

---

Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 12 Oct 2008 16:48:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You're clearly not understanding what the fuck I'm talking about.

I'm not making an argument for religion. Like you, I hate religion. I am fully aware of the horrors that go about under the guise of religion. You don't have to convince me that religion is dangerous, but that's not the point I'm making.

As I said, the reason why it's freedom of "religion" instead of "beliefs" or "opinion" is simple. The founding fathers worded that intentionally.

Using the second amendment right as an example that you misinterpreted... just because you have the right to bear arms does not mean you're forced to own a gun. You can choose to waive that right to own a gun. You, again, have the right to freedom of speech. You can shout to the high heavens, or you can censor yourself. You can choose to be a part of a religion, or you can choose to ignore religion completely.

If they had used the word opinion or beliefs, that still opens the doors widely for a state religion. Good luck trying to get everybody to believe in secularism, and good luck getting politicians to abandon their beliefs when their constituents are too fucking stupid to vote for a candidate that renounces religion. There's a reason why neo-cons have been trying to label Obama as a Muslim... because Christianity is held in high regard by both liberals and conservatives.

What if the founding fathers said you had a right to protect yourself instead of the right to bear arms? You'd see gun-hating liberals trying to get rid of guns because guns aren't the only thing that is needed to protect one's self. If they said the right to beliefs or opinion, they would still say that you have the right to believe what you want as long as you're a part of the state religion.

Don't think state religions are unusual or improbable because history would laugh in your face.

---