No: 4: S2:That is not the question I asked Do you believe taht basic rights such as freedom of speech and religion should go on to the ballot? For instance do you think that the religious freedom of say that mormon, for instance, should go on the ballot for people to vote away? The privlege they are trying to defend by keeping gay people from marriage.Turn No: 5: S1:Since they are Constitutional rights, it would be slightly impossible to do :P What privelige is that? We don't have a right to love (at least, not one the gov't can help with). We don't have a right to marry whomever we love, or to love whomever we marry. What do you lack that every single unmarried person in America does not also lack, gay or straight? |

**Your summary of Debate 4**

|  |
| --- |
| **BEGIN 5**  Turn No: 1: S1: The cultural meaning of marriage is a formalization of a mating pair, who, in turn, create and support a family unit. Love and reproduction are implied. The legal meaning of marriage is, in most States, a contract between two people who are not under the age of consent, of different genders, of the same species, not closely related and who are not already married. Homosexuals are not a part of the traditional or cultural meaning of marriage. In order to be included, the meaning of marriage would have to change. The catch-22 is that homosexual couples want to be included in the current meaning of marriage, but what gives marriage meaning specifically excludes homosexual couples.Turn No: 1: S2:  Nonsense Two 70 year old heteros on their 3 or 4th marriages are hardly going to have children. So as long as people beyond breeding age are allowed to contract marriage there is nothing wrong with gay people enetring marriage.Turn No: 2: S1:Only if you reduce the meaning of marriage to a contract between two people. In that case you've stripped any and all cultural meaning from the practice and homosexual marriage would be no more meaningful than two friends becoming married for the benefits. I would not view that as a happy occurance.Turn No: 2: S2:It means nothing now if people get divorced and remarried over and over and over again.Turn No: 3: S1:Perhaps it doesn't. Perhaps marriage has already lost all meaning. But no matter what happens, Matthew S , homosexual marriage cannot and will not have the same meaning. Either marriage has already lost meaning, or you have to destroy that meaning to be included.Turn No: 3: S2:I have news for you!!! With a 50%+ divorce rate among heteros and 30 min annulment mills in Las Vegas, I think that ship has sailed. In a few years it seems like us gay people will be the only ones who actually want to get and stay married.  Turn No: 4:S1:  Apparently not, since trying to get homosexual marriage passed in State legislatures is and has been an uphill battle. People still place value in the meaning of ancient customs, even if their realization is imperfect. |

**Your summary of Debate 5**

|  |
| --- |
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