Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by Spoony on Wed, 15 Oct 2008 17:49:45 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 15 October 2008 11:12What?! There are no major upfront effects at all. Apparently, since you already seem to know so much about me, I guess I don't need to tell you that I am circumcised! I have absolutely no problem with either circumcision or no circumcision at all.

oh my.

how many times must either pawky or myself repeat the brutish details of female circumcision in the space of one thread?

it involves the excision of the clitoris and the labia (sometimes with a sharp stone). it's irreversible, undoubtedly extremely painful, humiliating in a way that is barely possible to imagine, destructive to the girl's future sex life, and probably hazardous with regard to childbirth.

but still, there are 'no major upfront effects'. I really do feel like punching you.

as for the male version, it's not anywhere near as horrific and barbaric as the female version, but it's still immoral to do it to someone else without their informed consent (and a child is not capable of giving that). But oh, you were circumcised and you don't mind it, so obviously it's fine for everyone else too.

Listen, asshole, if as an informed adult you wanna take a scalpel to your own genitalia, or sign something saying a doctor can do it for you, you go ahead for all I care. It is IMMORAL AND CRIMINAL (in the moral sense, if not perhaps the legal) to do it to someone else without their informed consent.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 15 October 2008 11:12Again, you are just going on end, ignoring everything else, and saying things. This will be the 3rd time I'm saying this in this thread: ACTIONS are not the same as the CONSEQUENCES that are implied. You are FREE TO DO WHAT YOU WANT, whether you break a law or not, whether you're following a religion or not, you are free to do what ever you want, but if what you do breaks a law, regardless if you had the freedom to do the action, you will still suffer the consequences.

If someone follows a religion that requires them to beat up dogs, they have every right to follow it if they want. But the second they DO beat up a dog, they can be arrested for animal cruelty, not because they are following their religion.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 15 October 2008 11:12Learning what is good and bad? Now you are just making stuff up. If a RELIGION brings someone to KILL someone, a law which is written that you are NOT ALLOWED to do, then they will be arrested. Or are you implying that killing someone is something that you are unsure if it is ok to do or not? What about beating animals? Mutilating kids?

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 15 October 2008 11:12It is acceptable because you just can't seem to get the idea that freedom of religion is not immunity to consequence! If you get arrested cutting your kids fingers off, it's because you were committing child abuse. The fact you were following your religion means nothing!

Just because you are being arrested for committing a crime during a religious ceremony, doesn't mean you are being discriminated against because your religion!

you're evidently blind to the fact that WE DO ALLOW people to get away with obvious crimes on the sole pretext of religion. Female genital mutilation is just one example (and probably the most appalling)

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 15 October 2008 11:12 spoony, I would reply to your post, but I'm in a rush to go somewhere, perhaps when I get home.

no problem, but before you do, go talk to a woman - any woman - a friend, your girlfriend, your mother, anyone - describe the process of female circumcision to her as pawkyfox and myself have described it, and then say to her the following two things (which you have already said) "There are no major upfront effects at all."

"I have absolutely no problem with either circumcision or no circumcision at all." Then ask her if she agrees with you.

I would carry out the same exercise myself, only to be honest I don't dare.