**Hit id 3M47JKRKCX8A1MOWV8SVR19ASAL68R**

**Worker id : A2A8HRBDYBV6XJ**

**Reject**

S 1 : 1 - The divorce rate in the U.S. is really blown out of proportion by high rate of very young people whjo get divorced ............. The percentage of people getting divorces who have been married over 5 years drops dramatically ........... S 2 : 1 - Um , young people and young marriages really aren't the same thing . There are those young people who actually do stay together past those first five years . The truth of the matter is that couples in general who divorce do so more often within the first five years , regardless of age . The point was and still is , that heterosexual marriages end in divorce nearly 50% of the time . End of story . You can try to pretty it up all you want , it doesn't change the fact that you heteros are no better at staying together than you expect us gays / lesbians to . S 1 : 2 - Of course there are but a lot of young people get married and realize it was a mistake and get divorced ............ S 2 : 2 - Yeah , so ? There are a lot of older people who get married and realize the same thing and get divorced ... all within the same five year time period . One does not really have a lot to do with the other . Nor does it change the fact that more than half of ALL marriages end in divorce . Period , end of story , no nit-picking ... { Just remember these marriages still only are consisted of HETEROSEXUALS ... } S 1 :3 - yes but because of the high rate of young people that get divorced it throws the percentage off ...... Statistics prove by a wide majority that gays in general are much more promiscuous then straights ......... S 2 :3 - You are completely off base : READ THIS ; http://www.religioustolerance.org/chr\_dira.htm http://www.divorcemag.com/statistics/statsUS.shtml http://www.barna.org/FlexPage.aspx?P...naUpdateID=170 Try reading actual census data : http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1027306/posts You cannot compare gay to straight promiscuity within the context of a " marriage " when only straights are legally allowed to get married . It's obvious the data will be skewed , any idiot could see that . S 1 : 4 - you can't compare marriage but you can compare relationships ........ S 2 : 4 - Read the articles before you shoot off your mouth . S 1 : 5 - I very rarely read propaganda be it from the right or the left ........... S 2 : 5 - So now data from the Census Bureau is now " Propaganda ? " What a riot ! S 1 : 6 - No one can actually know what percentage of the population of the U.S. is gay ........ If you throw out the lesbians it would be about 2 percent .......

**Worker id : A2A8HRBDYBV6XJ**

**Reject**

The oercentages of the divorce rate have dramtically increased in the passt few years. Whether they are gay or heterosexual, it does not matter becaus ethe factsn are what they are. When young kids get married, the rate increses because after about five years, they realize that they can not stand the person that they basically devoted the rest of their lifew too. If there was an actual law that said that gays could legally be married, it would actually change ytha marriage of a joining with a man and woman to a relationship between and two people.

**Worker ID**

**A1BWLW96IG3063, Good**

The first writer states that divorce rates are only so high because the number of young couples getting into bad marriages early on in life skews the statistics. He says that gays are much more promiscuous than straights, insinuating their marriages would not be stable.  
The second writer reiterates the high divorce rates of straight marriages are real, and uses this evidence as a reason why marriage is no more sacred or infallible when straight people are involved than it would be if gays were allowed to marry. He then cites census data which the first writer refuses to look at.

**Worker ID**

**A3TSHG5R492EHU ( doubt)**

Relying only on aggregate divorce data is misleading. The rate is blown out of proportion by the very high divorce rae of young people who get married and divorce, but looking at data of people married over 5 years shows a very precipitous drop in the divorce rate. Some people dispute this and state that age is not the issue but length of marriage, so someone married at age 35 is just as likely to get divorced within 5 years as a 22 year old.

**WorkerId**

**A2OWKNH3FGF84A good**

S1 feels that divorce statistics are thrown off by people who marry too young, then get divorced within the first 5 years after realizing their mistake, but gays tend toward promiscuity in general. S2 says that plenty of older heterosexual couples get divorced as well, and really it doesn't matter in terms of statistics because the comparison is divorce and split up rates, not ages of the people in the relationships. S2 feels that gays and lesbians should not be held to a higher standard than the rest of society, which currently has a divorce rate in excess of 50%.

**WorkerId**

**AKUZT1DRRKXRR, reject**

The divorce rate in the U.S. is really blown out of proportionNo one can actually know what percentage of the population of the U.S. is gay he point was and still is , that heterosexual marriages end in divorce nearly 50% of the time The percentage of people getting divorces who have been married over 5 years drops dramatically 's obvious The truth of the matter is that couples in general who divorce do so more often within the first five years , regardless of age the data will be skewedThere are a lot of older people

**WorkerID**

**A1YJKLVJW1FE33 Good**

This is an argument against homosexual marriage. It discusses divorce rates that are already too high and the breakdown of the nuclear family. Speaker one argues that once you move young marriages out of the statistics, divorce rates are well below 50%. Speaker two argues that people of all ages are getting divorced within the first five years of marriage. These heterosexual couples divorce at a rate of over 50% and homosexual marriage could hardly do much to increase this rate. Speaker one counters that homosexuals are more promiscuous and even more likely to divorce after marriage.

S 1 : 1 - We don't just benefit from what is often considered the common , nuclear family . We benefit from families with adopted children , step children , families with no children at all . No it does not . Prove it will come up , and also prove it will come up as a result of same-sex marriage . Marriage is that now . You're right , it has nothing to do with the Bible . It has everything to do with the slippery slope logical fallacy , which we've discussed in the forum ad nauseum . It only shows that those opposed do not have an argument . You know the prospect of incest and polygamy is much less socially acceptable than gay marriage , so you try to erroneously tie polygamy and incest to gay marriage in people's mind to strike fear in them , and hope their logical reasoning can be replaced by irrational fear . S 2 : 1 - a married couple as the head of a home is considered a nuclear family it already has . the question of legality is what this whole issue is about . marriage is a legal instituation , how could legality NOT come up . yes it is whoa ... hold up ... are you saying that only because gay marriage is less unacceptable that incestuous relations , that its ok to grant gay marriage but not sibling marriage ?? if the incestuous society begin to parade and protest , until society accepts them on the level that they accept gays now , what will you say then ? on what grounds should we discriminate against 2 siblings wanting to get married , particularly if they believe they truly love each other , or if they believe that they were born with that attraction ? this is classic hypocracy . if 2 siblings want to love each other in their private lives , how is that any business of yours ? and what does irrational fear have to do with anything ? do you have an irrational fear of an incestuous or polygamous lifestyle ? based on what ? give me one reason why society shouldnt accept an incestuous relation between two consenting adults S 1 : 2 - Then what may lead to incest and polygamy is the fact that marriage is a legal institution , is that what you are saying ? If so , these things may come up equally as a result of straight legal marriage or gay legal marriage or interracial legal marriage , or legal inter-faith marriage or legal marriage with legal divorce , etc. It doesn't relate specifically to gay legal marriage at all . I was saying this is how many people attempt an argument against gay marriage , by attempting to incite fear by spouting off a parade of horribles that have nothing to do with the issue of gay marriage . What if straight people are married and winged green monkeys come flying out of everyone's derriere in the future ? What will you do then ? Demonstrate how gay marriage specifically relates to incest and incestuous marriage and polygamy . This is the gay rights forum , not the incest forum . S 2 : 2 - thats not what im saying . what may lead to incestuous marriage is if siblings or related people who love each other and want to live together under the legal union of marriage . and what may lead to polygamous marriage is 3 or more people who love each other and want to live together under the legal union of marriage . do you see a pattern here ? ooooh .. nice way to snake out of the issue ... let me refresh your memory since you brought it up , what exactly does the social acceptance of any type of " taboo " relationship have to do with their right to be legally married ? is there a certain limit of " tabooness " , and if youre past that limit then no marriage for you ? and what fear are you talking about ? i'm talking about people that love each other and want to tie the knot . how could that possibly strike fear in somebody ? please .... S 1 :3 - Yes , that's true . Yes , that's true . Are you saying love is the pattern ? Well , love applies to straight marriages as well as gay marriages . Love is not exclusive to gay marriages . If that's the connection , we can just as easily say straight marriage will lead to incestuous marriage and polygamy . You are saying love will cause a slippery slope . It's still fallacious . The issue I brought up was why this fallacy is often used , that is to create fear , because incest and polygamy are indeed considered so taboo . The issue is not the tabooness of anything and everything , but how it is being used to distract from the issue of same-sex marriage , when there isn't a logical , rational argument against same-sex marriage . It's an indication of desperation on the part of some of those who are against same-sex marriage . I have no reason to discuss the level of acceptability or lack thereof of every single thing , before I accept one thing that is different from all those other things . I can deal with that one thing on all of its own merits and shortfalls , without being drawn into a false dilemma , either accept everything or else don't accept one thing , as if those are the only two choices , fallacy . S 2 :3 - gay marriage will change the definition of marriage from " a legal union between a man and a woman " to " a legal union between any parties that love each other " . if its ok for 2 people that love each other and want to tie the knot , then how could incest be a taboo ? based on what ? again with the double standard . gay marriage was considered just as much a taboo as incest or polygamy just a few years ago . being gay emerged from its taboo status through parades , promotional efforts , and , unfortunately , by spreading lies ( i'll deal with that in another thread ) . however , incestuous people didnt go through the process of parading their lifestyle in front of the world and practically begging for approval from society . so incest is still deeper in taboo status than homosexuality . why is it ok to deny incestuous relations the right to marry on the grounds that it is considered taboo , but ok to approve gay marriage on the same grounds ?

**Worker id : A2A8HRBDYBV6XJ**

**Reject**

Dialog two states that it is basically at taboo for gay and incestuous people to get married. For years, it has been unnacceptable for either of these things to occur. Now, there aree protesters practically begging for acceptanc forem the government and the people. in some states, it is now legal, but incestuous relationships are a greater taboo than gay marriage.

**Worker ID**

**A1BWLW96IG3063, Good**

The first writer claims that society benefits from all manner of family types and not just the nuclear family, including families with stepchildren and adopted children. He accuses gay marriage opponents of spreading a slippery slope fallacy in which gay marriage is related to incest and polygamy to strike fear into people.  
The second writer, continuing the aforementioned slippery slope fallacy, questions what is to stop the acceptance of gay marriage from leading to the acceptance and legalization of incest and polygamy in our society. The first writer continues insisting it is irrelevant, and the second continues arguing it isn't.

**Worker id A3TSHG5R492EHU ,doubt**

Equating gays to polygamy, bestiality, and other degenerate relationships (like pedophilia), is a false argument. But the Bible is not the best source of information and is not a reliable source of authority. If you want to use the Bible as an authority on how to treat gays, you should also read the part of the Bible that says "love thy neighbor" and to treat your fellow human with respect and love. But equating gay marriage with gay rights is also wrong, because marriage is a legal institution, whereas the right to be treated with respect is a human right. Marriage is not a human right, according to one of the people in the dialogue.

**WorkerId**

**A2OWKNH3FGF84A, good**

S1 points out that family takes a lot of different forms these days including step parents, adoption, interracial and interfaith families and gay parents, and that trying to say that just gay marriage is a slippery slope that leads to incest and polygamy is a fear tactic used by those opposed to gay marriage. Realistically there is no link between gays and these other groups. S1 says that if anyone is to be allowed to marry, than why not siblings or polygamists. Just because it is a social taboo should not prevent these people from marriage if gays are allowed.

**WorkerId**

**AKUZT1DRRKXRR Reject**

**WorkerId**

**A1YJKLVJW1FE33 Good**

This is an argument about homosexual marriage. Speaker 1 believes that homosexual marriage would increase both the breakdown of the tradition family and the institution of marriage. It also sets a bad legal precedent for other forbidden relationships like polygamy and incest. Speaker 2 believes that people in love should be allowed to get married and homosexual marriage will bring more stability to families. He says the incest and polygamy are red herrings because both of these taboo relationships involve heterosexuals rather than homosexuals. Speaker 1 believes if one is right than all should be allowed

S 1 : 1 - I will take this one ........ Please don't compare a race of peoples fight for equal rights to a class of people determined by their sexual oreintation ...... It is and insult to all African Americans .......... S 2 : 1 - Yep , Coretta Scott King and Jullian Bond are against gay rights ? You did say : " all African Americans " . S 1 : 2 - We are talking about gay marriage .......... Can you cite a link where they say they are for gay marriage ? S 2 : 2 - ALready been done ,,,, several times . S 1 :3 - I did not think you could do it ....... S 2 :3 - Julian Bond : http://racerelations.about.com/b/a/069228.htm Coretta Scott King : http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/...marriage\_x.htm :p :p :p :p :p S 1 : 4 - Thank you , I will amend my statement to most African Americans ...... I wonder how Rev MLK felt about the issue ....... He has much more creditabilty to me then either of your examples ....... S 2 : 4 - I guess no one will ever know for sure .

**Worker ID**

**A1BWLW96IG3063, Good**

The first writer claims that it is offensive to compare the fight for gay marriage to the struggle of blacks for civil rights. He asks the second writer to provide examples of famous black civil rights leaders who actually support the prospect of gay marriage.  
The second writer then links him two websites where Julian Bond and Coretta Scott King have supported gay marriage. In response the first writer moves the goalposts of the conversation, saying he wonders what Martin Luther king would think about the issue. The second writer simply states that there is no way to know for sure.

**WorkerID**

**A3TSHG5R492EHU Reject**

Comparing the Civil Rights Movement to gay rights is not intellectually honest. S1 implies that people are not born gay, but choose the lifestyle. Race, though, is something you cannot control as you are born black or white or Asian. In fact, major civil rights leaders are not in favor of equating gay rights with civil rights.

**WorkerId**

**A2OWKNH3FGF84A, Good**

S1 says that the struggle for gay rights and gay marriage should not be compared to the civil rights movement, and feels that doing so is an insult to all African-Americans, then admits there are some African-Americans that support gay marriage. S2 points out that none of the civil rights leaders that are still living have spoken out against gay rights or marriage, although some have spoken out in support of it. S2 admits that we will never know what many of them, like Martin Luther King, would have thought about gay marriage or if they would have supported it.

**WorkerId**

**AKUZT1DRRKXRR Reject**

S 1 : 1 - I will take this one ........ Please don't compare a race of peoples fight for equal rights to a class of people determined by their sexual oreintation ...... It is and insult to all African Americans .......... S 2 : 1 - Yep , Coretta Scott King and Jullian Bond are against gay rights ? You did say : " all African Americans " . S 1 : 2 - We are talking about gay marriage .......... Can you cite a link where they say they are for gay marriage ? S 2 :

**Workerid A1YJKLVJW1FE33 good**

Dialog 3 involves the comparison between the struggle for gay marriage and the struggle for civil rights. Speaker one contends that they are completely different. He finds this issue insulting to all African Americans and then implies that most civil rights leaders are not in favor of homosexual marriage. Speaker 2 argues that civil rights leaders support gay marriage. Speaker 2 then provides links to articles about their positions on the issue. Speaker 1 then implies that Martin Luther King would be against gay marriage. Speaker one opines that we will never know either way.

Hit id 3PUOXASB57AC31RH25VKOVXGHK19ZB

Accepted A2OWKNH3FGF84A

A3O3NBBS790FO7

A38HCU1O9OS0C5

Rejected

Own opinion ? A2IKS5HMNMK5LB

AKUZT1DRRKXRR

MY OPINION:  
  
Granted after some thought and much consideration there is both right and wrong on both sides of both Homosexuality tho judging from the -GIST- of the stated article it is badly compared to the secondary issue of 'Gay Marriage', It would seem that the earlier writers are trying to reconcile the article whilst skipping the core essential fact that neither   
  
writer can reconcile the two separate issues of Homosexuality as expressed frankly there is no 'Acceptable' argument to justify either of the opposing points in 'Modern Society' as there are both glaring errors and truths also on both sides.

Its impossible to separate jumbled dialog's that jump from point to point as Jesus, Polygamy, and High Taxation are all separate and complicated issues, To reconcile the article let me state the only right is to keep the Law, Human Rights, and Government as 'separated issues,As that has worked very well throughout the basic history of Human Civilization,But the best approach has always been to adopt the best approach that benefits society as a whole as whats fair for one person tends to revolve around fair play for all and that's the American Way being fair play!,.

It appears the main issue here concerns the re-opening of Gay Bathhouses in California, It is hard to summarize this as both 'Common Law and Morality' and mixed here, So if one abandons dialog and cuts to the gist of the matter its plain that bathhouses has existed since millennium but basic human behavior and reaction plus social outlook has somewhat now changed in the intervening years, It would seem to the impartial reader that the 'Public Health' authorities would be best put to resolve these complicated issues due to both public exposure and to the issues of pathogenic exposure?,.

Worker id A38HCU1O9OS0C5

S1 argues many straight men have â€œwivesâ€ for every day of the week. S2 argues so what, it doesn't indicated those men are not committed to those women. S2 says the majority of Americans, including Democrats, oppose gay marriage. S1 says it's not a party issue. S2 calls those who favor gay marriage heterophobes. S1 asks how favoring is forcing it on others. S2 says if people who oppose gay marriage are labeled homophobes, it's OK to call those who favor it heterophobes and says we have a constitutional right to oppose

S1 brings polygamy into the gay marriage debate, identifies supporters as left wing S2 points out that divorce laws result in serial polygamy. S2 argues if its right wing to oppose gay or polygamist marriage, then its left wing to support it. S1 says new testament doesn't support polygamy. S2 argues new testament doesn't oppose polygamy and new testament doesn't apply to everyone. S2 parallels arguments to deficits, that opposing the deficit sis now a left issue. S1 says that's absurd, points out Democrat big spending. S2 says Bush was a big spender and the left have opposed big spending.

S2 calls S1 homophobic bigot. S2 says there are bathhouses in SF with 100 men in daisy chain practicing unsafe sex. S2 questions, says he doesn't believe. S1 says research it. S2 challenges S1 to prove claim and again calls him a homophobe for making accusations without proof. S1 says this is why they closed these bathhouses down in 1980s. S2 Says 1980s are not relevant. S1 says gays want the bathhouses reopened. S2 says this has nothing to do with gay rights and it's irresponsible to equate this with all gays.

Worker id A3BL2ZEODD79AZ

These are two people who have different views on gay marriage or more so the fact of two men being together in a committed relationship. They seem to have very different points of views, even citing a CNN poll regarding Democrats being opposed to gay marriage and how they are now on some sort of Christian agenda over it. There is also a discussion of being called a homophobe just because you one of them is opposed to gay marriage they feel it is unfair to be called a homophobe over the fact they feel gay marriage is not ok.

This is about having multiple wives and two very different views on this. There is some discussion over the left and right wings of politics and the fact polygamy seems to go hand and hand with being homosexual. This conversations then takes a turn to the deficeit in the country and which administration caused the biggest issues with spending. How right and left wings vary on all standards of beliefs from spending money to being homosexual and polygamy in this country. Attacks began on Bush and the kind of money that he spent while in the office of the country.

This is two people arguing over Bath Houses in San Francisco and comparing it to Sodom in the bible. One feels his research is not very good regarding the Bath Houses in San Fransisco and how they are just not true or accurate. The other party feels that searching on the internet is sufficient enough for him to believe that they did and still so exist. The conversation was apparently supposed the be about gay rights and somehow took a turn to attacking a small group of people that MAY have been involved in bath houses in the SF area.

38XPGNCKHT7UXBGVKDAQMH947HH4VA

Worker id Accept A1GEJHBBGGV1F

Worker id accept ATGH2Q508ZON7

Accept A1BWLW96IG3063

A2OWKNH3FGF84A

A3RCQTOLRFH2S9

Reject

AKUZT1DRRKXRR

Worker id Accept A1GEJHBBGGV1F

The second speaker says most self-identified Christians oppose gay marriage and that a majority of â€œevangelical Christiansâ€ oppose laws that would give the right for gays to marry, adopt, or have same-sex relationships. The first speaker responds that these groups are not trying to ban gay rights. In response, speaker 2 brings up the fact that several states have passed constitutional amendments to ban same-sex marriage and civil unions. Speaker 2 then says that gay lobbyists are stepping over the line by â€œcounter â€“attackingâ€ those who oppose same-sex marriage. Speaker 2 then states that speaker

ATGH2Q508ZON7

Two people are arguing about how evangelical Christians argue over the controversial issues that exist in the country. They are arguing if it is universal or it is how the environment influences the perception Christians have about gay marriage. The example used is that in Spain, evangelical Christians donâ€™t opposed gay marriage while in this country they do. They donâ€™t worry about the important things in this country and that is a problem. The one making such accusations is being accused of exaggerating the issue at hand and seems to lack credibility. There seems to be a shift in where the topic actually leads.

Healthcare and how it should be applied is being argued. In essence, it is being argued whether gay people should be given healthcare benefits which can be applied to their spouses. If marriage is not legal in a state such as VA, there is no way it can apply in this situation. There is an other side to the equation where exceptions that may be made such as cohabitation or having children. There seems to be a disagreement about common law in this situation. One hopes that gay marriages will be outlawed everywhere so there is no more of this outcry.

A2OWKNH3FGF84A

1 says that gays have exactly the same rights as everyone else, so the situation is not comparable to other human right's struggles such as the civil and women's rights movements, gives cases of states that have outlawed gay marriage and suggests that if gays want healthcare they should marry a person of the opposite sex to get it. S2 replies that gays can't really enter into an opposite sex marriage because they don't love someone of the opposite sex, and feels that gays will ultimately win the right to equal rights, marriage and healthcare much like interracial couples did.

S1 feels that marriage is defined as a union between a man and a woman and that gay marriage could never exist by the definition of the word marriage. He does, however, recognize that if there were a good reason to allow it, there could be gay civil unions with similar legal rights to marriage, but fears that 500,000 gays would rush to enter into such unions. S2 states that if marriage is just a legal definition then there is no reason it can't be redefined to allow gay marriage and that a marriage rush would not be a problem.

The first writer is refuting the second writer's assertions that natural disasters have increased as foretold in the bible. He mocks these views as silly and irrelevant, and questions why God would allow his children to suffer in the first place.  
  
  
  
The second writer continues to argue the point and tries to explain how God raises his children how he thinks is best. The remaining conversation is an exchange of opinions about gay marriage and polygamy, and what the constitution means for minorities. The writers cannot agree on what causes homosexuality or why it should be treated differently from polygamy.

Hit id 3RWO3EJELHG00SMGBJIPIRDJ995P1W

A2OWKNH3FGF84A

A1BWLW96IG3063

Reject

A1LZB1IN8UX3AH(26) no personal opinion

This is about gay marriage and the definition of marriage in society. S1 argues that marriage is legally defined as one man, one woman and this cannot be changed just because a group of people want it to be different. But there options to assuage advocates of gay marriage, which is to grant equal rights to gay couples that straight couples have, which is known as gay unions. The phrase "gay marriage" is an oxymoron because historically marriage has always been between man and woman. semantically, marriage cannot be redefined because people want it to change, and the phrase has a constant meaning.
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MY OPINION:

Granted after some thought and much consideration there is both right and wrong on both sides of both Homosexuality tho judging from the -GIST- of the stated article it is badly compared to the secondary issue of 'Gay Marriage', It would seem that the earlier writers are trying to reconcile the article whilst skipping the core essential fact that neither

writer can reconcile the two separate issues of Homosexuality as expressed frankly there is no 'Acceptable' argument to justify either of the opposing points in 'Modern Society' as there are both glaring errors and truths also on both sides.