

DOCTRINES THAT SOW HATE

There is secular faith and there is religious faith. Both cannot be equally good. There is secular hate and there is religious hate. Both cannot be equally bad.

There are subdivisions in religious hate. Some just hate those who they think are facing bad karma. That does not compare to hating people who you think are in Hell forever cast off from God forever.

If the person is absolutely valuable then it follows that every moment of that person's life is as well. Therefore the person deserves only happiness in this world and in the next no matter what he or she does. Yes she or he does deserve to suffer but this deserving is blanked out by the treatment she or he deserves as a person. The doctrine of Hell shows a lack of compassion and moral sense and those who teach it have no monopoly on determining morality. To say people should suffer in Hell because they deserve it is plainly vindictive – what would you think of a person who said that a joyrider deserved to get maimed in a car crash? It might be true in a sense but its vindictive.

If God valued the sinners as persons he would fight their sin because he values them and not cast them into a Hell. Whoever denies this only show their own true colours.

To say that God loves me unconditionally means that God loves me because I am a person and not because of what I do. If my personhood were that important then he wouldn't let me go to Hell forever but he does. So though my personhood is important he refuses to acknowledge it and therefore he hates me for that is the essence of hate.

If God is the only thing that can make us happy as Christianity teaches then it is clear that losing him is punishment enough. The doctrine of the fire of Hell tells us that Hell is more than losing God and being lonely. There is pain of a torturing kind there as well like something exterior to you tormenting you. It could be literal fire and when it can be literal fire it is. There would be no need for the word fire to be used by Jesus symbolise agonising loneliness. This additional torment suggests that God hates the damned because he thinks what they endure in losing him is not bad enough and puts them in fire to make it worse. When God does that it shows that the damned are not in Hell against the will of God as some contend. If they burn themselves then why does he give them the power to do it?

Hell is a dangerous doctrine and its seeming cruelty needs to be explained and God has no right asking us to believe until it is explained.

The idea of hate the sin but love the sinner says the sinner should be treated as if they have not committed the sin which is hardly loving either. It is evil to condone evil and is not really caring about the person for it is really indifference which is worse than hating the sinner. Also, choosing to be indifferent is an act of hate. Hate is the act and indifference is the resulting act. Nobody separates good works from the person which betrays the whole deceit of it all. Jesus permitted judging fairly and Hell teaches that sin exists so Hell is a doctrine of hatred and anybody who teaches needs to be firmly told they should not be doing that. Incidentally, if we cannot love the sinner without loving the sin it follows that if there is a God then he is a tyrant then for we are all sinners according to him so how could we love anybody? He would have made us for sadistic thrills for the growth of love was not the reason he made us.

Hell makes loving the sinner but not the sin impossible because it supports the idea that if the law is cruel and people break the law they deserve all it gives them. This is the logic in many Islamic countries. They think that even if stoning gays to death is wrong it is right when the gays know what the law is and break the law for they are asking for stoning and so deserve it. If a sinner wants to be hated and believes he or she should be what use is the rule about loving sinners and hating sin?

God must hate the unsaved as he hates the damned for they are like the living damned.

Suppose the Roman Catholic doctrine of venial sin, sin that doesn't deserve hell such as stealing an apple from a shop, is true. Suppose the Roman doctrine that piles and piles of venial sin cannot add up to a mortal sin though a mortal sin may do less harm in the world and to people. Then he sends people to Hell and spares others for doing worse.

Rome says that some good acts are your duty and others are not and the latter are called acts of supererogation. Acts of supererogation are acts above and beyond the call of duty. If the concept of acts of supererogation makes sense (it doesn't) then it means that for Catholics morality is not about doing what is best. Yet they say that it is best to believe in duties. If it is best to believe in duties then it is a duty to do what is best. If duties are not for the best then they are the useless

inventions of control freaks. Typical of a lying religion, it cannot get its ethics straight. So God according to Catholicism, says works of supererogation are works that you don't have to do though they are for the best. Then God is saying that morality is not for the best which is really an affirmation that morality is anything more than an illusion. The damned are hated and sent to Hell over a lie made up by God.

It is not God who wants people in Hell. It is the vicious religion founded by Jesus Christ if he existed and his followers.

It is time Christianity stopped getting praised despite advocating doctrines that can do grave harm when people figure out their dark implications. It is still responsible even if it leaves these people to work it out on their own.

Suppose God and the Church find it regretful that somebody is in Hell. What they regret is that the person abused his will. What they don't regret is that owing to the choice he made the person is there. They hold the person deserves it. It is foolish to warm to God and the Church when they lament the soul being in Hell for that is not the whole story. They have found a way to celebrate it too. If I regret the fact that the murderer of my child abused his will for his sake and the child's, that is not only compatible with gloating over his fate which is rotting in jail. **IT IS THE REASON I CAN GLOAT!**

The doctrine that you put yourself in Hell by abusing your free will is not the same as teaching that you go there to suffer for your sin. The difference is subtle but it is there. The Christian teaching is that you merit eternal damnation. It is the difference between locking yourself in jail and in being put there for some crime. If God is using your free will as an excuse for having you in Hell then he hates you and is a hypocrite.

The book observes that God told Paul he hated Esau and loved Jacob and that he did not say he hated Esau's acts but Esau himself (page 68, *The Bible Tells Us So*). This observation is right for if Paul, who was teaching elementary Christianity to the Romans when he said that God revealed that to him, had believed that God did not hate Esau in the literal sense he would have made that clear.

If God hates the damned and won't help them to repent then this alone would prove that he hates them enough to keep them in Hell forever and probably does.

Catholics would try to tell you that God hates the works of the damned but loves or values them as persons. If that were true then he has a choice between honouring their personhood and punishing their works. He cannot do both so he has to do one or the other.

He can make them as happy as possible despite their sins because they are persons or he can punish them for their sins. Making sinners happy and thereby rewarding them for sins would be better than punishing them needlessly. And it is not really rewarding when the alternative is immoral. In practice it is rewarding but intention wise and motive wise it is not. There is no alternative. If you act as if you forgive a person because you are forced then in your heart you have not forgiven them. This works the same way.

Perhaps punishing them is treating them as persons. But what use is useless suffering? The suffering is useless for if a person is happy but evil inside but is in a place where they cannot harm others who cares? We need punishment on earth for the sake of order but it is pure superstition and anthropomorphism to have a punishing God unless that God is a tyrant. So the suffering is treating them as impersonal. The punishing does no good for the damned will not or cannot repent. They might as well be happy. It follows that the punishment of the damned is a needless evil and that its infliction implies that God hates the damned and treats them as worthless. His attitude to them is that they have no value. When God hates the damned he must hate sinners. And so must we.

God may have to punish in this world to restrain sinners but that is only necessary because of the kind of world it is – it is needed to stop people going out of control. He could make another world and populate it with people in force-fields where nobody can harm anybody else. Punishment is certainly an evil. It is not a nice thing even if it is necessary. It does not change the evil inside the person unless the person decides to change so it is really only the person who can change. Punishment may educate and inspire change but these things can be done without it. Though it is good to try and convert through punishment on earth - when we have to punish we may as well try to change the person through it – punishment is adding the evil of suffering to the evil in somebody's heart. It doubles the evil. Though it is good to will the punishment of the evil in the person on paper it is bad in practice. There is some sense in saying the person should be punished but there is not enough sense in it to justify punishing. To make sense of this perhaps this parable will be of assistance: A woman murdered her lover in cold blood. She deserves death because she killed him. That is pure logic. But it does not mean we should kill her. One way it does but because you cannot destroy a person for a person is valuable even after they take a life you cannot do it. This implies that the welfare of the person is more important than punishing them. The person comes before the punishment. It implies that God has no business punishing anybody once they leave this world for as long as they can't damage anything but their own morals let them do what they want. We need to be punished on earth to keep us under some restraint when we are bad. This could not be necessary in the afterlife where Christianity says we will be

disembodied beings but at the resurrection we will have magical bodies that can pass through walls etc.

If the person is absolutely valuable then it follows that every moment of that person's life is as well. Therefore the person deserves only happiness in this world and in the next no matter what he or she does. Yes she or he does deserve to suffer but this deserving is blanked out by the treatment she or he deserves as a person. The doctrine of Hell shows a lack of compassion and moral sense and those who teach it have no monopoly on determining morality. To say people should suffer in Hell because they deserve it is plainly vindictive – what would you think of a person who said that a joyrider deserved to get maimed in a car crash? It might be true in a sense but its vindictive.

If God valued the sinners as persons he would fight their sin because he values them and not cast them into a Hell. Whoever denies this only show their own true colours.

To say that God loves me unconditionally means that God loves me because I am a person and not because of what I do. If my personhood were that important then he wouldn't let me go to Hell forever but he does. So though my personhood is important he refuses to acknowledge it and therefore he hates me for that is the essence of hate.

If God is the only thing that can make us happy as Christianity teaches then it is clear that losing him is punishment enough. The doctrine of the fire of Hell tells us that Hell is more than losing God and being lonely. There is pain of a torturing kind there as well like something exterior to you tormenting you. It could be literal fire and when it can be literal fire it is. There would be no need for the word fire to be used by Jesus symbolise agonising loneliness. This additional torment suggests that God hates the damned because he thinks what they endure in losing him is not bad enough and puts them in fire to make it worse. When God does that it shows that the damned are not in Hell against the will of God as some contend. If they burn themselves then why does he give them the power to do it?

Hell is a dangerous doctrine and its seeming cruelty needs to be explained and God has no right asking us to believe until it is explained.

The idea of hate the sin but love the sinner says the sinner should be treated as if they have not committed the sin which is hardly loving either. Its hypocritical to call a person a sinner meaning they are the problem and the one deserving punishment and then to say you hate the problem and not them.

It is evil to condone evil and is not really caring about the person for it is really indifference which is worse than hating the sinner. Also, choosing to be indifferent is an act of hate. Hate is the act and indifference is the resulting act. Nobody separates good works from the person which betrays the whole deceit of it all. Jesus permitted judging fairly and Hell teaches that sin exists so Hell is a doctrine of hatred and anybody who teaches needs to be firmly told they should not be doing that. Incidentally, if we cannot love the sinner without loving the sin it follows that if there is a God then he is a tyrant then for we are all sinners according to him so how could we love anybody? He would have made us for sadistic thrills for the growth of love was not the reason he made us.

Hell makes loving the sinner but not the sin impossible because it supports the idea that if the law is cruel and people break the law they deserve all it gives them. This is the logic in many Islamic countries. They think that even if stoning gays to death is wrong it is right when the gays know what the law is and break the law for they are asking for stoning and so deserve it. If a sinner wants to be hated and believes he or she should be what use is the rule about loving sinners and hating sin?

God must hate the unsaved as he hates the damned for they are like the living damned.

Suppose the Roman Catholic doctrine of venial sin, sin that doesn't deserve hell such as stealing an apple from a shop, is true. Suppose the Roman doctrine that piles and piles of venial sin cannot add up to a mortal sin though a mortal sin may do less harm in the world and to people. Then he sends people to Hell and spares others for doing worse.

Rome says that some good acts are your duty and others are not and the latter are called acts of supererogation. Acts of supererogation are acts above and beyond the call of duty. If the concept of acts of supererogation makes sense (it doesn't) then it means that for Catholics morality is not about doing what is best. Yet they say that it is best to believe in duties. If it is best to believe in duties then it is a duty to do what is best. Typical of a lying religion, it cannot get its ethics straight. So God according to Catholicism, says works of supererogation are works that you don't have to do though they are for the best. Then God is saying that morality is not for the best which is really an affirmation that morality is anything more than an illusion. The damned are hated and sent to Hell over a lie made up by God.

Hell is about punishment not about reform. But even if it is not about reform it has to keep the door open so that the person can reform if they want to. A God that does not leave that door open is pure evil. The doctrine denies that he leaves the door open. Thus Hell leaves us adoring an evil God and condoning and celebrating his evil.

The Church says that whoever rejects God or his Church is in fact rejecting a caricature for they are so wonderful and attractive. It follows then that the damned don't make a choice against God at all but against a caricature of him. Whatever a Christian can say, they cannot say that Hell exists because God respects free will and the freedom of a person to reject him. Christians don't believe that Hell is a doctrine that respects free will at all for they are the ones saying that God is never rejected but only a mockery of him is. They use an excuse to justify Hell that they don't believe in - they are a lot more vindictive than they pretend. If God asks for that excuse then he hates the damned.