

---

Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 13 Oct 2008 16:54:51 GMT

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

---

cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 13 October 2008 09:49: Read it again. I said freedom of BELIFS or OPINION (without freedom of religion) would open the door for a state religion. But you already have one, as do we... the only difference is yours is 'unofficial', but more influential.

cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 13 October 2008 09:49: My only point has been that freedom of "opinion" and "beliefs" would make state religion legal. Listen to what you're actually saying. We can't allow people true freedom from religion because if we do, they won't have freedom from religion. Well, admittedly it's hard to debunk an argument like that, if only because it isn't an argument.

cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 13 October 2008 09:49: 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.

yet you still seem strangely unmoved by either of the two examples I gave, and you claimed that no such thing is happening at all, bizarrely.

cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 13 October 2008 09:49: Spoony You 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.

Well, if it's obviously failing utterly, what's the harm in getting rid of it and replacing it with something infinitely more sensible and less open to exploitation?

R315r4z0r

wrote I'm still not understanding..

Why do you think that? It makes no sense?

You're basically saying something like "freedom to choose a car" should be "freedom to choose a vehicle" because just because there are different types of vehicles doesn't mean it still isn't a car. That just doesn't make sense.

Different religion is a different religion, a different belief.

You can't say freedom of belief because belief is an opinion that is granted for anything you care to believe in. A religion is a specific kind of belief. Just like saying you can't say freedom to choose a vehicle over a car because there are other such vehicles out there other than cars, be it planes, boats, trains, ect.

Someone believing in 1 religion and someone believing in another are two different religions, or two different beliefs. Just because they are both a specific type of belief, doesn't mean they are the same.

Perhaps it would be easier to say "You have the freedom to believe in any religion you want." However, I do see your point in that being contradictory if your religion takes you to remove rights of other people. However that is not a choice between "belief" and "religion." You can believe in a religion, but you don't have to carry it out.

You say you don't understand, but you also say this:

However, I do see your point in that being contradictory if your religion takes you to remove rights of other people.

That is virtually the entire point.

"You can believe in a religion, but you don't have to carry it out"... well, there you have it. If we had freedom of belief, I might happen to believe that all chavs need a good stabbing, yet I would be quite rightly locked up for carrying it out. Right now, we instead have 'freedom of religion'. That means if a muslim believes he is entitled to mutilate a poor girl's genitals, we mustn't prevent him exercising his religious beliefs. Again, try my political party exercise; try swapping "muslim" for "democrat". When a religious figure very nicely warns children that they'll suffer eternal roasting torment if they don't abide by the correct religion, the emperor's clothes look wonderful. Swap the religious figure for someone from the Democrats, and swap the "believe in Christianity" for "vote for us"... and the emperor's suddenly naked, you see it for the horrific, disgusting thing it is.

---