

**FORGIVING RESTS ON THE FOUNDATION OF JUDGEMENT**

We will learn that forgiveness may not be real in the sense that it is a mask for separating the sin from the sinner. No wonder you seem to forgive and even think you forgive.

Love the sinner and hate the sin can be rephrased as bless the sinner and judge the sin. Interestingly few are interested in reading it that way which may prove significant. It shows they judge the sinner and the sin together and want others do but they want to hide their spite.

The Christian teaching that we must judge sins and not sinners needs translation. The translation is, "Sins are perfectly bad and sinners are perfectly good." Merely to state such a doctrine is to prove it is hypocritical nonsense. It is obvious that an "evil" deed is a mixture of good and bad motives. At least some of the motives whether good or bad will be influenced by mistakes or be mistakes. You cannot condemn making mistakes for they are not meant. Plus there will be motives we are not even aware of.

"Love the maths student but hate his mistake" is definitely personal for why are we saying hate? Why not just correct?

All agree that nobody can say x has sinned in doing something and really love that person if there is any unfairness in x's assessment of that person.

The argument that unjustly saying somebody sinned means you cannot hide behind love the sinner and hate the sin and you hate them with the sin is interesting. Being fair in your assessment of somebody's action being sinful does not in itself mean you really do judge the action not them. People often use justice as a weapon. It is not the justice they care about though they take a lot of effort to be right in their assessment of what the person has done.

Judging and condemning mean that a person's worth has been judged and it is less than that of those who are assessed as better than her or him. It is based on the view that your actions show what you are. If we believed they didn't show what you are, there would be no problem in worshipping Attila the Hun as a saint.

A paraphrase would be, "Actions may be evil but the people that do them are not evil at all." Or, "We have no right to judge anybody evil even if we can prove they are totally dangerous."

This is based on the popular notion, "You are not defined by my judgement of you. But I am defined by my judgement of you."

Such ideas try to create a disconnect between the doer of the evil and the action. It is a good way of seeming moral while in fact you are programming people to divorce themselves from their immoralities and to divorce others from theirs, thus eventually nobody feels bad about letting people be evil or becoming evil. The most common manifestation of this problem is sectarianism. Because a disconnect is created between two denominations, the members of one do not feel bad enough about hurting the members of another to refrain from persecuting them. People like hurting other communities better than they do their own.

You cannot hate a sin unless you judge the person as a sinner first so the idea that the love sinner hate sin principle goes with the ban on judgement is totally wrong. Nearly everybody bases their allegiance to morality on their feelings and not on morality itself. Real ethical behaviour would be based on what reason decrees to be wrong. So it is an appearance of morality that they follow. So when you condemn something just because you want it to be wrong you cannot say you love the sinner and hate the sin for when you are being unfair you must hate both.

Christian forgiveness is passive aggressive hypocrisy

There is no forgiving where there is no judging and no thinking, "This person does not deserve anything from me." If forgiving is a response to judging then it follows that I have to judge and forgive actions that are nothing to do with me. It is not just that I will judge if somebody harms another. It is that I have to judge. I am obligated to for that is about recognising morality. The command of Jesus to love neighbour as yourself tells you to feel the same way when another is hurt as you would if they hurt you. The Golden Rule says the same thing. These heart warming commands, moral "principles" or rules are deceptive. They only work in a society where everybody is good nearly all the time. They are okay if it is only nature not somebody's personal choice that hurts you. But we live in a society where everybody is deserving of morality rooted suspicion most of the time.

If it is morally good and right to put yourself first then it follows you should avoid any upset about what happens to a person not connected with you.

Some argue that self-forgiveness is the most important forgiveness of all and it is important to do that if nothing else. They treat it as therapy.

If so then Jesus' teaching is damaging. And he knew it for there is a reason why nobody heeds his teaching demanding that you treat another as another you.

What is harmful and what harm means differs from person to person. All agree though that the most important danger to you is yourself and your unconscious impulses and actions. Wrongs done to others are wrongs done ultimately to yourself. So it follows that sin and harm can overlap but are not the same thing. So you shouldn't even be thinking of the sin. Its about the harm that the person is doing to themselves.