
Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 16 Oct 2008 12:19:06 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 16 October 2008 02:12: Go over my thread again and tell me once were I said "female" circumcision.

I'm not talking about female circumcision

We were, because you said that we weren't allowing people to commit atrocious acts under the pretext of religion. Female genital mutilation is about as shocking an example to the contrary as I can think of.

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 16 October 2008 02:12: I'm talking about male circumcision, hence me replying to pawky who was talking about male circumcision. Not to mention the fact that I'm not a female and I said I was circumcised.

Yet my point still stands. You were circumcised and you don't mind it; fine. When you go on to say there's nothing wrong with the practice because of that, that's where you're an idiot.

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 16 October 2008 02:12: However, I do not see how changing it to "freedom of belief" will change anything. You are free to follow a religion that asks you to mutilate someone. But you can also simply just believe in mutilating someone for some cause. Either way, it's the same situation and result. Which brings me back to my ignorant first post; why even bother?

sigh

one last time

because (typically) religions are not just beliefs, they're also actions.

Muad-Dib wrote: Aside from that this is what Spoony believes in... THOUGHT POLICE. Read 1984. !facepalm

read this extract from the very first post in the thread:

let's start from the assumption that in any society that wants to call itself modern and free, you can't have thoughtcrime. orwell put the name to what must be the most extreme form of totalitarianism and dictatorship; the idea that you can be convicted because of what you think, what you privately want.

you say you've read 1984, so surely it's evident to you that I am specifically talking about thoughtcrime and saying it cannot be enforced in any free society.

I go on to make another point on the same topic...

i could digress and say that several religions do teach that thoughtcrime is indeed a crime, Islam and Christianity being the most obvious examples... once again one side of the chess game says you aren't allowed to move on his side of the board... but that's besides the point.

need this point reinforced? in Islam, there is no freedom to change religion. apostasy (i.e. renouncing your religion) is punishable by DEATH. the same treatment can be dished out to a Jew. firstly what is this if not thoughtcrime? secondly it warrants the second worst penalty

possible, namely death. (what's the 1st worst penalty, you may ask...? I'm about to get to that)

moving on to Christianity. read the ten commandments, the ones that millions of plankton-brained shitkickers in your lovely advanced country are demanding be shown prominently in your courthouses. the thou shalt not kills and steals and so on are OK... but read number ten. thou shalt not be envious of your neighbour's property.

envy is an emotion, therefore it's thoughtcrime. clearly when God supposedly dictated the ten commandments he saw this as absolutely paramount (as he did the worship of other gods, considering the number of innocent people he massacred in enforcing that one). odd, since rape, genocide, cruelty to children, and slavery did not make the final cut of 10.

leaving the worst till last, the most sick and twisted idea mankind ever came up with: hell. Christianity teaches that the only way to avoid an eternity of horrific torture is to follow this religion (and this is fed to children, disgustingly enough). that's thoughtcrime too.

actually, I can go one further than thoughtcrime. you said you're a catholic, I believe? so presumably you believe in the concept of original sin, whereby we all inherit the sin of a remote ancestor (Adam)? it goes without saying that it is immoral to hold someone responsible for the crime of someone else, even their parents (there are plenty of other examples where God shows his immorality in this area too, e.g. holding modern-day Jews responsible for the crucifixion, or the stern warning that the punishments for breaking the Commandments will go down for several generations). this is even more than thoughtcrime. thoughtcrime is the idea that you can be convicted of something you privately think. until I started writing this post, that was in my view the most extreme form of totalitarianism. but we can go one further; holding someone responsible for someone else's crime. religion is multiply guilty of this; shall I give any more examples? in Pakistan, a woman can be sentenced (yes, sentenced) to be gang-raped in order that she feels the shame of a crime committed by a male relative. you probably reel in disbelief at this, but have you read the bible...?

so in a nutshell, no... I don't believe in thought police and thoughtcrime. I will argue against them at every turn. bearing everything I just said in mind about religious thoughtcrime, do YOU believe in thoughtcrime, muad_dib? Or instead do you pick and choose which of your religion's teachings you think are valid?
