

ATTRITION - THE DOCTRINE THAT GOD CAN ACCEPT YOUR REPENTANCE FOR SIN IF SOME OF YOUR MOTIVES ARE IMPURE

Sin is an offence against God and his law. Sin is seen as being like a power with a destructive mind of its own as it were. So it calls for being feared and therefore hated. Repentance is to be a manifestation of hating sin.

If you hate the sin you hate the person who freely causes the sin. There are no sins without persons. Being against somebody's sin is being personal. It feels personal. You can't and don't hate the door you hit your head on but you can hit the person who strikes you on the head. Sin may be described in our language as if it were separate from the sinner but in actual fact the person is the sin for there is no such thing as a sinful act as such but only sinful characters or people. When the pope is lying and advocates his lying doctrine, owing to the fact that it is so fundamental, it makes his whole system and life built on a lie. It is like a marriage built on lies.

Hate is vindictive. Hate implies a dislike of a person that inclines you to want to see the person hurt for your pleasure. You can't want to see a sin hurt. It is the sinner you want hurt. Hate is not necessarily an intense dislike. But it can be. To hate evil is to give evil power over you and to become evil.

The Church believes that it is love to want to see a person hurt in a way that will help them or make them become better people. This shows that hate is not forbidden because it can hurt people. This shows that the Church approves of your arrogance in deciding that the person needs to be hurt to be changed. You don't know the future. You don't know if it is the best road. You can't even prove that your moral code is correct - such codes are relative. The doctrine is vicious and vengeful because pain never changes people - it is only how they respond that effects a change. Yet Jesus wished evil on people supposedly for their good. We read that the apostle Paul handed a man over to Satan for tormenting that he might repent and be saved. Hate is not forbidden because it hurts you for it hurts you to wish pain on another. Hate is really just forbidden because God forbids it and concern for the hater and the hated doesn't come into it.

The hypocritical claim that you can love the sinner not the sin is foundational to the Catholic system so the whole system is based on a lie. Would you believe a person who said to you, "I have nothing against you. It is just your sin I have something against"? Love the sinner and hate the sin means love the sinner in spite of the sin which you hate so it is grudging love - it can be called love at all. It can hardly mean you must love the sinner because of the sin you hate for that is impossible - you can't both hate the sin and love it. Religious love is fake love. Religious people are required to hate sin more than non-religious people are and do. Religious have to see it as an insult to such a good God and see it has necessitating the death of Jesus Christ for sinners. Religion encourages hate.

Contrition is when you repent your sin because it is sin and offends God. Attrition is when you vow to stop your sin because you want to avoid punishment or shame. It has no concern for God. Attrition is called repentance by the Catholic Church though it is not. It may look like it a bit but that is all. Repentance is turning away from the sin because it is a sin. It is an act of love. Attrition is just fearing the punishment and not despising the sin and is an act of selfishness - it is a bad manifestation of self-interest. Attrition is wanting the sin but not the punishment. If that is not a sin in itself then what is? The pope advocates the sacrament of confession - the need for this sacrament is based on the idea of attrition. God does not forgive people who have attrition unless they go to confession and absolved by the priest. The confessional then is totally immoral. If Jesus provided the sacrament for attrition and to reward such fake repentance then he was immoral. The confessional is really about rewarding sin more than eradicating it.

The doctrine of the sufficiency of attrition is official "infallible" Catholic doctrine. The Bible God says that if a prophet teaches things that match what God says or predicts the future accurately but makes one false report in his capacity as prophet he is to be rejected. Presumably Satan is keeping him right but uses him to teach error. Satan as counterfeiter has to teach mostly truth and deliver some error with the package to lead people astray. Even if the acceptance of attrition were the only error Roman Catholicism made, it would prove that it is not the true Church and not infallible. The Council of Trent said, "If the person in confession is sorry for he will burn in Hell if he doesn't that will do for absolution" (Session 14).

The Church does not censure the belief that repenting out of the fear of punishment or repenting out of shame is enough to get you forgiven in confession (Denz 2071, New Catholic Encyclopaedia, Contritionism). But it is certain that the Church believes that it is sufficient in confession. The doctrine of Genesis that God rejected Cain's offer of fruit and accepted Abel's offering which was a better one comes to mind. The Catholic Church offers rubbish to God.

To teach such an evil doctrine such as attrition being enough for salvation belittles those who go to Hell which is for all

eternity. It shows the Church does not love them at all. It hates them. The pope expects people to assume Hell exists and believe in it even if they have poor evidence for it. This is virtually asking them to want there to be a Hell. The pope cannot say he wishes the doctrine of Hell wasn't true for that suggests that there should be no such fate for those who go there and that the doctrine does not give dignity to God. Yet if he said he wished that we would plainly see how vindictive his religion is.

The doctrine that attrition is enough shows that the Church hates the sin but loves the sin when the person comes to confession. Is this fair or sensible? How could a paedophile priest feel bad about his sin of child molestation with a doctrine like that? It would be an encouragement to the paedophile tendency to feel that he has done nothing wrong.