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Abstract
I (hereafter: the writer) argue that, first of all, the freedom of religion and some standards of freedom of religion (hereafter: SFR) is absolute. In addition, different concepts of God do not change SFR, and this claim proves that revises of God’s ideas do not lean toward the restructuring of SFR. Last but not least, the slap argument shows that theocracy suffers from these delighted features of SFR. These claims have been presented by an argument that the writer calls Slap Argument.

Freedom and Alternatives Concepts of God
Different varieties of the concepts of God or deity or other maximally great beings or the divine have been manifested and opened up new lifestyles and religious worldviews for their followers and other people who are thirsty for new religious beliefs and practices. The first note is that there is some traditional theism that many of them have been promoting this idea that there is a distinction between God and the universe, even though, there are some others that they refuse or eradicate the distinctness wholly, the writer’s concerns are whether religious worldview or theologies that reject the distinction affect SFR as absolute freedom or not, the
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writer will present the Slap Argument (hereafter: SA), to admit that theocracy wastes SFR.5

**Slap Argument**

It seems that this literature focuses only on liberal democracies and if one criticizes the primary values such as freedom or equality in liberal democracies, then, the proponent of it needs to start from very introductory premises. For example, SFR in a theocracy is far away from SFR in liberal democracy. The writer -unlike the other authors- will not apply some normative legal, political, or moral principles and arguments to solve the paradox of SFR, but the writer will undermine the proportion of religion in the whole of our life by drawing on a Kantian term of thisworldly and otherworldly distinction and after that show SFR as absolute freedom.

Let the writer begins with the positive side of SR. it is positive because it seems that SFR is a symbol of absolute freedom. These claims have been motivated by the otherworldly aspect of it. Nobody and nothing could be compliant with your SFR if you avoid the constraint of SFR:

- Religious beliefs and practices have absolute SFR iff it remains deeply and wholly belongs to otherworldly beliefs and practices. That means if you involve in a thisworldly problem you have to apply the thisworldly concepts and entities and avoid otherworldly concepts and entities. Otherwise, there is a conflict between the former and the latter, and then, you defeat this criterion if you choose the latter.

This criterion shows SFR as negative freedom, if SFR would participate in politics, law, public social institutions, and so many others like them, then clearly there is a constraint that principally has to be prior to the SFR.

For instance, imagine Niki is driving on a highway to reach the saint temple, there is theurgy in the temple that is once in a lifetime, but there is also a volcanic eruption close to the temple and so, local Police block the crossroads because of the eruption. It is clear that no one could move off the crossroads, and the police do not permit anyone to go there. Niki prefers to be there and she is ready to face the danger. She does not think that it is pulling a stunt and believes if she does not attend the ceremony, then she abjures her religion. We observe a conflict between a case for banning between freedom of participating in an important religious ceremony and willing of the police officers to save lives. The positive side of SA argues that you have

---

absolute freedom of religion when you apply it as otherworldly and if there is a conflict between the otherworldly and thisworldly beliefs and actions, the former is the last priority and so, Nike ought to obey the Police Officers. Altogether, you have an absolute SFR there is a severe constraint on SFR that is SFR has to remains only otherworldly. The writer calls the positive side of SA the Slap on the Back.

Theories of freedom -like SFR- could not refuse SA, because it is based on some sorts of otherworldly beliefs and practices that all of the theories such as positive and negative liberty, republican liberty, and Freedom as a Triadic Relation, libertarian freedom could be free from obstacles.

To illustrate, you could have SFR negatively, since SFR has a common feature that is a mere absence of something like interferences, no one could stop you to have SFR unless it does not remain religious. In conditions where SFR follows SA, it seems that politically there would not be conflict. That means if one interprets SFR from the perspective of freedom, then she will come up with the idea that there is no absence of obstacles.

Also, if one knows SFR in republican terms then, she will agree with SA because it does not conflict with non-domination or self-mastery of freedom which could be another sphere when she put SFR in front of republican liberty.

Besides that, there is no constraint of SFR -to accept religion and express religious beliefs and practices- which is come from SA and so, one could admire that SFR could survive when playing a true role of itself.

Another objection would come from freedom in a general sense in which there is a question of how we could determine constraint in SFR, and it seems to the writer's mind SFR is interestingly different from other types of freedom. It is owing to this fact that all other types of freedom and freedom in general except SFR do not involve the before-mentioned constraint which means they have to be evaluated from different perspectives and this SFR's constraint is based on the thisworldly and otherworldly distinction those others are not. For instance, one may argue against freedom of speech, since, there is a serious constraint on it which is hate speech. But, look both of them are involved with thisworldly issues. It is the delighted aspect of SFR.

How could the writer argue that SFR has nothing in common with different concepts of God that the writer acknowledges the proportions of religion to the whole of our life have a serious constraint. That means that religion is the only otherworldly concept in which other types of concepts of God that would push God to this world need to add something otherworldly like God to thisworldly concepts and entities.

For instance, they had to say that:

---
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• Pantheism: God is identical with the world, and so, there is a world where we add God to it in an identical way,
• Panentheism: The world is a part of God, and so, there is a world that we add God to it as containing way of it,
• Theistic Idealism: The word depends on the mind of God, and so, there is a world that God is added to it as the former depends on the latter.

Let the writer mention another aspect of the argument that is opted to the one how to identify and/or interpret one's religious belief and practice. That shows if the one would like to unseen the distinctness then the one will face answering what would be his option that a Slap in the Face:

• In a dissimilar way, we could perceive the former writer's criterion in this way that religion includes religious beliefs and practices that the adjective of -religious- could only be identified iff it precludes the religious from non-religious one and it does not occur unless we grasp the religious as otherworldly concepts and entity and know the non-religious one as this worldly. This new criterion shows that different concepts of God do not affect the SFR. Due to the fact that different concepts of God lead to the traditional theism and God by knowing them to be added to this world or would be this worldly.

Let one more time, know that whether the Niki as a panentheist or pantheist or theistic idealist, theistic fictionalist, theistic ultimist, and so many others would decline SFR or not.

The first example is that Niki believes God is identical to the world and due to the reason that SFR is absolute, she is free to believe in pantheism on the condition that it follows the first criterion in which pantheism has to remain otherworldly and we know that pantheism is otherworldly, because it only adds God to this world identically. As a result, Niki may wrongfully claim that she ought to participate in the ceremony, also, she may argue that she is not obligated to obey the police officer's order and it is because the eruption is identical to God and so, there is no conflict between the theurgy for God and the eruption, then, the police have not to issue an order on the moving off and Niki could also disobey the order. Although undeniably, this case is a Slap in the ace to Niki, since, she may die as soon as an active volcano erupts, she will die and rescuers and firefighters may die because of her. Altogether it does not matter how you place your faith in God as a pantheist or theist, there will be a death toll rose.

Another example will be the same as the abovementioned example, Niki believes the world is a part of God and due to the reason that SFR is absolute, she is free to believe in Panentheism on the condition that it follows the first criterion in which Panentheism has to remain otherworldly and we know that Panentheism is otherworldly because it only adds God to this world as containing way of it. As a result, Niki may wrongfully claim that she ought to participate in the ceremony, also, she may argue that she is not obligated to obey the police officer's order and it is because the eruption is a part of God and the same story: there is no conflict between
the theurgy for God and the eruption, then, the police have not to issue an order on the moving off and Niki could also disobey the order. Although undeniably, this case is a Slap in the Face to Niki, since, she may die as soon as active volcanic erupt, she will die and rescuers and firefighters may die because of her. Altogether, it does not matter how you place your faith in God as a pantheist or theist, there will be a death toll rose.

You could replace Pantheism or Panentheism with different kinds of modern theologies or religious worldviews. However, the writer's two criteria will remain the same.

The writer's point in this section is that theocracy lacks both faces of SFR in which it has neither SFR as mentioned in the SA on the back and nor SA in the face arguments. The writer's argument on the SFR in theocracy (Hereafter: SFRT) is this:

1. SFRT suffers from the Slap on the Back argument (with an official religion):
   - SFRT in this argument has some serious difficulties,
   - Imagine, a theocracy announces an or some religion(s) as an official religion(s) of a government, then,
   - First of all, it will face nonbelievers of the official religion who do not believe in the official religion,
   - What would be the response of the theocracy to them?
   - A question will arise whether the theocracy will know them as the second citizen?
   - Because they could not be like other citizens whose religion is the same as the official religion iff the theocracy only behaved toward them neutrally,
   - That means, they lack something unjustifiably that other citizens who live in the theocracy have,
   - It will be discriminatory.
   - Another response of the theocracy would be that the theocracy will threaten nonbelievers with cruelties such as prison, torture, massacre, the death penalty, and many others?
   - In this case, the theocracy will do something that is not neutral, those identified as cruelties. Undeniably, it will be brutal.
   - As a consequence, the theocracy could not enjoy the freedom and more importantly, it could not use the delighted aspect of SFR as absolute freedom.

2. SFRT suffers from the Slap on the Back argument (without an official religion):
   - Imagine that a theocracy that is based on an or some religion(s) does not announce an or some religion(s) as an official religion(s),
   - That means, they only run an or some religion(s) as a basis for political authority and governing a country functionally,
   - Then it seems that they one more time will struggle with some strict problems,
o Because, inherently, it has changed the otherworldly identity of that religion(s) and SFR which is the basis for political authority and governing the country to a thisworldly one, functionally
o It is not only to the believers but also, it is to the nonbelievers,
 o As a result, they face not only the Niki example but also will suffer that it could not use the delighted aspect of SFR as absolute freedom.
 o Although, in this case, both discrimination and cruelties would arise again.

3. SFRT suffers from the Slap in the Face argument:
   o If the second constraint is true then it seems that it does not change the first and second cases of SFRT,
   o It is due to the fact that if the alternative concepts of God remain SFR all of the discrimination, cruelties, the functional problem of Niki example and delighted aspect of SFR would come again.

4. SFRT in both arguments suffers from this claim that which God or religion is true to be as a basis for this or that political authority and so, admitting or refusing SFR could solve the plurality concepts of God and religion.

If the slap argument is true as SFR and SFRT, it is clear that theocracy suffers from a political value that is called freedom.

There would be sorts of objections to the Slap Argument as follow:

First of all, one may object that Slap Argument could enroll as a negative actor in international debates, delighted features of the argument could be a disadvantage to the third world, developing, and powerless countries. It means that superpower countries could persuade and/or target citizens of those powerless countries to proselytize their religion. Therefore, it could transform all or most religions to only a few ones in favor of superpower countries.

- The first reply of the writer is that we need to recall the core idea of the argument that SFR only includes otherworldly entities and concepts, and so, it could not include thisworldly entities and concepts such as festivals, ceremonies, law, politics, and many others. There is a serious constraint on SFR as mentioned before. The former countries could apply those constraints to their citizens.

- Second of all, it seems some traditional or modern theologies and religious worldviews are more rational compared with the other ones. For instance, there is a consensus that monotheism is much more coherent compared to polytheism. As a result, this concern could not be a restraint to the irrational traditional or modern theologies and religious worldviews. Those countries that insist on those irrational traditional or modern theologies or religious worldviews seem that they could not isolate their citizens to believe or practice the rational one.
Another objection would be that SFR and Slap Argument could be harmful to diversity in pluralistic countries and/or moral indigenous cultures owing to the fact that they could transfer all of those diversities and cultures to homogenous and/or immoral ones or eradicate all of them.

- It seems that first of all, we have to recall the former objection’s replies to this objection.

- Also, we have to remember that both Slap Argument and SFR belong to the private sphere because of the constraints. As a result, a legitimate government could recognize the diversities and the cultures officially, it shall impose provisions to present the indigenous diversity and the indigenous cultures as the official ones. For instance, the government could declare that a language is the only official language and the others could be practiced as non-official ones or it could impose some festivals and ceremonies as official ones and the others as private one. This trend toward diversities and the moral indigenous cultures will make the others as private one and it could preserve them practically.

**Conclusion**

All in all, SA will prove that SFR is not only absolute iff the former criterion is satisfied, but also, different concepts of God do not revise absolute SFR iff the latter criterion is fulfilled. Even though, Theocracy suffers from these delighted features of SFR.
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