

---

Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 13 Oct 2008 13:49:50 GMT

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

---

Spoonyyour 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.

I already made it clear what I'm talking about. I was arguing the choice of wording. I'll admit, I didn't fully read your post, so I went on what I read of your last paragraph. However, I did make an edit to a later post that addressed the atrocities being permitted by "freedom of religion". The law doesn't allow for that. The government may look the other way, as it does time and time and time and time and fucking time again, but it's not because of any sloppy wordage used, at least, in the U.S. Constitution.

SpoonyThe 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.

Read it again. I said freedom of BELIFS or OPINION (without freedom of religion) would open the door for a state religion. I guess we're both guilty of ignoring what the other has said.

Spoonyyou 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. Err, when did I ever disagree with that? I refer to my first point of this post... just because it's law doesn't change a fucking thing, unfortunately. One can only hope and pray that a government follows the restrictions its given. Obviously, it doesn't. My only point has been that freedom of "opinion" and "beliefs" would make state religion legal. State religion is illegal under "freedom of religion", but again, that doesn't mean the government will actually abide by the law it's supposedly held to. Just look at the Democrats AND Republicans. They fucking hate the Constitution, apparently, because they constantly wipe their asses with it.

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

No. I'm not advocating any terrifying action that's put under the guise of religion. That's just fucking absurd. By now, you should know what I meant.

SpoonyYou already have several state religions. You just can't see them.

I never meant for that to imply that the law is being followed. I was just talking about what the law was MEANT to prevent.

Spoonythat's the point I've been unsuccessfully trying to get through to you, einstein...

I was just answering the question "why is it freedom of religion instead of beliefs or opinion?"

-----

I was trying to say that the law doesn't allow for those atrocities. I never denied that they happen,

nor that it is done under the guise of religion. I know what people do because of their backwoods, retarded belief systems. Just look at what happened to Matthew Shepherd and what the Westboro Baptist Church did at his funeral. I get it. I was never denying it. Still, the law of "freedom of religion" doesn't allow it. Corrupt politicians and idiotic constituents blindly following their faiths do.

Again, I've been arguing the semantics of why "freedom of religion" is more air tight to protect people than "freedom of beliefs" or "freedom of opinion". I never said they wouldn't be ignored. In fact, I've been repeatedly saying that law is constantly ignored for the sake of pathetic agendas of religions and their faithful.

---