

---

Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 15 Oct 2008 16:12:35 GMT

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

---

pawkyfox wrote on Wed, 15 October 2008 02:08 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. I didn't imply it didn't "look cool." Nor did I imply that I was "generally shy and coy when it comes to talking about sexuality." What I mean by "going downhill" is that you sounded smart in the first half of your post and the next half just sounded like baseless facts that you were shooting out that had nothing to do with the topic.

"Besides you seem to be a bit insensitive to circumcision and it's adverse effects (so why I included detailed description)."

What?! 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.

pawkyfox wrote on Wed, 15 October 2008 02:08

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.

Again, 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.

pawkyfox wrote on Wed, 15 October 2008 02:08I 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.

What?! You are agreeing with what I said but still criticizing it. It's a given? Not according to what you said in the beginning of your post with not allowing people to follow religions that inflicts harm other people.

Learning 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?

pawkyfox wrote on Wed, 15 October 2008 02:08I 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.

It's the first thing you said, not the second. They can follow a religion no matter what it entails but once they break a law then they can be arrested.

It 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!

@ spoony, I would reply to your post, but I'm in a rush to go somewhere, perhaps when I get home.

---