

"Love the person but hate the harm they do to themselves"**Hating Sin is not Hating the Harm**

Love the sinner and hate the sin is the corner stone of Christianity and other religions. Catholics are to love the sinner and hate the sin. Their God does that too. At least he says he does!

Some who think loving sinners and hating sins is possible are confusing it with love the person and hate the harm they do to themselves. They need to see that harm and pain is not the sin.

Loving the person means hating the harm they do to themselves. This is not a religious precept. It is a human one. Even the biggest sceptic about right and wrong can hate to see a person suffer.

What is sin?

Morality implies that you must do something or suffer punishment for failing to do it. With morality, if you break the rules you deserve punishment. Morality then demands that evil be visited on the wrongdoer. For an atheist, an evil action may be immoral. But for a believer it is immoral in God's sight and by God's law. That is what sin means. A sin means a sign of an immoral character in the sight of God. It calls for and deserves and earns punishment and condemnation.

Sin and Harm are separate

God says that doing some forms of harm to others is a sin. But it does not follow that doing deliberate and unnecessary harm and sinning are identical. Jesus said you must love the Lord, God as a person, with all your heart and mind and strength. Loving God as Lord means you do his will and not your own. It follows then that the harm done by sin is not what makes it sin. The harm is a side-effect of disobeying God.

The person who thinks loving the sinner and hating the sin makes sense is making a mistake. They mistake hating what a person is doing to themselves for hating the sin. Its not the same. You can hate a person hurting themselves without thinking of it as a sin or something morally bad.

You can hate the harm a person does to themselves. You do this without making any moral assessment of them or their behaviour. If a moral judgment is present, it is excluded. You refuse to be motivated by it. For you, it is about helping the person.

You hate your child making the mistake of burning himself.

That is lovingly hating the harm he has done. You hate it because you love him.

But if you see the child as sinning you are judging the child as at least partly evil as a person. To do that is intrinsically the same as believing, "Punishment needs to be visited on this child." There is no concern for the child's wellbeing in so far as he is judged.

Thus you cannot punish the sin by your hate and condemnation without hating the sinner.

A sinner is a person perceived by God as a morally bad person who deserves to suffer for what they have done and hopefully will suffer for it. You cannot hate a sin. What you hate is what a sin says about the sinner. It's the sinful character that is hated. In other words, it's the person.

Choice or force?

Let us choose prostitution as an example of something that people consider immoral. Any example would do to make the point.

What if a woman is a prostitute by choice? What if another one is by force? The prostitute who freely does it is seen as the most harmful one even if she practices safer sex to protect her clients unlike the forced one. If she were compelled and doing the same things she would to be seen as harmful. This clearly suggests that merely being a prostitute is bad and it is not about any harm done to anyone or herself. That is not a morality. It is just hate lurking in the guise of love. When the harm does not matter, it is clear that believers are saying that being a prostitute makes you a thing and you are really not a

real person anymore. That is moralism and a morality that does not worry about harm in itself is not a morality at all. They go as far as to say that the harm done by prostitution is down to prostitution being wrong and that the harm is simply the consequences. Thus harm is separated from the act.

Witchcraft with its law of An it harm none do what ye will is far superior to Christianity and similar cons.

Opposing

To oppose somebody's self-destructive ways is seen as good. But to oppose is to oppose the person. Opposing is violent in the sense that you want to hurt the person by stopping them doing what they want. It's evil even if it is for their own good in the future. It is like hitting a child so that he learns how to forgive. Opposing is not good - its evil though the results of doing it may be good. Good is not snow white but one of countless shades of grey.

Love person hate the harm they do to themselves contradicts love sinner and hate sin

Love sinner and hate sin is confused with a philosophy of hating the harm a person does to themselves and loving the person. But that philosophy actually contradicts it! To hate sin is about wishing it was possible for the person to be paid back. Love the person but hate the harm they do to themselves is about wishing the harm could be taken away.

Imagine the two rules could agree.

Then which rule is the most important?

God by definition must be put first in all things for he is perfectly good. If God is unimportant to you then it will be, "Love the person but hate the harm they do to themselves."

If God matters to you the important rule will be, "Love the sinner or breaker of God's law. But hate his law-breaking for it offends God." That is what love the sinner and hate the sin means.

If you love people, then cease to regard God as important.

Love the sinner and hate the sin is no true friend to those who wish to stop people being harmed. It's a hindrance with its lies and the confusion it creates.

Love sinner and hate sin is tactical for it is about stopping sinful actions and one way to do that is to make the sinner feel loved so that she or he will desist and repent. Those who love their sin will not want that Christian love! It gets them to put walls up. It is really about people feeling smug that they oppose sin while they in fact empower others to get better at it and more intransigent.

We conclude that instead of asking if the behaviour of some is immoral or moral we should ask how we make/help them see that they don't really want to engage in it. It is actually immoral to do this for morality is about law and a law by definition is to be enforced. Who cares?

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, 1987

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