

---

Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 13 Oct 2008 11:27:52 GMT

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

---

cheesesoda wrote on Sun, 12 October 2008 11:48 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. your complete lack of understanding of this entire thread is very nicely illustrated by this paragraph. Read each post from me again until you get it. I am talking about the automatic deference we seem to give to religion to interfere in other people's lives, when no secular excuse would be allowed. I am talking about the fact that while letting someone believe there is a God is okay because the Bible says so, letting someone kill homosexuals because the Bible says that too is not okay. What's the difference? Not religion, clearly.

cheesesoda wrote on Sun, 12 October 2008 11:48 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.

The first sentence in this paragraph is the really puzzling one. Freedom from religion would open the door to a state religion... okiedokie. Freedom from religion is the POLAR OPPOSITE.

cheesesoda wrote on Sun, 12 October 2008 11:48 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.

When you pay taxes and extraordinary amounts of money go to undeserved religious causes, when religions are allowed to get away in court with the kind of crimes no secular organisation would... you are part of the state religion. Just because you can't see it doesn't mean it's not there.

cheesesoda wrote on Sun, 12 October 2008 11:48 Don't think state religions are unusual or improbable because history would laugh in your face.

you're really, really confused. I never said state religions are unusual and improbable. I am arguing against them, dumbass. Secular democracies, they're the unusual and improbable ones; there's only one country's constitution in the history of the world (AFAIK) which says anything about church and state, and it clearly isn't being followed.

cheesesoda wrote on Sun, 12 October 2008 11:48 My whole argument was about how "freedom of religion" makes more sense than "freedom of opinion" and "freedom of beliefs". Then I made a comment about how, at least for America, the wording was intentional and makes sense.

Then you allow anyone to carry out any immoral action as long as they remember to say it's part of their religion?

cheesesoda wrote on Sun, 12 October 2008 11:48 Changing it from freedom of "religion" to freedom of "opinion" or "beliefs" opens up the law for the government to establish a state religion. You already have several state religions. You just can't see them.

cheesesoda wrote on Sun, 12 October 2008 11:48 You don't seem to get it, at all. Having the freedom to think differently is not the same as having the freedom to practice differently. that's the point I've been unsuccessfully trying to get through to you, einstein...

cheesesoda wrote on Sun, 12 October 2008 11:48 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. sigh...

read this again. Spooky said, regarding circumcision:

Why's it even allowed? Religion. Why do authorities turn a blind eye to the thousands of girls who are victims of the female version (and like I said before in other threads, if there is anything more disgusting and barbaric going on in this day and age than that, I'm unaware of it)? Putting a stop to that should be the absolute number one fucking priority in this country as far as I'm concerned, but nobody cares. Why? Religion.

Imagine for a second if a political party, not a religion, did this. Or imagine if a political party said that people who don't vote for them are in for an eternity of torture. (The only flaw is that children can't vote, otherwise I'd have said "children" rather than "people" since the appalling doctrine of telling people they'll be tortured for ever after they're dead is even worse when an adult 'authority figure' applies it to the innocent, unformed mind of a child).

It is not hard to imagine the outcry if it was a political party rather than a religion who did these despicable things religions do. When it's religion, there seems to be a get out of jail free card. Why?

clearly you've actually read my posts, otherwise you surely wouldn't have the amazing nerve to say things like "Holy shit, you're an idiot. I really didn't want to have to result to insults, but holy shit", "You don't seem to get it, at all", and "You're clearly not understanding what the fuck I'm talking about.". I can only, therefore, assume you have read the post about female circumcision and are unmoved by it.

Firstly, here are some of your responses to that very post whose absurdity I could barely add to if I tried:

"The whole idea that we allow inhumane activities because of religion is a little absurd."

I would be very surprised to find a single case of female genital mutilation, out of the thousands that have been inflicted in this country and are still being inflicted today (in the 21st century in one of the most advanced nations in the world...) that was done for a reason other than Islam.

"In fact, allowing freedom of religion actually helps to protect people from this."

Uh no, the only reason our authorities do nothing about it is because we mustn't offend the religious. Freedom of religion? Children are allowed to be indoctrinated before they're old enough

to really decide for themselves what's what, and you think there is such a thing as 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."

Again, the complete lack of response to the really horrific version (where the victims are female) puzzles me. And yet if a law was passed saying you can't take a scalpel to a child's genitalia, and you need informed, adult consent of the person to do anything of the sort, it's not hard to picture the rage it would generate from Christians.

---