

---

Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 13 Oct 2008 16:36:12 GMT

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

---

Spoony wrote on Mon, 13 October 2008 07:35 You are correct about only one thing in this paragraph... namely the first sentence.

Religion is not just an 'opinion'. If it was, the world would be an infinitely better place. It also tends to be a set of actions that are instructed (or forbidden), and the problem comes when they're imposed on others (and this absolutely does include children).

Stay with me here. If your religion makes you believe God made the world 6000 years ago, that's fine with me (just don't teach it in science class to innocent, unformed minds). If your religion instructs you to kill homosexuals... this is clearly a different scenario, but the difference between the two is NOT RELIGION. The justification for both the two is religious. The only difference is the difference between thinking something for yourself while doing no harm to anyone, and actively taking away the rights of others. If you permit the one under the pretext of religion, you surely have to permit the other. That's why "freedom of religion" is nonsense; you'd have to allow all sorts of atrocities. Which, of course, we do.

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." 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. Or maybe if you think about it this way, it will make more sense: In the United States, you have the freedom to kill someone if you wanted to. Is it illegal? Yes. Will you get arrested and be punished for it? Yes, but that still doesn't deny the fact that you are still able to physically do it.

---