

Sin and Sinner are one and the Same

You cannot separate sin and sinner so to hate the sin is to hate the sinner

"The disengagement of moral self-sanctions from inhumane conduct is a growing human problem at both individual and collective levels" Albert Bandura, Stanford University, <https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/Bandura1999PSPR.pdf>

Love the sinner and hate the sin is at the very heart of many religions.

This core teaching has been exposed over and over as a hypocritical lie.

If you want to be good at abusing and hurting another person, tell them you do it because you love them.

If they believe you, it is then and only then that you have power over them

Your innate qualities show in your behaviour. You can't be a sinner because you sin but you must sin because you are at least partly a sinner. Whoever says that they condemn your behaviour, and not your innate qualities is being a pure hypocrite.

Sin is not about the harm you do outwardly but about the intention that did the harm. The intention is you and speaks about you.

If people really want you to understand the sinner, why don't they say that we should not judge paedophiles or sadistic murderers unless we are paedophiles and sadistic murderers?

If you sin, you deserve to suffer and be hurt for your sin. Deserve means you get what is your fair due. Loving the sinner is not going to help them - it only helps you be smug. There is no point in preaching about sin (sin means wrongdoing and how it offends God - the atheist will condemn wrongdoing but not as sin) if your message is, "Your sins do not affect how I think of you." You will not be taken seriously and the sinner will feel encouraged to persist in sin.

Many of us identify ourselves with our sins. Thus we will feel hated. Hate sin and love sinner does little good.

If we love our sins, we will feel hated.

The Doctrine

Sin is rebellion against the will of God. The Christians have managed to get seen as fairly innocuous through their two-faced doctrine of detesting the rebellion and loving the rebellious person. This teaching is a cloak over Christian incitement to hatred. When Christians engage in violence over religion, their leaders seek to avoid responsibility for this by claiming to love sinners and hate sins.

Religion says you must love the sinner and hate the sin. Sinner means your sin is not the problem but what you say about yourself by sinning. So why is it not phrased as, "Love the sinner and hate the sinner"? Because that would render the hypocrisy too obvious.

Another version is, "I love you. I do not condemn your sin to judge or to hurt you but merely state that it is bad. I state it not as a criticism but as a fact." This is trying to separate the hatefulness of sin from the fact of sin. The two go together. To see sin as a fact is a refusal to see sin as evil. It is trying to make it an abstract thing and not a real evil. It is trying to water the condemnation down.

Would you consider a person sincere if they said to you, "I am sorry I have to hate your sin"? They tell you that the sin has nothing to do with you but if it doesn't then why are they saying sorry to YOU? The person is pretending that you can separate the sin from the person. The person cannot be sincerely sorry for hating!

What's Sin?

Sin is using your free will to create separation from God. It is a religious term. It means doing what God has forbidden. Sin

and evil are not the same thing though sin is supposed to be evil for many actions that are not evil or necessarily that harmful are excoriated as sins. Unbelievers talk about evil and believers talk about sin. Unbelievers consider the pain caused by evil while believers worry more that it is forbidden by God's legal decree.

Sin is not a thing as such. It is a description of what a person has become - a criminal. Sin is the person. Our language makes a difference between sinner and sin but there isn't. To say that there is blue and there is a blue ball does not mean that the blue and the ball in one way are not the same thing.

A sinner is a person who makes sin partly or wholly part of themselves. They make themselves bad at least up to a point and invite bad consequences. If this definition is wrong then there is no such thing as a sinner. To call somebody a sinner is to say they brought the bad consequences on themselves. This eliminates compassion. How could you love them when love and compassion are inseparable? To call somebody a sinner is to agree with the bad they bring on themselves - it means agreeing under the circumstances.

The Doctrine of Loving the Sinner and Thinking of Sin as not Part of them

The Church says that we must love sinners and hate sins. This is on a par with Father Anthony de Mello's insane advice that when you are suffering never think, "I am suffering", but, "It (hand, stomach, knee etc) is what is suffering not you!" The Church even makes a command of its insane law which makes it a form of bullying. If the command is true and good we don't need to be commanded to do it. Love is something that is freely given. You don't command love.

Anyway the Church command means you judge the sin not the sinner.

You view the sin as bad or dangerous not the sinner.

You see the sin as deserving punishment not the sinner.

Clearly we are to think of the sinner as perfect and the sin as something that has nothing to do with them at all.

But if that is true then why are they calling the person a sinner?

When you break the command down to find out its meaning you feel and see plainly how stupid and hypocritical it is.

To Wish Harm on the Sin is to Wish Harm on the Sinner

Hate implies wishing more than something didn't happen or exist but expresses the wish to hurt it as well. It's a violent emotion and you can't want to hurt the sin without wanting to hurt the sinner for to hurt the sin you have to hurt the sinner. You hurt or offend against the sinner by hating them. It would be foolish to want to hurt sin if you separate it from the sinner and it wouldn't be possible. When you hurt things it is your way of taking it out on a person. For example, the fiancée who flushes the engagement ring down the toilet does it not to spite the ring but to spite her fiancé.

If you hate the sin you must hate the sinner for the sinner freely commits the sin. Sin is a quality a person has and you are your qualities. For one to hate your sin and wish evil on it is to wish evil on you and hate you. If a person hated your kindness, you would know that is only another way of saying they hate you. So why pretend they don't hate you if they hate your sin?

If the sin is hateful the sinner is as well for the sinner freely causes the sin. There would be no sin without the sinner and how could you love the sinner if you pretend that they had nothing to do with their sin? It is hypocritical to separate the person from the sin as if the person was not to blame for the sin. That is not love at all for it is blessing their sins by developing the attitude that their sin is not part of them. To love the sinner and not the sin is to pretend that the sinner has had nothing to do with the sin which is hardly loving or sincere for the sinner needs to be freed from the sin for sin must be bad for her or him when you have to hate it.

The reason you can love the sick person but hate the disease is because that person is not causing the disease so those who say we must love the sinner and hate the disease of sin because we can love the patient and hate the illness have to be deliberately trying to mislead. They insult people who battle disease too.

To hate the sin and to love the sinner makes out that there is a distinction without a difference. It is like saying, "I hate your Christianity but admire your religious notions." "I oppose everything about you and everything that you do but I don't oppose you." "I am glad you are alive but I am opposed to the fact that you are breathing."

If you told a black person you loved them but you hated their skin colour it would be rightly disbelieved that you really

love them. A sin or evil character is more personal than skin colour so you hate the sinner if you say you hate the sin. Notice how it condones racism by implication?

If you say John's essay is stupid that is the same as calling John stupid though many pretend it is not. If to call John clever is to say John is clever that means to call John stupid is to say John is stupid. Religion pretends that it doesn't think John is stupid. This shows it is wilful dishonesty and false charm. It makes altruism impossible for it is meant to be free from lies but this bases it on lies.

Belief in love the sinner and hate the sin (we call it belief for the sake of argument - but can a person truly believe it? NO!) does not stop the person feeling outraged and hated and degraded if somebody admonishes their sin. Those who believe, "Love the sinner and hate the sin means you do not condemn the sinner as bad and worthy of hate" are not helping at all - they only look as if they do. What is the point of the doctrine if it makes one no different from people who hate sinners? You get angry at being called a sinner and the sin being condemned simply BECAUSE you know the condemner knows you have a good side. Really what you have is the believer in loving the sinner and hating the sin and the person who believes in hating the sin with the sinner doing the same thing except the first pretends to be any different from the second.

Some act as if they hate the sin when the sinner does it but as the sinner stops it and may do better after they tend to look at the person as a whole. For example, you steal thousands but afterwards you behave better and redeem yourself in their eyes. This is not hating the sin and loving the sinner. It is hating the sinner until the sinner stops the sin.

Sin is you and you are sin

This page is about what everybody knows but few dare to admit: that to hate sin is to hate the person who creates the sin.

Sin cannot be treated separately from the sinner for it reveals the sinner, it reveals what kind of person the sinner is. The sinner makes himself or herself harmful in some way and invites and accepts evil into his or her core or being. To fail to see that is an act of hate itself for it refuses to see properly what the sinner does to his or her victims and understand it for the evil that it is. Love the sinner and hate the sin is vindictive in this sense.

When you become a sinner, being a sinner becomes the core of your sense of self. When somebody says they are gay they will argue that gay is them, their gayness is one of the things that define them as a person. They did not make themselves gay. How much more does something you make yourself to be define you?

Religion counsels us to hate the sin but love the sinner. This is absurd as saying, "I disapprove of the sin but not the sinner". It is as absurd as saying, "I disapprove of the sin but not the action." And as absurd and two-faced as, "Hate the sinner and love the person".

Love the sinner and hate the sin will lead to a distorted view of the wrong people do. It is not the way to influence or stop people doing harm. It is no wonder some Christians virtually condone the evil that monsters do to them. They may make excuses etc. Christian communities are famous for enabling criminals by turning a blind eye.

You can't Hate the Sin if it is Separate from the Person

The sin cannot be hated until it is seen to exist and it is only seen to exist if the person is judged. In other words, there cannot be a sin without a person being freely responsible for it. The sin cannot be divorced from the person. Even if the person may be different from the sin, there is no distinction. It is like the difference without a distinction that exists between sight and the eye.

To love the sinner and not the sin is to separate the two. It is totally foolish to say you hate somebody's sin but not them because how could you hate something that is separate from them? It is only a thing and what is the point of hating a thing? It's only a thing and has no will of its own. What would be the point of hating the fact that it is raining in Australia now when you are living in the UK? Hating the sin and not the sinner is only for crazy people. When say we hate cheese or crap on our doorstep. But this only refers to dislike because they are harmless things that don't have to harm us. We don't really hate them because we want them to exist for they have to exist for human betterment but we don't want to. Real hatred involves wishing the thing didn't exist and wishing it for unreasonable and malevolent motives. If sin is a thing or to be treated as something separate from the sinner that her or she has nothing to do with you can't hate it. So you can't hate the sin so if you hate something it has to be the sinner and you won't admit it. This then is the morality of Christianity and many religions, hating people but hiding it under charm and serenity.

To teach that sin is some kind of object or property with which God and ourselves is exclusively angry is illogical. It is irrational to get angry at an object or property. Anger makes you irrational in your approach to those whom you are angry at. Imagine how you will make it worse by trying to hate things not people. Do not say that anger at the sin not the sinner

SEEMS unfeasible. It is unfeasible. There is no seems about it.

Doing wrong without meaning to be evil is not sin but becoming evil is sin. To hate sin as if the person has nothing to do with it is to hate nothing. It is hypocritical self-torment.

God and hating the sin, loving the sinner

"Sin" is just a shorthand way of describing what sinners do and what kind of people they are. To say that the wrath and hatred of God is reserved only for people's actions doesn't make sense because actions are not independent things from the people who perform them. If I go out and steal a disabled person's car, God isn't angry at the physical process of a given human being removing a particular piece of hardware. He is angry at me. Sin is a shorthand way of talking about sinners in the context of their actions. To make out that it is the physical process God has the problem with is deeply vicious towards the victim.

To say that God or anyone hates sin is really just a quick way of saying that God or anyone hates people for doing evil things. In other words, to say that God's or anybody's wrath and hatred is reserved only for sin is actually to say that God's or anybody's wrath and hatred is reserved only for sinners.

Insults God

It is bad enough to be an unbeliever and promote the lie of loving wrongdoers and hating wrong but it is worse to say that God does the same, to blacken the being you say is all good. Despite all its "love" for God, God-religion is intrinsically blasphemous and deepens vice. The atheist will have the best hope of entering the kingdom of Heaven if there is a God just like Jesus said adulteresses and tax collectors would have more hope than the respectable Jewish leaders.

If God hates sin and not the sinner, then he loves the evil demons in Hell as much as he loves the greatest saint. The wrath and hatred of God are only directed at sin. It is not the sinner. But then if that is true the demons should be released from Hell. If their sin is the problem and they are not then their punishment is unjust. Why are they bearing the consequences of their actions and choices if they are not in some way the sin they are being punished for?

Thin

Saying that you condemn the sin not the sinner is mad because you will not say:

The sin is sick but the sinner is not.

The sin is bad but the sinner is as good as any saint.

The sin does harm to the sinner but the sinner does no harm to herself or himself.

The sin does harm to the others not the sinner.

The sin needs to be punished not the sinner.

You will not say, "I will not praise x for being so kind for she can only do good and not bad. I hate her for being so perfect. Even her sins are nothing to do with her."

We have to see how deranged and selfish and two-faced loving sinners and hating their sins is. It is too thin to impress anybody and it may make you feel smug but it will not inspire the sinner to see such hypocrisy and to feel so mothered as if he or she was useless and needs your parenting.

Finally

If sin and sinner need separate treatment then they are separate. One wonders how you can treat a sin if the sinner is separate from it! It is the sinner you may try to reason with!

Nobody says, "Praise the good deed not the good person." (If you cannot say that then you cannot say people must hate the sin and love the sinner either.) Or, "The sin must repent not the sinner." Why bother repenting at all if the sin is nothing to do with you - which raises the question of why it is called your sin at all. One minute sin is defined as, "A person abusing their responsibility to God and God's law" and then we are told that it does not imply that the person is bad to any degree. The separation between sin and sinner is really just lip-service.

You have to own your sin and say it is you. There is no sin - its just sinner. The lie about separating the two means repentant and forgiveness end up being fake and hollow and no wonder the Christian religion has been rather merciless.

If hating the sin is hating the sinner then love for sinners is pretend. Even Hitler could say that he loved the Jews for he didn't want them to be Jews and that it was Jewishness not Jews he intended to hurt. As with love sinner and hate sin, it is a distinction without a difference. It is a non-distinction disguised as a distinction.

The good deeds done by religion are based on a lie and such goodness soon shows its true colours and falls like a house of cards.

THE WEB

www.shilohcommunitychurch.org/love_sinr.htm

TRUE OR FALSE? GOD LOVES THE SINNER BUT HATES THE SIN, FALSE, Errol Hale

www.ffrf.org/ftoday/back/hatred.html

With Perfect Hatred by Dan Barker

<http://www.godhatesfags.com/>

A Baptist anti-gay site

BOOKS CONSULTED

BEYOND GOOD AND EVIL, Friedrich Nietzsche, Penguin, London, 1990

CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, Veritas, London, 1995

ECUMENICAL JIHAD, Peter Kreeft, Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1996

GOD IS NOT GREAT, THE CASE AGAINST RELIGION, Christopher Hitchens, Atlantic Books, London, 2007

HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS, Peter Kreeft and Ronald Tacelli, Monarch, East Sussex, 1995

HOW DOES GOD LOVE ME? Radio Bible Class, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1986

IN DEFENCE OF THE FAITH, Dave Hunt, Harvest House, Eugene, Oregon, 1996

MADAME GUYON, MARTYR OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, Phyllis Thompson, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1986

MORAL PHILOSOPHY, Joseph Rickaby SJ, Stonyhurst Philosophy Series, Longmans Green and Co, London, 1912

OXFORD DICTIONARY OF PHILOSOPHY, Simon Blackburn, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996

PRACTICAL ETHICS, Peter Singer, Cambridge University Press, England, 1994

PSYCHOLOGY, George A Miller, Penguin, London, 1991

REASON AND BELIEF, Brand Blanshard, George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1974

REASONS FOR HOPE, Ed Jeffrey A Mirus, Christendom College Press, Virginia, 1982

THE ATONEMENT: MYSTERY OF RECONCILIATION, Kevin McNamara, Archbishop of Dublin, Veritas, Dublin, 1986

SINNERS IN THE HANDS OF AN ANGRY GOD, Jonathan Edwards, Sword of the Lord, Murfreesboro, Tennessee,

undated

THE BRIEF OF ST ANTHONY OF PADUA (Vol 44, No 4)

THE IMITATION OF CHRIST, Thomas A Kempis, Translated by Ronald Knox and Michael Oakley, Universe, Burns &

Oates, London, 1963

THE LIFE OF ALL LIVING, Fulton J Sheen, Image Books, New York, 1979

THE NEW WALK, Captain Reginald Wallis, The Christian Press, Pembridge Villas, England, undated

THE PROBLEM OF PAIN, CS Lewis, Fontana, London, 1972

THE SATANIC BIBLE, Anton Szandor LaVey, Avon Books, New York, 1969

THE STUDENT'S CATHOLIC DOCTRINE, Rev Charles Hart BA, Burns & Oates, London, 1961