
Arches

Posted by Levenax - 2008/08/30 23:59

http://www.theherald.co.uk/news/news/display.var.2436541.0.Archives_told_to_close_after_police_uncover_indecent_acts.php

This seems to be a bit gross. Apparently when the uniformed cops turned up the revellers just carried on bugging because they thought the newcomers were fancy dress types keen to join in. I can't imagine that a mixed crowd of men and women would indulge in such group debauchery but then maybe I've led a sheltered life. With behaviour like this apparently common in those of a homosexual bent it's hardly surprising that disease is rife amongst them.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by TLJ - 2008/08/31 07:57

Levenax wrote:

http://www.theherald.co.uk/news/news/display.var.2436541.0.Archives_told_to_close_after_police_uncover_indecent_acts.php

This seems to be a bit gross. Apparently when the uniformed cops turned up the revellers just carried on bugging because they thought the newcomers were fancy dress types keen to join in. I can't imagine that a mixed crowd of men and women would indulge in such group debauchery but then maybe I've led a sheltered life. With behaviour like this apparently common in those of a homosexual bent it's hardly surprising that disease is rife amongst them.

Yes, you've led a sheltered life if you think that orgies are the preserve of the gay community.

Google "swinging" or "swingers". Hey, there might be a club near you.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Meg - 2008/08/31 11:09

Have to agree with TLJ that you have led a sheltered life Lev. Sex takes place in and around nightclubs between heterosexual and homosexual couples. I wondered why you thought anyone would contract a disease? Do you not think that people might be having safe sex?

Now, I have to say I have no desire to see anyone having sex so I am quite happy for the licensing board to stop this happening however I do find it hypocritical that there are several lapdancing clubs in Glasgow and they are quite happy to allow them to continue to stay open. Whether or not you approve of lapdancing in itself, they are well known as places where full sex takes place regularly - unless of course, guys are making empty boasts.:P

I wonder if the Arches was the target in general though. I am not saying that it is true but it does have a reputation for the availability of drugs and the heavy drug use of some of the clubbers (even in relation to other clubs) so perhaps the police have been trying to crack down on the Arches and this was an easier way of proving there was problem.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Levenax - 2008/08/31 12:14

Meg wrote:

...Sex takes place in and around nightclubs between heterosexual and homosexual couples. I wondered why you thought anyone would contract a disease? Do you not think that people might be having safe sex?

I'm sure it does, but in large groups with multiple partner encounters within a very short time? I think not. Homosexualists are more promiscuous and indulge in more varied and risky sexual practices than normal people and as a consequence they suffer more from STDs. The various publications from Health Protection Scotland on the matter illustrate this quite well e.g. eighteen times more men than women were diagnosed with syphilis, four times more men than women were diagnosed with HIV and two and a half times more men than women were diagnosed with gonorrhoea (all in 2007).

See <http://www.hps.scot.nhs.uk/bbvsti/wrdetail.aspx?id=38616&wrtype=2> as an example. The safe sex messages had an effect on the behaviour of homosexualists when AIDs was at its height but the recent availability of relatively effective

treatments, albeit at great public expense, has blunted the message. The much higher incidence of HIV in queer men indicates that a lot of them have returned to bareback anal copulation.

Meg wrote:

....full sex takes place regularly

As opposed to what? Going off half cocked? B)

Re:Arches

Posted by TLJ - 2008/08/31 14:05

Levenax wrote:

I'm sure it does, but in large groups with multiple partner encounters within a very short time? I think not.

Oh, I think so. Have you done any research on swinging yet as I suggested ? Using the search terms "swinging" and "uk", you'll find some 232k pages on Google uk relating to a practice which some heterosexualists engage in quite frequently.

PS Your sheltered upbringing may also mean that you might not appreciate that some heterosexualists also engage in anal sex.

Re:Arches

Posted by Levenax - 2008/08/31 14:20

TLJ wrote:

Levenax wrote:

....you might not appreciate that some heterosexualists also engage in anal sex.

We could always ask Mr Sheriden about swinging but I still maintain that mixed groups don't indulge in the same large crowd sessions that homosexualists seem to do.

The "back door" has been used for centuries to avoid pregnancy and it's still used as a variation by some straight couples. However it seems not to be a widespread practice since not many women get sexually transmitted disease lesions of the anus or rectum as you'll find if you look through Health Protection Agency figures on the subject.

Re:Arches

Posted by Meg - 2008/08/31 15:39

Levenax wrote:

Meg wrote:

....Sex takes place in and around nightclubs between heterosexual and homosexual couples. I wondered why you thought anyone would contract a disease? Do you not think that people might be having safe sex?

I'm sure it does, but in large groups with multiple partner encounters within a very short time? I think not.

You are wrong if you do not think this happens in large numbers in establishments like lapdancing clubs.

Levenax wrote:

Homosexualists are more promiscuous and indulge in more varied and risky sexual practices than normal people and as a consequence they suffer more from STDs. The various publications from Health Protection Scotland on the matter illustrate this quite well e.g. eighteen times more men than women were diagnosed with syphilis, four times more men than women were diagnosed with HIV and two and a half times more men than women were diagnosed with gonorrhoea

(all in 2007).

See <http://www.hps.scot.nhs.uk/bbvsti/wrdetail.aspx?id=38616&wrtype=2> as an example. The safe sex messages had an effect on the behaviour of homosexualists when AIDs was at its height but the recent availability of relatively effective treatments, albeit at great public expense, has blunted the message. The much higher incidence of HIV in queer men indicates that a lot of them have returned to bareback anal copulation.

Why does it mean that these men have to be homosexual? Heterosexual men can be infected by a smaller group of women. This happens regularly through prostitution. My point is not about whether heterosexual or homosexual people are the more or less promiscuous. If promiscuity is something you object to then it shouldn't matter what sex the partner is. My point is that I don't see your evidence to back up that these men are homosexual.

Meg wrote:

....full sex takes place regularly

As opposed to what? Going off half cocked? B)

:lol:

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by TLJ - 2008/08/31 15:54

Levenax wrote:

The "back door" has been used for centuries to avoid pregnancy and it's still used as a variation by some straight couples. However it seems not to be a widespread practice since not many women get sexually transmitted disease lesions of the anus or rectum as you'll find if you look through Health Protection Agency figures on the subject.

The incidence of an STD present in the anus or rectum won't necessarily be reflective of how widespread a practice anal intercourse is. From what I can find out on the internet, somewhere around 13% to 15% of heterosexual(ist)s engage in it. That's reasonably widespread to me.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by dws - 2008/08/31 16:38

Personally speaking, consenting adults can do whatever the hell they want to each other as long as I don't have to watch or participate. If there are those interested in dogging, daisychains, swinging or strip-monopoly they'll know the associated risks with those activities and are responsible for any consequences they encounter.

Keep it behind closed doors, that's all I ask.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/08/31 18:06

I wonder what visitors to our country think when they walk into a nightclub and see sex as described in this article.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by InfrequentAllele - 2008/08/31 19:21

And what, pray tell, is a "homosexualist"? Someone who is gay as a hobby? Is that like stamp collecting, only with more spandex and leather chaps?

While you're at it Lev, please define "normal". You're confusing "normal" with "majority". "Normal" in terms of human sexuality means there is a wide spectrum of sexual behaviour, straight and gay. A society which was 100% heterosexual wouldn't be normal. In fact no such society has ever existed. Heterosexuality isn't normal dear. It's just common.

'Dark rooms' as they are called, are a well known feature of some gay venues. Gay venues which are mixed male-female don't have dark rooms. The clue is, if it's a men only night, then sex is likely to be going on. Anyway, in a lot of these places you have to snog the doorman before they'll let you in. (Well I always ask if I can snog the doorman, but perhaps that's just me.) It's hardly likely some poor unsuspecting tourists are going to wander in - anyway, if the tourists are that naive, you could just tell them it was a traditional folk dance.

In the Arches consensual sexual activity went on behind a screened off part of a venue. The venue was only attended by those who knew exactly what was going on there. No one was abused. No one was assaulted. No under age people witnessed anything. And no one, heaven forbid, was corrupted or scandalised. There were no victims.

If you don't want to be disgusted by what goes on in some gay venues, then don't go. For similar reasons I don't go to watch straight porn movies or Old Firm matches.

At a time when there is considerable polemic about violent crime and police numbers and resources, does anyone believe that this action represents an effective use of police time? Are the streets of Glasgow now safer? Perhaps this incident should be noted the next time Glasgow polis request an increase in funding and numbers, they've obviously got officers and resources to spare if they can use them for something like this.

Claiming this is a public health issue is a poor cover for prudish pursed lipped narrow-mindedness. Condoms were available, and based on my own experience of such venues, people who engage in casual anonymous sex have high awareness of safer sex issues. That applies to both straight and gay people.

So yeah Lev, you've led a very sheltered life. You need to get out more. Seriously. Wanna come to the next Gay Pride with me? I'm sure I've got some spandex and leather chaps which will fit you.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/08/31 23:00

Well I too must be a prude I A

I have no problem with any other person's sexuality and unless it breaks a law or involves force or young people, I really don't care what they do, or how many do this. I do care where it happens and who gets to watch. I don't want to watch, I don't want to inadvertently stumble across this activity, and I don't want visitors to my country to stumble across this activity. I don't want for instance the young people from abroad who visit my home and go to nightclubs to witness this activity. I know, I have led a sheltered life and would not know a gay nightclub from any other, nor am I familiar with clubs, which will turn a blind eye while any group sex takes place. If I do not have this knowledge, I cannot advise visitors to avoid these venues and put simply why, should we have to.

That I would imagine is the point the police are trying to make.

We are not talking about a parking ticket or a hatworth here we are talking about an illegal activity.

You cannot give me any guarantee that any under age person did not witness this, the young are famous for using false identities to gain entry to nightclubs, and if many complaints were received it must be that other people did witness this activity.

You cannot give me a guarantee that a drunk young man did not get used or abused during these activities.

My point, do what you want when you want in private.

To use a modern saying, get a room, and not one that is simply screened off and not very well by the sounds of it.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Levenax - 2008/08/31 23:34

InfrequentAllele wrote:

And what, pray tell, is a "homosexualist"? Someone who is gay as a hobby? Is that like stamp collecting, only with more spandex and leather chaps?

It's a bit a like a philatelist 'cos you get to lick sticky things that have been around a bit.

InfrequentAllele wrote:

While you're at it Lev, please define "normal".

I'm normal. :)

InfrequentAllele wrote:

'Dark rooms' as they are called, are a well known feature of some gay venues. Gay venues which are mixed male-female don't have dark rooms. The clue is, if it's a men only night, then sex is likely to be going on.

Why's that? Don't lezzas do group sex?

InfrequentAllele wrote:

If you don't want to be disgusted by what goes on in some gay venues, then don't go. For similar reasons I don't go to watch straight porn movies or Old Firm matches.

Quite. But it's still a bit gross when you hear about it. I mean, why would anybody want to bugger somebody they've only just met?

InfrequentAllele wrote:

At a time when there is considerable polemic about violent crime and police numbers and resources, does anyone believe that this action represents an effective use of police time?

No

InfrequentAllele wrote:

Claiming this is a public health issue is a poor cover for prudish pursed lipped narrow-mindedness. Condoms were available, and based on my own experience of such venues, people who engage in casual anonymous sex have high awareness of safer sex issues. That applies to both straight and gay people.

They may have a high awareness but they still behave irresponsibly. The infection figures speak for themselves. Many more homosexualists get syphilis than any other group. In recent stats, MSMs (men who have sex with men) accounted for 71% of all HIV infection in the USA. The plain fact is that sodomy is much more dangerous than normal sex.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Levenax - 2008/08/31 23:42

TLJ wrote:

The incidence of an STD present in the anus or rectum won't necessarily be reflective of how widespread a practice anal intercourse is. From what I can find out on the internet, somewhere around 13% to 15% of heterosexual(ist)s engage in it. That's reasonably widespread to me.

STD infection rates are a pretty good indicator of sexual preferences. Despite what it says on the interweb I don't think many folk would believe as many as 15% of straight couples engage in sodomy. Anyway why bother when they don't have to do it to avoid pregnancy?

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by InfrequentAllele - 2008/09/01 15:12

I can just picture it now. Wee Scots granny whose grandson is visiting from the USA with his wife - "Oh here son, there's a new club called ManThrob ye might like tae take Betty tae. Look, it's got a photie o two nice smart men in uniform - they must be respectable people. And they've got big muscles, so they must be into health and fitness. No like thae

druggies eh."

So Hank and wife Betty, naive strays from Cowpat Minnesota, accidentally wandered into the dark room of a gay venue in Glasgow where they were traumatised to discover the truth about what Scotsmen wear under their kilts. Hank tore up his application to join the Cowpat Caledonian Society now that he knew what the initiation ceremony entailed. The horror of Mairi's Wedding gave him nightmares for years ... Step we gaily on we go ... over and over in his head. He'd wake up, beads of sweat dotting his forehead. Betty needed months of therapy before she could dance the Gay Gordons again and still suffers a panic attack whenever she's asked if she wants porridge oats.

To this day neither can look at a sporran without a cold shiver running down their spines ... oh the dangly bits ... the dangly bits ...

In the real world, these venues are advertised along the lines of "Burly, For Big Burly Men And Those Who Love Them" or some such. They're generally illustrated by a big poster at the door which shows some of the said Big Burly Men And Those Who Love Them in various states of undress. When Hank and Betty buy their entry tickets, the nature of the venue will be pointed out to them if they haven't already twigged on by noticing all the Big Burly Men And Those Who Love Them who were standing in the queue. There will be doorstaff, whose main role is not to maintain order amongst the Big Burly Men And Those Who Love Them, but to keep out the likes of Hank and Betty. If the doorstaff don't think you're gay or gay-friendly, they won't let you in. (Discrimination!) Inside, any sexual activity will be confined to a secluded or semi-secluded area at the back of the premises. You do not wander into one of these places by accident.

Lydia, I have never been to the club in question, so I can't give you a guarantee of anything. But what I can tell you is that it's almost unheard of for non-consensual sex to go on in that kind of club. After all, it's not like entirely consensual sex is difficult to find there.

What went on in the Arches is less serious than a parking ticket. Illegal parking inconveniences other road users. No one was inconvenienced by what went on in the Arches. I think more time police time and manpower combatting the enforced prostitution of the people trafficking trade is a much greater priority than this. Don't you agree?

Lev - It's so sad that for you sex is such a dangerous and fearful activity, so full of unknowns and risks. What demons must stalk your imagination. Are you are friend of Hank and Betty by any chance?

Re:Arches

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/09/01 15:36

Your attitude I A says it all; you have no respect for the sensibilities of others whether they live here or not. There are many of us, who have pride in our nation; you are obviously not within that clan. That does not mean you are exempt from the laws of our nation. I can imagine the response from many people from other nations "What is your abiding memory of Scotland" - well I saw people having group sex.

If as you say this is a normal part of a club, which welcomes gays, then I will be one of the people making very strong complaints to Scottish Government and the Scottish Police Force.

I could not care who is having group sex, save it for a private room and get a little respect for others.

I see no reason why any other person should be forced to be careful what type of nightclub our relatives or friends visit for fear they encountered a group of people having sex.

I do not agree with your comment about police and the work they do. If a complaint is made to the police they have a responsibility to make enquiries. Just as a for instance, if your attitude is typical of the people who frequent these venues then how are the police to know that no other activities take place which are also illegal.

Tough luck, if this is your way of enjoyment, do it in a private room and get rid of this selfish attitude. To use another very modern saying "get a life", if this is the highpoint of your week you have my sympathy.

Re:Arches

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/09/01 15:57

I can be fairly sure that Lev with his attitude will not catch STDs AIDS or any other illness, which will cost our nation a fortune. This takes up money, which could be used to treat people, with for instance, cancer or MS or any other illness, which is not caught by having group sex in a nightclub with mindless selfish morons with no more thought in their head than group sex at the weekend.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Robin T Cox - 2008/09/01 17:06

It's a bit a like a philatelist 'cos you get to lick sticky things that have been around a bit.

Philately will get you anywhere. :woohoo:

Imitation is the sincerest form of philately. :silly:

Any more for any more?

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by InfrequentAllele - 2008/09/02 22:57

Lydia, there's a whole lot of responses I could make if I could stop laughing long enough. Your post and Lev's are ill informed nonsense mixed with personal insults and insinuations. They merely illustrate your own ignorance and naivety, and your anger at being challenged and contradicted.

So I'll just say this -

Promiscuity doesn't kill people, ignorance about sexual health kills people.

If you want to blame anyone for the AIDS epidemic, blame those who are ignorant and fearful about sex and who selfishly demand everyone else is kept as ignorant and fearful as they are. Blame those people who are so stupid and naive that they think telling young people "just say no until you're married" prevents the spread of STDs. Blame the egoists who think only heterosexuality is normal and gay people should be tolerated only as long as they're invisible. Blame the hypocritical pharisees who want to reduce funding for sexual health education because it offends their moral self-righteousness.

Oh wait, that would be the likes of you and Lev, wouldn't it.

ps. I've never contracted any STDs. And it had got nothing to do with good luck either. Unlike you and Lev I know what I'm talking about.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Levenax - 2008/09/03 08:29

Obviously if your "careful" you can lessen the risk of STDs but don't try to pretend that homosexualists don't have a much higher rate of STDs than straight folk. Obviously some sort of gay abandon overcomes those who indulge in sex with multiple partners and the result is a higher incidence of every STD amongst those who practice homosexuality. You can't argue that homosexualists don't contract more STDs since it's well documented that they do. One doesn't have to descend to the nonsense of "gay bowel syndrome" a look at the figures for syphilis and HIV will suffice. I've worked in laboratories that deal with the diagnosis of STDs and I'm well aware of the patterns of infection in those who attend GUM clinics.

I really don't care what your preferences are but don't try to tell us that group sex with 30 other folk behind a curtain in a sweaty nightclub is in any way normal - it just ain't.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/09/03 09:44

InfrequentAllele wrote:

Lydia, there's a whole lot of responses I could make if I could stop laughing long enough. Your post and Lev's are ill informed nonsense mixed with personal insults and insinuations. They merely illustrate your own ignorance and naivety, and your anger at being challenged and contradicted.

So I'll just say this -

Promiscuity doesn't kill people, ignorance about sexual health kills people.

If you want to blame anyone for the AIDS epidemic, blame those who are ignorant and fearful about sex and who selfishly demand everyone else is kept as ignorant and fearful as they are. Blame those people who are so stupid and naive that they think telling young people "just say no until you're married" prevents the spread of STDs. Blame the egoists who think only heterosexuality is normal and gay people should be tolerated only as long as they're invisible. Blame the hypocritical pharisees who want to reduce funding for sexual health education because it offends their moral self-righteousness.

Oh wait, that would be the likes of you and Lev, wouldn't it.

ps. I've never contracted any STDs. And it had got nothing to do with good luck either. Unlike you and Lev I know what I'm talking about.

Oh my Oh my, now people will still catch STDs if they abstain from sex, ok are they airborne now.

I certainly have not laughed at your posts; I feel nothing but pity for people who have nothing else in their personal life worth caring about other than the so-called excitement of sex at the weekend. That does not mean a lack of sexual enjoyment is something alien to me it just means that I am not pathetic enough to need that kind of stimulation.

We only have your word for the fact that you have not caught STDs and quite frankly, your statement is irrelevant. It is the general trend of the cost of STDs to the nation, which is important. You may very well feel well educated about sexual protection, obviously the figures researched by Lev prove this is not so for every participant.

You are trying to make excuses for the fact that groups of people whether gay or not have sex openly in front of others in a nightclub. There is no excuse, and if that makes me a prude, I take that as a compliment. I will gladly stand up and say I am proud to be one, so thank you, just call me Mary.

The point of this discussion is selfish people no matter their sexual preference. Don't try to use this age-old "stop picking on us because we are gay routine". I have not, at any time, in any post, differentiated, between gay and heterosexual people in the point I am making about group sex in a nightclub or any other venue.

It is a well-known fact that the type of group hysteria, that exists within a group having group sex, and especially when drink and drugs are in use can lead to mindless actions. Those mindless drink or drug-induced actions could very well be the lack of protection or the use and abuse of a young drunk person.

The whole point is simply put why should others avoid a venue or find the need to choose carefully a venue because of the sexual activity of others and why should our country be given a bad reputation because of the selfish self-centred actions of a minority. I repeat get a private room.

Re:Arches

Posted by Bananaman - 2008/09/03 17:42

Levenax wrote:

You can't argue that homosexuals don't contract more STDs since it's well documented that they do. One doesn't have to descend to the nonsense of "gay bowel syndrome" a look at the figures for syphilis and HIV will suffice. I've worked in laboratories that deal with the diagnosis of STDs and I'm well aware of the patterns of infection in those who attend GUM clinics.

I really don't care what your preferences are but don't try to tell us that group sex with 30 other folk behind a curtain in a sweaty nightclub is in any way normal - it just ain't.

If you're going to make such stereotypical claims lets have figures please (or at the least relevant weblinks) rather than the type inflamatory personal anecdotes beloved by tabloid hacks and unscrupulous politicians.

I just wonder if the persons concerned had been of the heterosexual persuasion if we'd even be having this discussion?

Would the polis have busted the gaff?

Would it have made the papers unless some vaguely famous person had been caught or was alleged to have been there in the past?

As to worrying about poor mythological tourists....words fail me.

Never mind some of the highest rates of heart disease in the developed world, never mind our well publicised alcohol 'problem', never mind our 'lets rip off the tourists' holiday industry.

Essential tourist services like decent food at decent prices....as rare as free range haggis!!!!

And we're worrying about a few adults with albeit unusual sexual preferences?

Lets worry instead about the treatment of those who have actually been raped or otherwise sexually exploited rather than consenting adults in a private club...and it WAS private the door policy would have seen to that.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Martin - 2008/09/04 09:59

Never mind the tourists, I object strongly to open displays of group sex (ok even if it is behind a curtain) whether homo or hetero. It is NOT normal!

It is a moot point whether it would be featured in the news if it happened in, say a lap dancing club. The fact remains that this is illegal and, frankly, distasteful.

It is wrong to state that this goes on all the time in lap dancing clubs. I've been to a fair few in my time (stag nights, works nights out etc) and I have never seen that type of behaviour. It does go on in saunas, I believe, but that's behind closed and locked doors.

The key objection here which no right minded person can object to is the public aspect of this.

As far as STDs are concerned, high incidences of STDs occur where there are high levels of multiple partners, homo, hetero or both. Surely this is common sense. In multiple sex sessions like this the risk must be enormous, regardless of precautions taken. There is always a risk of accidents and the more partners you have, the greater the risk.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Bananaman - 2008/09/05 00:28

Martin wrote:

Never mind the tourists, I object strongly to open displays of group sex (ok even if it is behind a curtain) whether homo or hetero. It is NOT normal!

The key objection here which no right minded person can object to is the public aspect of this.

As far as STDs are concerned, high incidences of STDs occur where there are high levels of multiple partners, homo, hetero or both. Surely this is common sense. In multiple sex sessions like this the risk must be enormous, regardless of precautions taken. There is always a risk of accidents and the more partners you have, the greater the risk.

Ok so you object which you have every right to do. However you have no right to then go on to talk about 'normal' which you don't define, or even more derogatorily 'right-minded' meaning I presume those whose views you agree with and

thus safely casting as lesser beings and not worth considering those with whom you don't agree. I fundamentally object to your pious sanctimonious 'right minded' thinking and characterisations. Such thinking is often the resort of the intolerant and dictatorial. I can object to your views if I so wish and you have no right to prejudge and label me as not being of 'right mind' if I should do so.

Normal is a normative term, frequently used in a pejorative fashion and is usually used by those who seek to impose their moral biases on others (often with no concomitant dissection of their own behaviour).

So just what do you mean by 'normal'? Do you mean in line with societal norms which is what the term is linked to? Or do you mean behaviour which falls within some measure of average defined by reference to some statistical measure of sexual behaviour?

If the former to who's mores are you referring? Those extolled by our tabloid hacks? Those exhibited by some sector of the population of whom you approve?

If it is the latter then to which sector of the population are you ascribing said 'normal'ness? I suspect you would get vastly different results from grannies in Inverness than you would from twenty year old clubbers in Glasgow. And then again you'd need to know who carried out the survey and what sampling techniques they used. See my thread Lies, Damned Lies & Statistics.

The behaviour was NOT going on in public. It was going on in a place to which members of the public MAY have had access (which is unlikely given the sorts of door policies these nights employ). To attempt to portray its location as 'in public' is scurrilous and inflammatory.

As to rates of STD infection can you provide figures which show that those who indulge in 'orgy' type sexual acts suffer higher rates of sexual infections than those who are merely having sex with many different partners? If you can please post them or at least the link to the studies.

If not, then like Lev, you are merely displaying personal intolerant preferences with no objective basis in fact.

You have every right to your opinions. You don't have the right to present them as fact and in the process castigate anyone who offends your moral sensibilities, either me or our fellow citizens.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Clare - 2008/09/05 01:20

B'man, that was a bit of a rant was it not? Shall I tell you what annoys me? People like you who detest the word normal. If you are happy to go with the "if it feels good do it" brigade fine, just say so.

There is a word "normal" and its definition is generally known so I really don't know why you are so upset about the use of it. Normal describes the usual way, the common way, or, dare I say, the norm. What's the problem with that?

The anus is an exit for body waste, that is its "normal" function and that is a fact. It is also a fact that regularly using the anus as an entrance for a penis causes damage which can lead to surgery being required up to and including a full colostomy because the anus has been completely destroyed beyond repair. And why? Because it isn't what the anus was designed for!

I would broaden that argument out to cover STDs too. The body if it was designed for promiscuity would cope with it and not break down the way it clearly does. That is a fact too no matter how much you wish to simply attack anyone saying such things. Promiscuity does indeed kill the body eventually or damages it very badly and yes I know there are treatments for STDs but the point I am making here is that it clearly hurts the body. That is a biological fact and ranting at people for daring to use the word "normal" is just plain daft. You're banging on about people dictating and just look at your own post and the tone adopted throughout. Whether the sex involves group sessions or otherwise the fact is STDs are through the roof and we have even seen the return of the really old ones like syphilis and gonorrhoea. Others like chlamydia can be present and do great damage to a woman without her even being aware of it. But hey, don't speak about these things in a negative way or one's view is compared with that of some ancient wee auld-fashioned Inverness granny! This isn't about moral bias B'man, its about plain old common bloody sense and its the "if it feels good just do it" mob who actively now encourage young people and even pressure them into living lifestyles that can do them great damage in the long run.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Levenax - 2008/09/05 10:19

Bananaman wrote:

As to rates of STD infection can you provide figures which show that those who indulge in 'orgy' type sexual acts suffer higher rates of sexual infections than those who are merely having sex with many different partners? If you can please post them or at least the link to the studies.

Referring to infectious syphilis the report Sexually Transmitted Infections, including HIV, in Scotland 2005 published by Health Protection Scotland said on page 18 "Between 2001 and 2005, there has been an almost 700% increase in diagnoses at GUM clinics â€" this is primarily due to a 25-fold increase in diagnoses among MSM." See <http://www.documents.hps.scot.nhs.uk/bbvsti/sti/publications/moving-forward-20061122.pdf>

There's lots of other stuff about things like anal warts and hepatitis B that MSMs are particularly likely to get.

Now if you use your imagination it is obvious that so called safe sex in an orgy situation is nigh-on impossible. Can you imagine a participant changing condoms between partners? Sure, if he kept the same one on he'd be "safe" but the subsequent recipient of his attentions would be exposed to the body fluids of the previous partners. Yuk.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Bananaman - 2008/09/05 21:58

Clare wrote:

There is a word "normal" and its definition is generally known so I really don't know why you are so upset about the use of it. Normal describes the usual way, the common way, or, dare I say, the norm. What's the problem with that?

No Clare there is a difference between the definition and the usage. My point was that the usage and what behaviour is classified as 'normal' varies depending on context.

Normal means in accordance with norms. Norms are NOT fixed they are socially constructed and as such vary from place to place and from era to era.

What is defined as 'normal' therefore also varies from group to group and place to place. Normal behaviour in one setting and by one person will vary depending on the situation. Eating your young is relatively abnormal in most species and in most situations. Yet under certain conditions it is widely observed and is therefore normal under those conditions.

What is normal behaviour for today's teenagers may well have been considered disgraceful and deviant 40 years ago (although the behaviour of young people has been a source of concern and a sign of moral breakdown since there were newspaper letter pages to complain to). Likewise the lives lived by today's pensioners would not have been considered normal for pensioners 50 years ago.

You're right it was a rant and I make no apologies for it.

The rest of your argument was a variant on the 'use as God intended' arguments and is just pseudoscientific moralising to suit whatever preferences the user wishes to portray as above reproach and criticism.

Homosexuality it would appear is as old as the human race. It is evident in all our major cultures, although it is true that most of the major religions frown on it (to put it mildly in some cases). Therefore to try to claim that it is 'unnatural' is more than a little untenable.

Our skin was never intended to be used to stick needles in yet we do it all the time. Our eyes were never designed to look at flat objects for hours on end yet we do it all the time. Women were designed for childbirth therefore they should stick to rearing children. Our feet were designed to walk barefoot on yielding surfaces yet we encase them in shoes and build footpaths of concrete, our spines were not designed to walk fully upright yet we do, etc, etc, etc.

It would appear that the body isn't designed to deal with much of modern life Clare hence the rise in asthmas, immune system diseases, incidence of depression, etc, are you advocating a return to a more agrarian social structure? Shall we do away with cities? All move to the country?

I am concerned about the rise in STD's as a public health issue however the premises weren't raided under public health grounds and neo-puritan moralising is not the answer in my opinion.

The whole 'swinger' scene be they gay or straight is not my idea of a satisfying relationship nor is it a way I would choose to spend my time. However I do NOT believe that it is my business, or anyone else's to police the activities of consenting adults in a private setting.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Bananaman - 2008/09/05 22:08

Levenax wrote:

Referring to infectious syphilis the report Sexually Transmitted Infections, including HIV, in Scotland 2005 published by Health Protection Scotland said on page 18 "Between 2001 and 2005, there has been an almost 700% increase in diagnoses at GUM clinics – this is primarily due to a 25-fold increase in diagnoses among MSM." See <http://www.documents.hps.scot.nhs.uk/bbvsti/sti/publications/moving-forward-20061122.pdf>

There's lots of other stuff about things like anal warts and hepatitis B that MSMs are particularly likely to get. Now if you use your imagination it is obvious that so called safe sex in an orgy situation is nigh-on impossible. Can you imagine a participant changing condoms between partners? Sure, if he kept the same one on he'd be "safe" but the subsequent recipient of his attentions would be exposed to the body fluids of the previous partners. Yuk.

As to the figures you present Lev... they don't specify whether the MSM's also slept with women and actually there were fewer new cases in MSM's (a drop of 1) than in heterosexuals (a rise of 9) between 2004 and 2005.

For Genital Warts they don't specify MSM they merely talk about men and women.

There were also more HIV cases in heterosexuals than in MSMs so it's hardly a 'Gay plague'. AND – "Increased HIV testing is considered to be the principal explanation for the increase in the number of newly identified cases of HIV in 2005." which is a direct quote i.e. its not that there is more HIV out there its just that we went looking for it. In fact the incidence is 4% in MSMs and 6.5% for men who had exposure in 'high risk countries' (10% for women with the same exposure) again hardly a 'gay plague'.

It is difficult to compare infection rates as they only talk about MSMs who presented for testing or had one STD who then proved positive for another not as a percentage of the whole MSM population. Whereas they do give these figures for young people. This creates a bias since by definition those who present for testing would be more likely to have a disease (why else would they be there?) so their infection rates will be much higher and therefore make the incidence in the whole MSM population appear worse as a result.

Another direct quote:

"Young women and young men aged less than 25 accounted for 40% and 27%, respectively, of the total workload in GUM clinics." i.e. almost 70% of the workload of the clinics were people under 25 years of age, Nearly half of those who went to the clinics were YOUNG WOMEN Lev NOT, repeat NOT, gay men. No mention here of MSM or not. Why are you not highlighting them as reprehensible? After all their behaviour is resulting in far more use of our health resources.

No it would appear its gay men and their behaviour which you dislike. If that is how you feel then fine as a citizen in a liberal democracy you have that right. What I find distasteful is your attempt to impose your morality on other adults who have the same rights as you claim for yourself.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Clare - 2008/09/05 23:47

Bananaman wrote:

Clare wrote:

There is a word "normal" and its definition is generally known so I really don't know why you are so upset about the use of it. Normal describes the usual way, the common way, or, dare I say, the norm. What's the problem with that?

No Clare there is a difference between the definition and the usage. My point was that the usage and what behaviour is classified as 'normal' varies depending on context.

Normal means in accordance with norms. Norms are NOT fixed they are socially constructed and as such vary from place to place and from era to era.

What is defined as 'normal' therefore also varies from group to group and place to place. Normal behaviour in one setting and by one person will vary depending on the situation. Eating your young is relatively abnormal in most species and in most situations. Yet under certain conditions it is widely observed and is therefore normal under those conditions.

What is normal behaviour for today's teenagers may well have been considered disgraceful and deviant 40 years ago (although the behaviour of young people has been a source of concern and a sign of moral breakdown since there were newspaper letter pages to complain to). Likewise the lives lived by today's pensioners would not have been considered normal for pensioners 50 years ago.

You're right it was a rant and I make no apologies for it.

The rest of your argument was a variant on the 'use as God intended' arguments and is just pseudoscientific moralising to suit whatever preferences the user wishes to portray as above reproach and criticism. Homosexuality it would appear is as old as the human race. It is evident in all our major cultures, although it is true that most of the major religions frown on it (to put it mildly in some cases). Therefore to try to claim that it is 'unnatural' is more than a little untenable.

Our skin was never intended to be used to stick needles in yet we do it all the time. Our eyes were never designed to look at flat objects for hours on end yet we do it all the time. Women were designed for childbirth therefore they should stick to rearing children. Our feet were designed to walk barefoot on yielding surfaces yet we encase them in shoes and build footpaths of concrete, our spines were not designed to walk fully upright yet we do, etc, etc, etc.

It would appear that the body isn't designed to deal with much of modern life hence the rise in asthmas, immune system diseases, incidence of depression, etc, are you advocating a return to a more agrarian social structure? Shall we do away with cities? All move to the country?

I am concerned about the rise in STD's as a public health issue however the premises weren't raided under public health grounds and neo-puritan moralising is not the answer in my opinion.

The whole 'swinger' scene be they gay or straight is not my idea of a satisfying relationship nor is it a way I would choose to spend my time. However I do NOT believe that it is my business, or anyone else's to police the activities of consenting adults in a private setting.

I did not mention God once in my post so please don't twist my words. What you are doing here is exactly what you accused Martin or doing, ramming YOUR views down everyone else's throats B'man. Your views are ok, but mine are wrong? Well I disagree and I'm entitled.

Modern life, as you put it, includes a lot of things that do damage the body and that is a fact, one which you cannot dispute. That isn't down to me or my morals, or anyone else's for that matter, it is just the truth. I was not moralising but simply stating biological facts. Facts you clearly can't deal with considering the ludicrous argument you have come back with. You can fill pages with your objections to my statement that the body does not physically cope with certain practices and you will still not change the the truth of that statement. The anus is an exit for body waste and that is its function. When used as anything other than an exit, it becomes damaged and eventually breaks down.

Your last post is almost hysterical given the extent to which you have frankly made things up and attempted to pass them off as views of mine. I did not say anywhere that women should have children and do nothing else. I did not say we should abandon our cities because of the rise in athsma either. Good grief, you're even trying to re-define the word normal so determined are you to score some sort of points victory in your own mind. I find that a bit worrying.

I don't really know what the status of this club was B'man. Some posts suggest it was not a private club which means "the public" had access to it. As far as I'm aware that makes the venue subject to certain laws although I'm sure it would be better to ask a policeman about that.

Re:Arches

Posted by Levenax - 2008/09/05 23:58

I would never make any attempt to impose my views on homosexuals. They can do what they want as long as it's legal and does no harm to anybody else. I don't think that sodomy is an abomination, it just a sexual preference. It's quite obvious that it's a risky practice especially when homosexuals typically have more sexual partners than straight folk. I take no moral view on the matter. You can finesse the STD fugures all you want but it's a plain fact that MSMs

DO contract syphilis and many other STDs much more often than straight people AND they tend to get repeat infections, unlike straights who usually learn their lesson after one nasty experience.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Bananaman - 2008/09/06 23:01

Hi Clare

Now you are being disingenuous Clare you mentioned the anus as having been designed.

Therefore implying there was a designer. Just which designer are you thinking of?

I assumed that you were implying a creator aka God however if you have another designer in mind I would be interested in hearing your views.

My problem with the way 'normal' has been used in this thread is that it implies a cosy consensus and a majority opinion. And in this thread this appealed to consensus has been used to vilify a minority which is the real danger of using terms like 'normal' in a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural society and is the reason I object to it so strongly.

As for my being hysterical...in your dreams girl I am perfectly lucid and reason my posts.

As for me including the examples including the one about women they were intended as examples to highlight the fallacy of using the 'designed' argument about human beings in particular and any biological entity in general.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Bananaman - 2008/09/06 23:13

Levenax wrote:

I would never make any attempt to impose my views on homosexualists. They can do what they want as long as it's legal and does no harm to anybody else. I don't think that sodomy is an abomination, it just a sexual preference. It's quite obvious that it's a risky practice especially when homosexualists typically have more sexual partners than straight folk. I take no moral view on the matter. You can finesse the STD figures all you want but it's a plain fact that MSMs DO contract syphilis and many other STDs much more often than straight people AND they tend to get repeat infections, unlike straights who usually learn their lesson after one nasty experience.

There you go again Lev you claim that you don't impose your views about MSMs then go on to state

MSMs DO contract syphilis and many other STDs much more often than straight people AND they tend to get repeat infections, unlike straights who usually learn their lesson after one nasty experience.

The first bit is fine and is born out by the facts the part from "unlike straights" is stereotypical, derogatory and inflammatory. I know from my own experience that many straights don't learn from their first or even subsequent experiences and the actual numbers are higher as a number but not as a ratio or percentage. Irresponsible behaviour is not confined to the gay community.

The high rates of STD infection across the board are due to a cultural anomaly whereby most sexual encounters(especially, but not exclusively, among the young)occur after taking alcohol and/or other intoxicants. This allied to the belief, when young that we are invulnerable and it'll only happen to someone else, means that many encounters occur when the participants are not in a responsible frame of mind and therefore the use of condoms is rarer than it could be.

Perhaps we ought to look at our attitudes to sexual intimacy and the way we socialise our young people so that they are confident enough to have sexual intercourse, or not, without the prior use of alcohol or other drugs.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Clare - 2008/09/07 00:27

Bananaman wrote:

Hi Clare

Now you are being disingenuous Clare you mentioned the anus as having been designed.

Therefore implying there was a designer. Just which designer are you thinking of?

I assumed that you were implying a creator aka God however if you have another designer in mind I would be interested in hearing your views.

My problem with the way 'normal' has been used in this thread is that it implies a cosy consensus and a majority opinion. And in this thread this appealed to consensus has been used to vilify a minority which is the real danger of using terms like 'normal' in a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural society and is the reason I object to it so strongly.

As for my being hysterical...in your dreams girl I am perfectly lucid and reason my posts.

As for me including the examples including the one about women they were intended as examples to highlight the fallacy of using the 'designed' argument about human beings in particular and any biological entity in general.

No, B'man, you're doing it again, you are twisting my words. Pack it in and just read them, its simpler! There is nothing disingenuous in anything I said. I spoke of the physical design of the body! I did NOT say who had designed it. Read it again. And I spoke the truth about the design. The anus is an exit for body waste : fact. Ok?

You are the one indulging in complete nonsense here, I am talking pure biology so please stop implying otherwise.

I do not have a problem with people improvising because they don't wish to indulge in heterosexual relationships but bear in mind that's what they are doing, improvising. And in the course of doing so the anus is damaged because it was not designed to be used for that purpose. Which is why so many male homosexuals end up needing colostomies! As I said before, that isn't my fault, so take it up with someone else and get off my back about it. I have villified no one so you can take that back too if you don't mind as I am heartily sick of untrue allegations being thrown about on this site for simply stating facts while others fall over themselves to deny the facts for fear of being politically incorrect. Tough B'man. Facts are facts and you're the one talking fallacies, not me. The fuss you have made over the word "design" is outrageous. I'm talking about how the body is structured, designed, put together. How you can attack my phraseology as disingenuous is almost hilarious. It also shows how weak your argument is.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Clare - 2008/09/07 00:29

Oh and whoever is knocking hell out of my karma,I don't give a flying wotsit. If it made you feel good keep going!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!:)

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Levenax - 2008/09/07 08:44

B'man. I've got the spreadsheet for Scottish STDs for the last decade on my desk. In 2007 12712 males and 10194 females attended clinics. Of these 235 men and 14 women had syphilis, 622 men and 242 women had gonorrhoea, 107 men and 26 women had HIV, 911 men and 350 women had "other acute STI".

The skew is caused by MSMs, especially with syphilis where many of the primary lesions in men were in the mouth and throat.

Now for syphilis alone look at 1998 when 3 men who attended clinics were diagnosed and 5 women. So diagnosed syphilis in women has gone up approximately three times in the intervening years but in men by just over 78 times.

This has happened because MSMs, who usually have multiple partners, have been neglecting so called safe sex.

As I've said before I make no moral judgement on the behaviour of MSMs but they are clearly suffering health problems as a result of their lifestyle choice. As do also, for example, smokers and greedy people.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Robin T Cox - 2008/09/07 09:19

As I've said before I make no moral judgement on the behaviour of MSMs but they are clearly suffering health problems as a result of their lifestyle choice. As do also, for example, smokers and greedy people.

Reading through this thread, however, I'm not clear whether the objectors to anal sex are against it on health grounds, or on moral grounds, or on some wierd mixture of both, which they have not thought through: except that the health issue is being used to reinforce the case for moral disapproval.

As far as health is concerned, there are far more serious health matters to be anxious or concerned about, surely, to judge from the published statistics. Smoking, obesity, cancer and in mental health depressive illness are far more serious threats than anal warts or VD.

Therefore it seems to me that the case for moral disapproval should stand on its own two feet. But, of course, in that case it might not have much of a leg to stand on.

Furthermore, it seems to me that if we are concerned about health, we should be acting as healers not judges.

See Desmond Tutu on this subject:

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7602535.stm>

Re:Arches

Posted by Clare - 2008/09/07 12:09

Robin can I just say my comments are not based on moral judgements and I am sick to death of certain types of comments being "judged" by others in that way. So, for the last time, can I just repeat the reason why I made the comments? I pointed out certain things about the body and its physical design and reaction to certain things. Anal sex was just one example, I also mentioned promiscuity. I said the body clearly breaks down in certain circumstances and becomes damaged and that is perfectly true. It is not a moral judgement but a plain fact. I have indeed thought it through and I think it is most unfair of you to suggest otherwise and attempt to rubbish my contribution or twist its meaning in the way others have. I am very disappointed to see you taking that route.

Re:Arches

Posted by TLJ - 2008/09/07 12:22

Clare wrote:

Robin can I just say my comments are not based on moral judgements and I am sick to death of certain types of comments being "judged" by others in that way. .

It's a bit difficult not to when you make references to the "'if it feels good do it' brigade' and the "'if it feels good do it' mob'

Re:Arches

Posted by Clare - 2008/09/07 12:27

TLJ wrote:

Clare wrote:

Robin can I just say my comments are not based on moral judgements and I am sick to death of certain types of comments being "judged" by others in that way. .

It's a bit difficult not to when you make references to the "'if it feels good do it' brigade' and the "'if it feels good do it' mob'

TLJ and how is that a moral judgement? I responded to people who were prepared to say just about everything is ok and who were unwilling to consider arguments put by anyone else. That isn't a moral judgement, I simply challenged

them regarding the facts I had presented myself about the physical reaction of the body to certain things. Facts they chose to ignore incidentally.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by TLJ - 2008/09/07 13:16

Clare wrote:

TLJ wrote:

Clare wrote:

Robin can I just say my comments are not based on moral judgements and I am sick to death of certain types of comments being "judged" by others in that way. .

It's a bit difficult not to when you make references to the "'if it feels good do it' brigade' and the "'if it feels good do it' mob'

TLJ and how is that a moral judgement?

They're very dismissive turns of phrase which clearly suggests some form of disapproval of an approach to life - and therefore is a moral judgement.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Clare - 2008/09/07 14:12

TLJ wrote:

Clare wrote:

TLJ wrote:

Clare wrote:

Robin can I just say my comments are not based on moral judgements and I am sick to death of certain types of comments being "judged" by others in that way. .

It's a bit difficult not to when you make references to the "'if it feels good do it' brigade' and the "'if it feels good do it' mob'

TLJ and how is that a moral judgement?

They're very dismissive turns of phrase which clearly suggests some form of disapproval of an approach to life - and therefore is a moral judgement.

T, it is NOT a moral judgement, it just suits you to call it that. I know it isn't and that's good enough for me. You have ignored everything else I said and that clearly suits you too. Fine if that's the way you want to go but it rather says you wish to select which parts you wish to debate by zooming in on a few words and ignoring hundreds of others. Seems to me you're doing a bit of judging yourself there. I'll withdraw now. I am clearly weighed down with morals and I have no right to express a view even when facts are involved. Maybe I'll set up a support group :)

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/09/07 14:58

I have watched this thread develop with interest.

Ok, what this thread seems to be saying is, morals have no place in our world anymore. I disagree. To prove the point I will make a moral judgement. Let's see what the reaction is to this judgement.

I think sex with many partners is not only immoral for me, but against any type of normality. If this were normal, I would imagine this would have been a normal activity for many of our ancestors.

Whether you decide that the world was created by the big bang and subsequently by a gradual formation of the human or God, it seems to me that any aperture made for taking waste away from the body should be used for just that. The

apertures created for copulation are designed whether you believe that to be by God or nature, for having sex.

I do not believe people who have homosexual feelings feel that way by choice or are having immoral feelings, for some reason they just are. Within history, it is noted, that homosexual people have always existed throughout the generations.

I cannot and have no wish to decide how others live their life so as I also believe each person is responsible for their own life and has a right to decide how to live their own life. I accept each person as they are and respect the fact that they have decided that they have a need or a want to have homosexual sex or sex outside of or before marriage.

With one proviso the way they live their life should not effect the way I live mine because that too is my right, it is about respect. I do not say to people who have group sex you should come to mass and atone for your sins that is their decision.

Their way of living would not be my way but I am not them I cannot live their life for them and have no wish to. I do not believe I am better than they are just different with a different way of life. Neither would I want to live the life of a train or bank robber or a rapist or a rapist. People are just people, they will live their own life.

The reason I believe that having group sex in a nightclub in front of other people is wrong is that just as people have a right to decide not to inhale my smoke others have the right not to witness my sex act. I have a right not to witness their sex act. I have a right not to be annoyed by a drunk and abusive person I have a right not to be raped or robbed or anything I do not agree with in my life.

Group sex, is an offence to the sensibilities of some, and therefore, should be kept behind closed doors. In this club as possibly in others, people who did not want to witness this act did, this is proven by the police having more than one complaint.

Re:Arches

Posted by TLJ - 2008/09/07 15:58

LYDIA REID wrote:

I have watched this thread develop with interest.

Ok, what this thread seems to be saying is, morals have no place in our world anymore. I disagree. To prove the point I will make a moral judgement.

I don't think the thread is saying that at all but (as you show yourself in your example), what is moral to one is not to another.

The judgemental bit comes in when you condemn out of hand those who do not follow your own code. You, yourself, don't appear to do so. Sadly, others do.

Re:Arches

Posted by Bananaman - 2008/09/07 18:20

Clare wrote:

Bananaman wrote:

No, B'man, you're doing it again, you are twisting my words. Pack it in and just read them, its simpler! There is nothing disingenuous in anything I said. I spoke of the physical design of the body! I did NOT say who had designed it. Read it again. And I spoke the truth about the design. The anus is an exit for body waste : fact. Ok?

You are the one indulging in complete nonsense here, I am talking pure biology so please stop implying otherwise.

No Clare you're not talking pure biology you're talking psuedoscience and anthropomorphism there is NO design implied in biology only in a human centric viewpoint of it.

Natural selection and genetic mutation are RANDOM. Survival is by chance not design in a truly scientific viewpoint. To claim otherwise is to misrepresent both chaos theory and natural selection.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Bananaman - 2008/09/07 18:46

TLJ wrote:

LYDIA REID wrote:

I have watched this thread develop with interest.

Ok, what this thread seems to be saying is, morals have no place in our world anymore. I disagree. To prove the point I will make a moral judgement.

I don't think the thread is saying that at all but (as you show yourself in your example), what is moral to one is not to another.

The judgemental bit comes in when you condemn out of hand those who do not follow your own code. You, yourself, don't appear to do so. Sadly, others do.

Thanks TLJ I agree with you and Lydia. I won't and don't seek to impose my views BUT I am unwilling to sit back and allows those who try to so do have the playing field to themselves.

I agree with most of what Lydia says too except that I'm wary of people who talk about design in biological systems. Design is a human concept and by definition, if there is a design there is a designer and most worryingly ideas of 'proper' (aka 'natural') use. It is where these types of ideas can lead and have led that concerns me. A point I was trying to make with the inclusion of the 'women are designed for child bearing' example.

As another example:- If I use the design hypothesis it is perfectly plausible to claim that life on this planet is designed to be killed and eaten (you could even back this up with scientific data on population explosions and crashes).

Thus as long as I eat what I kill then I am ok as I was merely following the design parameters. It doesn't specify how I kill or which animals are off-limits so to speak. In fact the idea that any animals are to be off-limits implies a 'special case' scenario which implies a human viewpoint intruding into the 'natural design process' does it not?

To go back something Clare accused me of I'm most certainly not a member of the 'if it feels good do it camp' nor do I believe that anything goes. But societal norms are to be achieved by debate and consensus not by imposition in my opinion. Hence I will argue the case as I see it and everyone can agree or not that's our right.

As for the idea that some member of the public has to witness something to make a complaint that the police will enforce this is not necessarily the case. Malicious complaints are made frequently. And complaints may be based on hearsay and anecdotal evidence and often will only be acted upon if the complainant knows ranking police officers or is a minister of the church, local bigwig or similarly well-connected or vocal individual.

I suspect in this case that the complainant may well fall into these categories as getting premises raided for a range of illegal behaviours is hardly straightforward as the number of pubs and clubs where drug taking and drug dealing are common place testifies.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Robin T Cox - 2008/09/07 20:26

See:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intelligent_design

The cry of the Religious Right.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/09/08 11:16

When I say every person has a right and a responsibility to form their own views on whether or not they believe in God that does not take away my right to try to live as God wants. (I wish I were that perfect)

I think if more looked at the possibility that, man defined the day God spoke of, not god then, it is not unrealistic to believe that no great disparity exists between the two theories.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/09/08 12:10

Bananaman wrote:

TLJ wrote:

LYDIA REID wrote:

I have watched this thread develop with interest.

Ok, what this thread seems to be saying is, morals have no place in our world anymore. I disagree. To prove the point I will make a moral judgement.

I don't think the thread is saying that at all but (as you show yourself in your example), what is moral to one is not to another.

The judgemental bit comes in when you condemn out of hand those who do not follow your own code. You, yourself, don't appear to do so. Sadly, others do.

Thanks TLJ I agree with you and Lydia. I won't and don't seek to impose my views BUT I am unwilling to sit back and allows those who try to so do have the playing field to themselves.

I agree with most of what Lydia says too except that I'm wary of people who talk about design in biological systems. Design is a human concept and by definition, if there is a design there is a designer and most worryingly ideas of 'proper' (aka 'natural') use. It is where these types of ideas can lead and have led that concerns me. A point I was trying to make with the inclusion of the 'women are designed for child bearing' example.

As another example:- If I use the design hypothesis it is perfectly plausible to claim that life on this planet is designed to be killed and eaten (you could even back this up with scientific data on population explosions and crashes).

Thus as long as I eat what I kill then I am ok as I was merely following the design parameters. It doesn't specify how I kill or which animals are off-limits so to speak. In fact the idea that any animals are to be off-limits implies a 'special case' scenario which implies a human viewpoint intruding into the 'natural design process' does it not?

To go back something Clare accused me of I'm most certainly not a member of the 'if it feels good do it camp' nor do I believe that anything goes. But societal norms are to be achieved by debate and consensus not by imposition in my opinion. Hence I will argue the case as I see it and everyone can agree or not that's our right.

As for the idea that some member of the public has to witness something to make a complaint that the police will enforce this is not necessarily the case. Malicious complaints are made frequently. And complaints may be based on hearsay and anecdotal evidence and often will only be acted upon if the complainant knows ranking police officers or is a minister of the church, local bigwig or similarly well-connected or vocal individual.

I suspect in this case that the complainant may well fall into these categories as getting premises raided for a range of illegal behaviours is hardly straightforward as the number of pubs and clubs where drug taking and drug dealing are common place testifies.

The designer may be nature it may be God but are you seriously telling me that men were designed to have babies....no. Then it surely follows that woman were. You cannot change that fact unless we talk of the asexual creatures within our ken then the female of any species is "designed" to have babies.

1. vti create detailed plan of something: to make a detailed plan of the form or structure of something, emphasizing features such as its appearance, convenience, and efficient functioning
a well-designed car interior
2. vti plan and make something: to plan and make something in a skilful or artistic way
3. vt intend something for particular use: to intend something for a particular purpose
The scholarship was designed to aid foreign students.
4. vt invent something: to contrive, devise, or plan something

They designed a scheme to get rich quick.

n (plural designs)

1. picture of something's form and structure: a drawing or other graphical representation of something that shows how it is to function or be made

2. way something is made: the way in which something is planned and made

the elegant design of the aircraft's wings

3. decorative pattern: a pattern or shape, sometimes repeated, used for decoration

a geometric design

4. process of designing: the process, techniques, or art of designing things

studied architecture and design

5. intention: an underlying sense of purpose or planning (formal)

or designs, npl

selfish or dishonest plan: a secretive plan undertaken for selfish or dishonest motives

by design intentionally or on purpose

Encarta © World English Dictionary © & (P) 1998-2005 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved.

I think there are times when too much intrusion into the use of a word can be unhelpful.

If you cannot admit that the Anus and the bowels were "designed" to be used to process the waste of the body then you are in a poor state. That is exactly what the body uses them for. The fact that some humans have found another use for them does not take away the fact that whether God or nature that is what they were "designed" for.

Neither can you assume that the complaints received were malicious it could be many gays object to this open display of sex in a nightclub. If this is a purely gay nightclub that would lead me to believe that, the complaints came from mostly gay people. Just because a person is gay does not preclude them from a moralistic belief or attitude. Nor does this separate the gay person from a belief that group sex is something they need not witness if they do not want to.

It could be they also were saying get a room and preferably a private one and do not intrude on the lives of other people.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Meg - 2008/09/08 17:02

Hi Lydia,

I noticed in your last post that you were wondering if the Arches was a gay nightclub. The Arches is an arts venue. Most of the people who attend events there (without wanting to stereotype anyone!) are middle aged heterosexual couples. It was started a few years ago and is a charity. It has a very up market cafe/bar (with prices for food and drink that reflect this). Most of the events it puts on are to support the arts in many different areas - music, dance, theatre etc and it supports many young and established artists. It also runs an educational programme open to children and adults and has many link ups with schools and other arts organisations.

The club nights are run as night club type nights. They cater for a great many different types of audience. It is one night a month that this event takes (took?) place. I am not trying to imply that it is acceptable to have sex taking place on the premises. I have previously stated that I don't agree with this. However as the majority of the events that the Arches puts on are seen as positive and beneficial to the arts then I wonder if there is a way to deal with this without closing the whole venue for six weeks.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Bananaman - 2008/09/08 20:05

LYDIA REID wrote:

If you cannot admit that the Anus and the bowels were "designed" to be used to process the waste of the body then you are in a poor state. That is exactly what the body uses them for. The fact that some humans have found another use for them does not take away the fact that whether God or nature that is what they were "designed" for.

Neither can you assume that the complaints received were malicious it could be many gays object to this open display of sex in a nightclub. If this is a purely gay nightclub that would lead me to believe that, the complaints came from mostly gay people. Just because a person is gay does not preclude them from a moralistic belief or attitude. Nor does this separate the gay person from a belief that group sex is something they need not witness if they do not want to.

It could be they also were saying get a room and preferably a private one and do not intrude on the lives of other people.

So now because I disagree with your ascientific viewpoint concerning "design" in biological systems I'm fair game for a personal attack Lydia? How very tolerant.

If I cannot assume that the complaints were malicious how can it be acceptable for you to assume that they were not? Double standards!!

At no time have I inferred any level of morality or otherwise on gay people or any others for that matter. Quite the reverse I'm arguing as I am against a perceived moralising tone to the condemnation of those mentioned in the original posting.

I too would not wish to witness such behaviour, or many other forms of behaviour, but provided it is not 'on display' and between consenting adults then it is, I believe, none of my business.

I may (and do) have views on whether or not I believe such behaviour is conducive to life, love or happiness but unless I am asked by someone for my advice then in line with my personal philosophical views I'll keep them to myself and live my life by standards I find suitable for me and which allow me to live in peace with myself and the world around me.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by InfrequentAllele - 2008/09/10 23:54

Dearie me, I go away for a while and look what happens. As has been said, no poor unsuspecting soul is going to stumble upon a gay orgy, but then that's not really the problem here is it. The real problem is that you don't have a clue about sex and sexuality in general. You are angry that your views are challeged and your ignorance is exposed. In order to justify your anger you need to see yourselves as victims, even if you have to invent things to feel victimised about.

Funny how it always ends up as a discussion of penile-anal sex. Why are you people obsessed with bottoms? Gay men are not gay because we're obsessed with anuses. (You can trust me on that one. I've actually had gay sex and know these things.) Some 45% of gay men do not have anal sex at all. Anal sex is not the most common form of sexual activity even amongst gay men who have anal sex. And you may not have noticed, but you don't find any sort of penile penetration in lesbian sex, never mind penile-anal sex. Your fixation on anal sex just illustrates yet again how you don't know what you're talking about.

I shall pretend not to have noticed the ridiculous comments about anal sex requiring gay men to have colostomies. They're too pathetically laughable even to make me feel insulted.

It's not just an understanding of basic biology or sexuality that's in short supply here. Despite the valiant attempts of Bananaman to explain, some people also have problems understanding what normal means.

I'll be as clear as I can - NORMAL IS NOT THE SAME AS MAJORITY. That's why we have two different words, "normal" and "majority" - there's a wee clue for you right there. A 100% heterosexual society would be abnormal. No such society exists or has ever existed. Being heterosexual does not make you normal, it just makes you more common. The fact 90% of people are right handed doesn't mean that the 10% who are left handed are abnormal. The fact that some 95% of the world's population have brown eyes doesn't make people with blue eyes abnormal. They're just less common. Got that? It's not a difficult concept.

Abnormal implies a pathology. However blue eyes work just as well as brown eyes and gay people function socially and sexually just as well as straight people do. And if you try and claim "oh no they don't function the same because gay people can't make babies" then yet again you're just showing your ignorance of what human sex is for. (Here's another clue, what's special about human sexuality is that we've evolved physiological adaptations which separate sex from reproduction.) If you believe homosexuality is pathological, you are a bigot, pure and simple.

Still, not having a clue what they're on about doesn't stop the McTaliban passing judgement on the rest of us and telling us how to live our lives. To quote Tom Nairn - "Scotland will never be free until the last minister is strangled with the last copy of the Sunday Post."

And Lydia - you said this -

"We only have your word for the fact that you have not caught STDs"

Casting doubt on a person's honesty because what they say goes against your preconceived notions, is the very

definition of prejudice.

Re:Arches

Posted by Meg - 2008/09/11 08:24

InfrequentAllele wrote:

Dearie me, I go away for a while and look what happens. As has been said, no poor unsuspecting soul is going to stumble upon a gay orgy, but then that's not really the problem here is it. The real problem is that you don't have a clue about sex and sexuality in general. You are angry that your views are challenged and your ignorance is exposed. In order to justify your anger you need to see yourselves as victims, even if you have to invent things to feel victimised about.

Funny how it always ends up as a discussion of penile-anal sex. Why are you people obsessed with bottoms? Gay men are not gay because we're obsessed with anuses. (You can trust me on that one. I've actually had gay sex and know these things.) Some 45% of gay men do not have anal sex at all. Anal sex is not the most common form of sexual activity even amongst gay men who have anal sex. And you may not have noticed, but you don't find any sort of penile penetration in lesbian sex, never mind penile-anal sex. Your fixation on anal sex just illustrates yet again how you don't know what you're talking about.

I shall pretend not to have noticed the ridiculous comments about anal sex requiring gay men to have colostomies. They're too pathetically laughable even to make me feel insulted.

It's not just an understanding of basic biology or sexuality that's in short supply here. Despite the valiant attempts of Bananaman to explain, some people also have problems understanding what normal means.

I'll be as clear as I can - NORMAL IS NOT THE SAME AS MAJORITY. That's why we have two different words, "normal" and "majority" - there's a wee clue for you right there. A 100% heterosexual society would be abnormal. No such society exists or has ever existed. Being heterosexual does not make you normal, it just makes you more common. The fact 90% of people are right handed doesn't mean that the 10% who are left handed are abnormal. The fact that some 95% of the world's population have brown eyes doesn't make people with blue eyes abnormal. They're just less common. Got that? It's not a difficult concept.

Abnormal implies a pathology. However blue eyes work just as well as brown eyes and gay people function socially and sexually just as well as straight people do. And if you try and claim "oh no they don't function the same because gay people can't make babies" then yet again you're just showing your ignorance of what human sex is for. (Here's another clue, what's special about human sexuality is that we've evolved physiological adaptations which separate sex from reproduction.) If you believe homosexuality is pathological, you are a bigot, pure and simple.

Still, not having a clue what they're on about doesn't stop the McTaliban passing judgement on the rest of us and telling us how to live our lives. To quote Tom Nairn - "Scotland will never be free until the last minister is strangled with the last copy of the Sunday Post."

And Lydia - you said this -

"We only have your word for the fact that you have not caught STDs"

Casting doubt on a person's honesty because what they say goes against your preconceived notions, is the very definition of prejudice.

Well said IA.

Can I add that as a blue eyed, left handed person, you have made me feel quite special. :)

Re:Arches

Posted by Brenna1508 - 2008/09/11 14:15

Meg remarked: Well said IA.

Seconded, I think you just said it all! :)

Re:Arches

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/09/11 14:18

InfrequentAllele wrote:

Dearie me, I go away for a while and look what happens. As has been said, no poor unsuspecting soul is going to stumble upon a gay orgy, but then that's not really the problem here is it. The real problem is that you don't have a clue about sex and sexuality in general. You are angry that your views are challenged and your ignorance is exposed. In order to justify your anger you need to see yourselves as victims, even if you have to invent things to feel victimised about.

Funny how it always ends up as a discussion of penile-anal sex. Why are you people obsessed with bottoms? Gay men are not gay because we're obsessed with anuses. (You can trust me on that one. I've actually had gay sex and know these things.) Some 45% of gay men do not have anal sex at all. Anal sex is not the most common form of sexual activity even amongst gay men who have anal sex. And you may not have noticed, but you don't find any sort of penile penetration in lesbian sex, never mind penile-anal sex. Your fixation on anal sex just illustrates yet again how you don't know what you're talking about.

I shall pretend not to have noticed the ridiculous comments about anal sex requiring gay men to have colostomies. They're too pathetically laughable even to make me feel insulted.

It's not just an understanding of basic biology or sexuality that's in short supply here. Despite the valiant attempts of Bananaman to explain, some people also have problems understanding what normal means.

I'll be as clear as I can - NORMAL IS NOT THE SAME AS MAJORITY. That's why we have two different words, "normal" and "majority" - there's a wee clue for you right there. A 100% heterosexual society would be abnormal. No such society exists or has ever existed. Being heterosexual does not make you normal, it just makes you more common. The fact 90% of people are right handed doesn't mean that the 10% who are left handed are abnormal. The fact that some 95% of the world's population have brown eyes doesn't make people with blue eyes abnormal. They're just less common. Got that? It's not a difficult concept.

Abnormal implies a pathology. However blue eyes work just as well as brown eyes and gay people function socially and sexually just as well as straight people do. And if you try and claim "oh no they don't function the same because gay people can't make babies" then yet again you're just showing your ignorance of what human sex is for. (Here's another clue, what's special about human sexuality is that we've evolved physiological adaptations which separate sex from reproduction.) If you believe homosexuality is pathological, you are a bigot, pure and simple.

Still, not having a clue what they're on about doesn't stop the McTaliban passing judgement on the rest of us and telling us how to live our lives. To quote Tom Nairn - "Scotland will never be free until the last minister is strangled with the last copy of the Sunday Post."

And Lydia - you said this -

"We only have your word for the fact that you have not caught STDs"

Casting doubt on a person's honesty because what they say goes against your ,preconceived notions is the very definition of prejudice.

My comment was just an observation IA you seem to be feeling a little English and a little worked up.

McTaliban

Preconceived notions

Not having a clue what they're on about

Pathological,

Funny how it always ends up as a discussion of penile-anal sex.

It seems to me we had a fairly good and reasonable conversation while you were away. It seems to me that you are the one with a problem with your sexuality it does not seem to bother any other person on Scotsgait as far as I can see. It seems to me you also have a problem with the Scottish people; there is nothing I or any other person on Scotsgait can do to help you with that. However, if I can I will. Mostly I think you need to start thinking that it is ok for others to have rights and opinions.

Re:Arches

Posted by InfrequentAllele - 2008/09/11 15:09

What absolute and utter drivel. "Only making an observation" Don't try and wriggle out of it. You were casting doubt on my honesty and implying I am a liar.

You keep repeating your anti-Scottish slurs against me. "Feeling a little English"? What exactly is that remark supposed to mean? I only have your word for it you're not a racist. I'm just making an observation.

Of course you're entitled to your opinions. You are entitled to believe that 2 plus 2 makes 5, and that the moon is made out of green cheese. But don't expect those of us who are better informed to pay much heed to your opinions, particularly when you express them in an ignorant and insulting manner.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Robin T Cox - 2008/09/11 19:37

It seems to me that the local God botherers have rather more of a problem than InfrequentAllele. As Desmond Tutu has correctly observed, their obsession with, and ignorance of, other people's sexuality must make God weep.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by InfrequentAllele - 2008/09/11 21:14

Thank you Robin.

It concerns me greatly that Scots who are not sure about independence, or people from elsewhere in the world, stumble across threads like this one and go away believing that Scottish nationalists are reactionary and backwards looking. If you disagree with their limited vision of Scotland, you're "anti-Scottish". They play right into the hands of the Labour party and other Unionists who regularly characterise the SNP as homophobic.

That's why the kind of remarks made by some people here need to be challenged. I'm heartened that others have spoken out on this thread.

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by Levenax - 2008/09/11 23:32

What does "feeling a little English" actually mean Lydia? Is it some arcane practice that few of us know about yet?

But dear me IA, even I've not come across anybody from the Scottish Branch of the Labour Party calling the SNP homophobic and there aren't enough Tories out there to know what they think. In fact, does Annabel Goldie even know what a homosexualist is?

There's the Tartan Tory thing too. OK I know that's a hoary old chestnut but it was proclaimed by my local SSP councillor the other day as an insult after the SNP ruling group sorted the equal pay fiasco that Labour created. The SNP is of course a broad church and some of us do have views that are a little to the right of centre. :)

And how about anti-Catholic? This, despite Mr Salmond expressing his support for segregated education for RCs. :(The fact is of course that the SNP has just as many members who play for the other side as any other party. I don't think they need to be proud about it or have a special section for trouser browsers or a dyke division. It's just a fact of life. B)

=====

Re:Arches

Posted by InfrequentAllele - 2008/09/12 12:56

Lev, the language you use to discuss your gay and lesbian fellow citizens is not acceptable on the centre right of politics and has not been for a considerable time. Your comments are not a sign of wit, they're a sign of adolescent insecurity.

The fact you are unable to mention lesbian and gay people without resorting to childish terms of abuse has nothing to do with centre right politics, and everything to do with immaturity, ignorance, and bigotry.

And yes, Annabelle Goldie knows what a gay person is. She voted in favour of same-sex couples having the right to adopt.

=====