

---

Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 12 Oct 2008 21:49:21 GMT

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

---

insert\_name\_here wrote on Sun, 12 October 2008 17:46cheesesoda wrote on Sun, 12 October 2008 22:41How in the Hell is that reductio ad absurdum? History is a great teacher, and all throughout history we can see how willing government is to force people to adhere to religious practices that it deems correct.

Hisotry might say that, but in these modern times there would be alot more civil unrest as there is one hell of alot more varieties in how people think.

We aren't living in a time where a leader's will is law, there are alot more complications than that and control over us at the level you say would always have far too much opposition.

You're assuming this because we're already living in a society with these precautions as law.

What if freedom of religion was never given?

-----

The whole idea that we allow inhumane activities because of religion is a little absurd. In fact, allowing freedom of religion actually helps to protect people from this. Ignoring the subject of circumcision, you're not allowed to sacrifice your neighbor for the sake of your religion because that would be forcing him to adhere to your religion's practices. That wouldn't be allowed under freedom of religion.

As for circumcision, it's no longer a practice of religion, for the most part. It's so common that it would still exist even as Christianity dwindles. It's a prime example of tradition of religion becoming a societal norm without the religion having any influence over the act.

---