

---

Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 15 Oct 2008 06:08:52 GMT

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

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 14 October 2008 21:26 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.

I don't write posts to look cool. People are generally shy and coy when it comes to talking about sexuality. I hold nothing back and use plain language. Besides you seem to be a bit insensitive to circumcision and it's adverse effects (so why I included detailed description). You cannot agree with the first part of my post and disagree with the rest unless otherwise you meant you were disturbed by the down-to-earth plain language explanation of circumcision.

Anyway, moving on, how can you respect someone's rights if that very same person is taking away the right of someone else? I don't understand! It's like knowingly letting a thief steal just because the thief is your friend but ignoring the fact he stole from an innocent man.

As much as you respect others to let them follow their religion, you are ignoring the fact they are destroying someone else (their OWN child) in the process of upholding the religion.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 14 October 2008 21:26 But anyway, back onto the actual topic. It is a bit of a dilemma. The reason why there is a freedom of religion is because people from other countries were persecuted for following different religions. America is supposed to be a place were someone can take any religion and practice it any way they want without being discriminated against.

Very true but AFAIK, this was applied to religion and worship and any rituals. So, a Hindu can immigrate to the United States, buy a plot of land, build a giant colorful statue, cover it with garlands, start a massive candlefest, firecrackers ftw, and begin chanting away into the night. Oh yes, THAT is allowed and SHOULD be allowed.

I should be allowed to put a giant cross in my front yard EVEN if it causes an eyesore to the Atheist nextdoor. Those rights cannot be taken away.

If my religion demands I buy a dog and beat it to the point of death on Friday mornings with a stick in my front yard, and you were my neighbor, what would go through your mind? Wouldn't you think it was inhumane? Now just switch that dog with a child and think of circumcision. It works the same way. Should it still be allowed?

What we must realize is that the religious rights cannot be applied when it comes to matters of protecting an individual's rights whether it is a child or not. The "freedom of religion" right is taken advantage of by religions and atrocities committed under this is stupidly ignored by the rest of the population; atrocities we still don't think of as atrocities.

What I HATE about America is that a damn bald eagle has more rights than some HUMAN

BEINGS. There needs to be a PLAIN non-religious standard when dealing with the human body and issues of life and personal rights.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 14 October 2008 21:26 However, some times religions can lead to breaking the law. But if someone is arrested for doing something like that, then that means the right "freedom of religion" is a lie.

So which is why I think that instead of religion requirements, the right of freedom of religion and any laws they might conflict with be completely separate.

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.

I agree fully but the underlined part is a given! Police catch criminals due to their criminal activity, not because they are Black!

I colored the part wherein lies the major problem. Even now in this day and age, we are still learning what it good and what is bad.

Well, we have not yet defined our boundaries. We still have not realized that circumcision intrudes and mutilates an individual. Once we have defined that as illegal and that it impedes one's rights (I do not know how long it will take), then religion/culture can't be used as excuses to follow the dreaded practice; at least in the so called "civilized" nations.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 14 October 2008 21:26 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.

I may have misunderstood this line. What are you saying here? A religion that orders barbaric practices can be followed as long as the practice is not put in use OR are you saying such barbaric practices can done within religion but would warrant an arrest if done in a non-religious setting?

But just incase I misunderstood it, both scenarios and both are unacceptable:

So my religion orders me that I have to cut off my child's little fingers at the 5th birthday. Now, I can be a follower of the religion BUT choose to ignore that law that tells me to cut off the finger. And I would be fine, is that what you are saying? Then it should be OK. But guess what?

I may have chosen to not follow along that requirement but what is stopping some other fundamental nut of the same religion to cut off his child's fingers at the 5th year? Afterall the religion instructs him to do so, right? You see what I mean? This is where a secular law that supercedes the religious law is required.

BUT if what you are saying above is what I fear, then that's absolutely ridiculous and I can't agree

at all. Think for yourself this hypothetical scenario in the year 2008:

The Mayans have survived through the 21st century. And many Mayans have immigrated to the United States. They are upto to their sick ways offering humans as sacrifices and forced bloodletting.

Would or should the police intravene? What YOU are basically saying is that, no, the Mayans are in the middle of a religious ritual, bloodletting and human sacrifices to please their gods and since religious freedoms should not be questioned, the police should get lost.

I find that absolutely ridiculous. And you imply that if that very same Mayan went out at night into a bar and cut someone's heart out, he should be arrested and charges filed! WHAT A FREAKING DOUBLE STANDARD!

There is a reason why humans were barbarians once upon a time. There was killing, cannibalism, and butcherous behavior. As we learned over the years and became more and more civilized, we cut down on these animalistic acts. Now while we in the civilized Western worlds seem to be better off than before, we still have a long way to go.

---