

---

Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 13 Oct 2008 17:13:26 GMT

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

---

SpoonyBut you already have one, as do we... the only difference is yours is 'unofficial', but more influential.

I'm sure I agreed to this in my replies...

SpoonyListen 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.

If you give people freedom of religion, you're theoretically giving them freedom from religion. Obviously, that doesn't always work out the way it should, but that's the case for any "freedom of" regarding beliefs and opinions.

Spoonyyet 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.

I claimed it's not being protected under "freedom of religion". It's being protected by governments blindly following illegal state religions.

SpoonyWell, 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?

How is it less open to exploitation? I already explained why it would open up the possibility of a LEGAL state religion. Government will exploit whatever loophole it has, and the southern states here in America would be quick to ban evolution from being taught in school, put the Ten Commandments all throughout courthouses and block any and all social progress while doing it under the name of God.

---