

---

Subject: Re: Freedom of Religion?

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 15 Oct 2008 04:01:53 GMT

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

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 14 October 2008 17:05 Just because you think it is sick, disturbing and evil doesn't mean it is and it doesn't mean we should outlaw it. The victim may not like it either but it is still the same as above. Because one person doesn't like it doesn't make it illegal. If they don't want it to happen to them, then they just have to change religions.

They follow a religion in which that is practiced. The act of actually doing it is not illegal and the right for them to practice it for religious purposes is legal, therefore they are allowed to do it and if you don't follow their religion, you have no legitimate say on whether it is right or not. You can express your disgust with it because of the first amendment, but it won't be taken seriously because you don't follow said religion.

Welcome to America!

First, he is not in America; he is in the UK: a country that is getting invaded from within.

You are completely missing Spoony's point. This is clearly an example of when a religion is automatically immune to scrutiny.

A young child cannot change religions to escape circumcision which is made through the decision of the parents.

What Spoony wants (or what I think he wants) is some sort of secular rule or just a solid thought that decrees and overrides any religious/cultural norms with a stance that every human being has the right of choice and that the basic human anatomy be preserved and as such PARENTAL CONSENT be outlawed in decisions that negatively scars the body AND/OR reduces/deprives any function of any part of the human body. And that life-long changes to the physical body be made ONLY through SELF-CONSENT of the person in question when of mature responsible age UNLESS otherwise parental consent is necessary in some cases to avert other risks.

Female circumcision is a bastardly act and is even more hideous and damaging than a male circumcision. A circumcised male would have difficulty masturbating due to loss of foreskin (he can still use lubrication) among other inconveniences. But he is still able to have pleasurable sex because the sensitive areas of the penis (glans) are not damaged by circumcision.

However, in a female circumcision, the clitoris (which is equal to the stimulating glans in a penis) is cut off removing/depriving the woman to feel/enjoy sexual pleasure.

Whats more, the labia minora is cut off as well. The woman is reduced to having a hole, literally. And worse, this is sewn shut using the labia majora. And causing tremendous pain as well.

I do not know what age you are but I cannot imagine a erect penis that cannot feel pleasure. That would be the ultimate form of deprivation. The same can be said for a woman who has undergone circumcision as a child. So should such deprivation be visited upon a child when the child has not had a chance to even know what it is getting deprived off?

I have only explained the procedure since you think it is not wrong. It maybe "right" for religious reasons but I feel it is certainly wrong on so many other levels and should be banned.

---