

---

Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 15 Oct 2008 15:10:45 GMT

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

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 14 October 2008 23:26 Just because you think it is sick, disturbing and evil doesn't mean it is and it doesn't mean we should outlaw it. The victim may not like it either but it is still the same as above. Because one person doesn't like it doesn't make it illegal. If they don't want it to happen to them, then they just have to change religions.

They follow a religion in which that is practiced. The act of actually doing it is not illegal and the right for them to practice it for religious purposes is legal, therefore they are allowed to do it and if you don't follow their religion, you have no legitimate say on whether it is right or not. You can express your disgust with it because of the first amendment, but it won't be taken seriously because you don't follow said religion.

Let me isolate the massive flaw.

They follow a religion in which that is practiced.

If they don't want it to happen to them, then they just have to change religions.

Here's another example of the elephant in the room, the emperor's new clothes. We are talking about CHILDREN here. When you refer to a 'Muslim child' (or a 'Christian child') for that matter, what you actually mean is 'a child who has been brought up in a Muslim family' (same for Christian). It is absurd to label a child according to the religious beliefs of their parents; any more than you would call a child a 'Republican child', a 'Marxist child' or, indeed, an 'atheist child' because their parents were. A child, no matter their intelligence, doesn't have their ideas about religion worked out yet, just like they haven't decided where they stand on economics or foreign policy.

The problem is further complicated by the obvious difficulty a child would have if they DID want to 'change their religion'. In Islam, apostasy (i.e. renouncing your religion) is punishable by death. And it is enforced all the time. Imagine yourself to be a 'Muslim girl' who either doesn't really buy the whole Allah business or thinks Mohammed's revolting teachings are no way to live your life (i.e. imagine you actually have some moral strength in you). There'd be a very real fear of being killed if you spoke up about it; you might probably think it's better to stay quiet and wait for the scalpel.

With Christianity it isn't quite so brutish, but there's still clearly a big problem in society for those who want to say they don't really feel a part of the religion they've been brought up into.

I am absolutely convinced that the world would be a far better place if there was no religious teaching at all until a child had reached an age where they could give it the kind of critical reception it deserves. Absolutely convinced of it. Again, try the 'political party' thought exercise I mentioned on the previous page.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 14 October 2008 23:26 You should of stopped at the word "risks." Because up until there I can agree with you.

But the rest of your post just went downhill. I don't like it as much as you don't like it, if not more, but I respect other's rights, as well as my own, enough to not question their actions or reasons.

You used the word 'rights'. It sounds like you're saying a parent has the right to mutilate their daughter's genitalia in a manner which is hideous, extremely painful, damaging to her future sex life, probably a risk to child-bearing, and irreversible. Is that an unfair assumption?

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 14 October 2008 23:26 What I mean is this: you are free to practice any religion you want without being discriminated or persecuted. However, if you are caught doing something illegal, whether you are following your religion or not, you would be arrested. You would be arrested for breaking the law, and breaking the law alone. The fact you were following your religion would have nothing to do with it.

To put it into a perspective: If you follow a religion in which it involves dismemberment of human parts, you cannot be arrested or persecuted for doing so. If you literally act and follow through with the dismemberment of human parts, then for that you can be arrested, as something that has nothing to do with religion.

Yes, that's what I've been saying; but to have this, you quite simply have to accept that the whole 'freedom of religion' is an illusion. 'Freedom of belief', on the other hand, covers it all very nicely.

pawkyfox wrote

A young child cannot change religions to escape circumcision which is made through the decision of the parents.

bingo. (I would go further on that point to argue that the child isn't really religious at all until he/she is older and capable of really thinking it through for himself anyway... to say otherwise is basically to admit that religion is not really a matter of intellectual choice but something you can be forced into, and while that's certainly the case in the Muslim world it embarrasses me to think it's the case in the UK or US)

pawkyfox wrote What Spoony wants (or what I think he wants) is some sort of secular rule or just a solid thought that decrees and overrides any religious/cultural norms with a stance that every human being has the right of choice and that the basic human anatomy be preserved and as such PARENTAL CONSENT be outlawed in decisions that negatively scars the body AND/OR reduces/deprives any function of any part of the human body. And that life-long changes to the physical body be made ONLY through SELF-CONSENT of the person in question when of mature responsible age UNLESS otherwise parental consent is necessary in some cases to avert other risks.

more or less... like I said, I would go further. see above re: religious labelling of children, and my 'political party' thought exercise.

---