
California's top court overturns gay marriage ban

Posted by bif - 2008/05/15 14:00

This thread discusses the Content article: California's top court overturns gay marriage ban

Disgusting. :angry: There's nothing noble in one guy sticking his penis in the hole from which another guy evacuates fecal matter. How romantic. . .

=====

Re:California's top court overturns gay marriage ban

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/05/15 14:50

bif wrote:

This thread discusses the Content article: California's top court overturns gay marriage ban

Disgusting. :angry: There's nothing noble in one guy sticking his penis in the hole from which another guy evacuates fecal matter. How romantic. . .

And a female would find a dirty old man like you romantic?

=====

Re:California's top court overturns gay marriage ban

Posted by Everybody Loves Raymond - 2008/05/15 14:53

Time to get rid of these Dem activist judges. If you want more of this, just vote for Obama and his immoral Dem Congress. They will appoint just these types of judges. Keep it up and you can soon marry your Yellow Labrador.

=====

Re:California's top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by JLD - 2008/05/15 14:57

It is amazing that for so many people that are vocally anti-gay they can't come up with one good reason for being that way. :dry:

=====

Re:California's top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Everybody Loves Raymond - 2008/05/15 15:04

JLD wrote:

It is amazing that for so many people that are vocally anti-gay they can't come up with one good reason for being that way. :dry:

Uh, how about this one, the Bible says we are to be "anti-gay." Can ya top that, Mr. Rainbow?

=====

Re:California's top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Betz - 2008/05/15 15:07

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:

JLD wrote:

It is amazing that for so many people that are vocally anti-gay they can't come up with one good reason for being that way. :dry:

Uh, how about this one, the Bible says we are to be "anti-gay." Can ya top that, Mr. Rainbow?

Really? Where does it say the words anti-gay? Do you have a different Bible than I do?

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by woody - 2008/05/15 15:25

Let the homo humping begin:kiss:

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by rightwingedliberal - 2008/05/15 16:09

Maybe the government will now give us another paid holiday called the Homo Hump day

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Dubbs - 2008/05/15 16:28

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:

JLD wrote:

It is amazing that for so many people that are vocally anti-gay they can't come up with one good reason for being that way. :dry:

Uh, how about this one, the Bible says we are to be "anti-gay." Can ya top that, Mr. Rainbow?

More of your kind Wren and Blogan, the condemn to hell all that believe different than the mainstream "Bible thumpers" beleive, and you wonder why I call them nutjobs.

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Pittakos - 2008/05/15 16:47

Let's all sing a verse of "Love at Home." This thread has really put me in the mood for it.

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage ban

Posted by mykidsgramma - 2008/05/15 17:59

In Genesis, we are told that God created Adam and Eve.

Genesis 1:27-28 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it . . .

Genesis 1:24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.

Now, that seems to be very clear that man and woman are meant to be together. They were commanded to multiply and we know that two members of the same sex cannot multiply. To put it in my husbands word, an innie and an outie go together, two innies? two outies? doesn't work.

Now, before you start saying I am just an old granny and out of touch with today and anti gay etc., please let me assure

you that is not so. I have a very close family member that is gay, in fact, he is here visiting for 2 weeks right now. I love him and accept him for who he is, not what he is. I do not approve of his "orientation" but it is his right and his business. He does not have a partner and I really don't know how he feels about Gay marriages. I don't care if gay and Lesbian couples want to live together, it is not hurting me. But, I do not believe that they should be married as marriage is between a man and a woman.

Furthermore, I do not berate, ridicule or make fun of gays. I do not make crude, rude comments about them. They are people, just like us, they are our brothers and sisters, our aunts and uncles, our cousins (yes, I have a much loved gay cousin as well). We should not base our feelings on their sexual orientation.

Like the saying goes, Love the sinner, hate the sin.

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage ban

Posted by mykidsgramma - 2008/05/15 18:01

I just noticed some one gave me a positive Karma! Wow! Thank you. Now I really feel like I belong here! :laugh:

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by JLD - 2008/05/15 18:25

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:

JLD wrote:

It is amazing that for so many people that are vocally anti-gay they can't come up with one good reason for being that way. :dry:

Uh, how about this one, the Bible says we are to be "anti-gay." Can ya top that, Mr. Rainbow?

The bible? That is the best you can offer? Do you want to take everything from the bible and put it into our laws?

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by JLD - 2008/05/15 18:32

mykidsgramma wrote:

In Genesis, we are told that God created Adam and Eve.

Genesis 1:27-28 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it . . .

Genesis 1:24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.

Now, that seems to be very clear that man and woman are meant to be together. They were commanded to multiply and we know that two members of the same sex cannot multiply. To put it in my husbands word, an innie and an outie go together, two innies? two outies? doesn't work.

Now, before you start saying I am just an old granny and out of touch with today and anti gay etc., please let me assure you that is not so. I have a very close family member that is gay, in fact, he is here visiting for 2 weeks right now. I love him and accept him for who he is, not what he is. I do not approve of his "orientation" but it is his right and his business. He does not have a partner and I really don't know how he feels about Gay marriages. I don't care if gay and Lesbian couples want to live together, it is not hurting me. But, I do not believe that they should be married as marriage is between a man and a woman.

Furthermore, I do not berate, ridicule or make fun of gays. I do not make crude, rude comments about them. They are people, just like us, they are our brothers and sisters, our aunts and uncles, our cousins (yes, I have a much loved gay cousin as well). We should not base our feelings on their sexual orientation.

Like the saying goes, Love the sinner, hate the sin.

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation. Ultimately, marriage in America is not about morality it is about rights. Marriage in and of itself is a lot of fluff and frill but it doesn't mean anything. It is the rights behind the practice that really mean something. The rights that come from being legally wed are important - but apparently we only extend those rights to one man and one woman. On a personal level you can feel about it any way you want (personally, I don't care for it) but that doesn't mean you should step in and say that only those relationships you deem appropriate can have those rights. I'm talking about relationships between consenting adult humans - and all humans, regardless of sexual orientation, should expect to get those rights.

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Dubbs - 2008/05/15 18:41

JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by JLD - 2008/05/15 18:45

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

I was, many years ago. I haven't been involved in a better religion, but LDS just didn't work for me.

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by JLD - 2008/05/15 18:47

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

Also, regardless of what a religion's stance is on the issue, that is neither here nor there. No one should force their religious views over others. I was appalled when the LDS spoke out on the issue...so much for separation of religion and politics.

EDIT: I'm referring to the LDS releasing a statement that they approved of legally defining marriage or something to that effect. I'll have to go looking for it now, I don't remember the wording.

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage ban

Posted by mykidsgramma - 2008/05/15 18:49

Many of our laws have been based on the Bible, in particular, the 10 Commandments. Thou shalt not kill, though shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness (ask Martha Stewart about that one :)) I know where you are heading with this. You are going to bring up the laws in the Old Testament. But, in the New Testament, Christ says his coming here fulfilled the law and he gave us new laws. So, put away your rocks, no stoning allowed ;)

Someone asked for reasoning, I was giving what I thought was a very good reason. You don't have to agree with me.

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Dubbs - 2008/05/15 19:27

JLD wrote:

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

Also, regardless of what a religion's stance is on the issue, that is neither here nor there. No one should force their religious views over others. I was appalled when the LDS spoke out on the issue...so much for separation of religion and politics.

EDIT: I'm referring to the LDS releasing a statement that they approved of legally defining marriage or something to that effect. I'll have to go looking for it now, I don't remember the wording.

The way we look at it, if you were LDS maybe you know this, is that it must have been pretty important for the church to have stepped in and made a statement, which they normally don't do. As we believe the Prophets are inspired and speak for God. God must disapprove pretty mightly if the church asked us to vote against it.

The church isn't forcing it's views on anyone, merely stating it's doctrine clearly, as we believe the Prophet speaks for God. No more than we would be forcing our views on anyone if we said we agreed that any sin is wrong.

That's one thing I personally love about the church, is the clear, set, doctrine. And a willingness to come out and say what God doesn't like. I wish more religions would have the courage to do this personally, but they don't want to offend, and don't even claim to speak for what God wants.

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage ban

Posted by Just Reading - 2008/05/15 20:00

bif wrote:

This thread discusses the Content article: California's top court overturns gay marriage ban

Disgusting. :angry: There's nothing noble in one guy sticking his penis in the hole from which another guy evacuates fecal matter. How romantic. . .

Wow You sound romantic bif,

Do you really think romance is sticking your penis in something, anything?? I don't think romance has anything to do with your penis bif...

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage ban

Posted by Just Reading - 2008/05/15 20:09

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:

Time to get rid of these Dem activist judges. If you want more of this, just vote for Obama and his immoral Dem Congress. They will appoint just these types of judges. Keep it up and you can soon marry your Yellow Labrador.

Oh and don't forget, God forbid your daughter marries a BLACK MAN..!!

<http://www.superemoticons.com/emoticons/rolleye/014--.gif>

Everybody Loves Raymond You're an Idiot....

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Just Reading - 2008/05/15 20:11

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:

JLD wrote:

It is amazing that for so many people that are vocally anti-gay they can't come up with one good reason for being that way. :dry:

Uh, how about this one, the Bible says we are to be "anti-gay." Can ya top that, Mr. Rainbow?

"LOL" boy we can tell you read the bible "LOL"

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Just Reading - 2008/05/15 20:21

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

If he is Dubbs, he's a very smart and a very upstanding member and God has blessed him with the Knowledge to not judge others....

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Just Reading - 2008/05/15 20:25

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

Also, regardless of what a religion's stance is on the issue, that is neither here nor there. No one should force their religious views over others. I was appalled when the LDS spoke out on the issue...so much for separation of religion and politics.

EDIT: I'm referring to the LDS releasing a statement that they approved of legally defining marriage or something to that effect. I'll have to go looking for it now, I don't remember the wording.

The way we look at it, if you were LDS maybe you know this, is that it must have been pretty important for the church to have stepped in and made a statement, which they normally don't do. As we believe the Prophets are inspired and speak for God. God must disapprove pretty mightily if the church asked us to vote against it.

The church isn't forcing it's views on anyone, merely stating it's doctrine clearly, as we believe the Prophet speaks for God. No more than we would be forcing our views on anyone if we said we agreed that any sin is wrong.

That's one thing I personally love about the church, is the clear, set, doctrine. And a willingness to come out and say what God doesn't like. I wish more religions would have the courage to do this personally, but they don't want to offend, and don't even claim to speak for what God wants.

Baaaaa Baaaa Baaaa, did you say something Dubbs

P.S. "LOL" Like God need the LDS Church to speak for him..!! "LOL"

Sounds like Dubbs and his Church are full of themselves "LOL"

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Wren - 2008/05/16 07:56

Here are my thoughts on this matter.

The LDS church has every right to make its opinion known. So does any American group.

Only the states can regulate marriage, which is true conservative federalism. Those in California who are opposed have every legal and ethical right to overturn the Supreme Court's decision through referendum this fall.

I personally believe that our culture is best served with one-man, one-woman marriage laws. However, I think in the future the gay and plynny agendas are going to triumph.

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage ban

Posted by gaystaterefugee - 2008/05/16 08:01

Remember that HUGE EARTHQUAKE that they have been predicting for years in California?

RUUUUUUUNNNNNN!

(remember....a couple of weeks ago the ChiComm's slapped around Tibet? GOD slapped around China this week. And don't forget the other tourist attractions such as Cyclones, Volcanoes, Typhoons and Al Gore)

RUUUUUUUNNNNNN!:ohmy:

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Sir John the Apostate - 2008/05/16 08:13

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:

Time to get rid of these Dem activist judges. If you want more of this, just vote for Obama and his immoral Dem Congress. They will appoint just these types of judges. Keep it up and you can soon marry your Yellow Labrador.

Oh my the sky is falling the sky is falling..... http://www.heraldextra.com/images/fbfiles/images/Green_gobber-aadce9d2a0c19144bb4cfa328fc136de.gif

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Sir John the Apostate - 2008/05/16 08:16

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

Here we go another one of Kent's online bishops interview.

http://www.heraldextra.com/images/fbfiles/images/Blowing_Chunks-6e6185efe74466189d9be470dfa82c5b.gif

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/05/16 10:53

JLD wrote:

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

Also, regardless of what a religion's stance is on the issue, that is neither here nor there. No one should force their religious views over others. I was appalled when the LDS spoke out on the issue...so much for separation of religion and politics.

EDIT: I'm referring to the LDS releasing a statement that they approved of legally defining marriage or something to that effect. I'll have to go looking for it now, I don't remember the wording.

I'm LDS. I pretty much agree with him. The Church has every right to make the statement they have concerning marriage and the law. Personally I don't agree with it. If it is legalized that doesn't mean that they have to accept it. And I would be against any law that would say that they have to.

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by JLD - 2008/05/16 11:03

ThomasK wrote:

JLD wrote:

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

Also, regardless of what a religion's stance is on the issue, that is neither here nor there. No one should force their religious views over others. I was appalled when the LDS spoke out on the issue...so much for separation of religion and politics.

EDIT: I'm referring to the LDS releasing a statement that they approved of legally defining marriage or something to that effect. I'll have to go looking for it now, I don't remember the wording.

I'm LDS. I pretty much agree with him. The Church has every right to make the statement they have concerning marriage and the law. Personally I don't agree with it. If it is legalized that doesn't mean that they have to accept it. And I would be against any law that would say that they have to.

I don't care if the LDS church is against gay marriage and I don't care if they go on the record stating such - as a religious point. What I care about is when they move to urge the members of the church to pass legislation that will infringe upon the rights of others. I find that wrong.

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Dubbs - 2008/05/16 11:30

JLD wrote:

Thomask wrote:

JLD wrote:

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

Also, regardless of what a religion's stance is on the issue, that is neither here nor there. No one should force their religious views over others. I was appalled when the LDS spoke out on the issue...so much for separation of religion and politics.

EDIT: I'm referring to the LDS releasing a statement that they approved of legally defining marriage or something to that effect. I'll have to go looking for it now, I don't remember the wording.

I'm LDS. I pretty much agree with him. The Church has every right to make the statement they have concerning marriage and the law. Personally I don't agree with it. If it is legalized that doesn't mean that they have to accept it. And I would be against any law that would say that they have to.

I don't care if the LDS church is against gay marriage and I don't care if they go on the record stating such - as a religious point. What I care about is when they move to urge the members of the church to pass legislation that will infringe upon the rights of others. I find that wrong.

Again, you have to understand that we feel God feels so strongly that this is a serious decline in morals that it will have a serious affect on the United states of America. If you are Ex LDS you should know what I mean from the BofM.

And we are not forcing our beliefs on anyone, we are merely asking our members to remember to do something they should know to do anyway, that is uphold Gods laws.

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by The Keeper - 2008/05/16 11:58

Thomask wrote:

JLD wrote:
Dubbs wrote:
JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

Also, regardless of what a religion's stance is on the issue, that is neither here nor there. No one should force their religious views over others. I was appalled when the LDS spoke out on the issue...so much for separation of religion and politics.

EDIT: I'm referring to the LDS releasing a statement that they approved of legally defining marriage or something to that effect. I'll have to go looking for it now, I don't remember the wording.

I'm LDS. I pretty much agree with him. The Church has every right to make the statement they have concerning marriage and the law. Personally I don't agree with it. If it is legalized that doesn't mean that they have to accept it. And I would be against any law that would say that they have to.

501(c)(3) alert!

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Wren - 2008/05/16 15:55

Dubbs wrote:
JLD wrote:
ThomasK wrote:
JLD wrote:
Dubbs wrote:
JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

Also, regardless of what a religion's stance is on the issue, that is neither here nor there. No one should force their religious views over others. I was appalled when the LDS spoke out on the issue...so much for separation of religion and politics.

EDIT: I'm referring to the LDS releasing a statement that they approved of legally defining marriage or something to that effect. I'll have to go looking for it now, I don't remember the wording.

I'm LDS. I pretty much agree with him. The Church has every right to make the statement they have concerning marriage and the law. Personally I don't agree with it. If it is legalized that doesn't mean that they have to accept it. And I would be against any law that would say that they have to.

I don't care if the LDS church is against gay marriage and I don't care if they go on the record stating such - as a religious point. What I care about is when they move to urge the members of the church to pass legislation that will infringe upon the rights of others. I find that wrong.

Again, you have to understand that we feel God feels so strongly that this is a serious decline in morals that it will have a serious affect on the United states of America. If you are Ex LDS you should know what I mean from the BofM.

And we are not forcing our beliefs on anyone, we are merely asking our members to remember to do something they should know to do anyway, that is uphold Gods laws.

Do you oppose civil unions for couples, regardless of their sex?

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by dave - 2008/05/16 18:11

How will gay marriage affect anything?? I fail to see any tangible effect. Maybe the divorce attorneys will have more business????

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Dubbs - 2008/05/16 18:15

Wren wrote:

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

Thomask wrote:

JLD wrote:

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

Also, regardless of what a religion's stance is on the issue, that is neither here nor there. No one should force their religious views over others. I was appalled when the LDS spoke out on the issue...so much for separation of religion and politics.

EDIT: I'm referring to the LDS releasing a statement that they approved of legally defining marriage or something to that effect. I'll have to go looking for it now, I don't remember the wording.

I'm LDS. I pretty much agree with him. The Church has every right to make the statement they have concerning marriage and the law. Personally I don't agree with it. If it is legalized that doesn't mean that they have to accept it. And I would be against any law that would say that they have to.

I don't care if the LDS church is against gay marriage and I don't care if they go on the record stating such - as a religious point. What I care about is when they move to urge the members of the church to pass legislation that will infringe upon the rights of others. I find that wrong.

Again, you have to understand that we feel God feels so strongly that this is a serious decline in morals that it will have a serious affect on the United states of America. If you are Ex LDS you should know what I mean from the BofM.

And we are not forcing our beliefs on anyone, we are merely asking our members to remember to do something they should know to do anyway, that is uphold Gods laws.

Do you oppose civil unions for couples, regardless of their sex?

That would be fine with me.

=====

Re:California\'s top court overturns gay marriage b

Posted by Wren - 2008/05/16 21:22

Dubbs wrote:

Wren wrote:

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

Thomask wrote:

Comments - Daily Herald

JLD wrote:

Dubbs wrote:

JLD wrote:

I used to agree with what you were saying but when put to the task of backing up why marriage should be limited to one man and one woman I couldn't come up with a single real reason for limitation.

You LDS?

Also, regardless of what a religion's stance is on the issue, that is neither here nor there. No one should force their religious views over others. I was appalled when the LDS spoke out on the issue...so much for separation of religion and politics.

EDIT: I'm referring to the LDS releasing a statement that they approved of legally defining marriage or something to that effect. I'll have to go looking for it now, I don't remember the wording.

I'm LDS. I pretty much agree with him. The Church has every right to make the statement they have concerning marriage and the law. Personally I don't agree with it. If it is legalized that doesn't mean that they have to accept it. And I would be against any law that would say that they have to.

I don't care if the LDS church is against gay marriage and I don't care if they go on the record stating such - as a religious point. What I care about is when they move to urge the members of the church to pass legislation that will infringe upon the rights of others. I find that wrong.

Again, you have to understand that we feel God feels so strongly that this is a serious decline in morals that it will have a serious affect on the United states of America. If you are Ex LDS you should know what I mean from the BofM.

And we are not forcing our beliefs on anyone, we are merely asking our members to remember to do something they should know to do anyway, that is uphold Gods laws.

Do you oppose civil unions for couples, regardless of their sex?

That would be fine with me.

You support civil unions, then.

=====