

Secularism and incitement to hatred

Christianity defines sin not as an act but as a sign of having a bad character. Then Christianity tells you to love the bad character and hate the sin meaning the bad character. Totally impossible! To hate one is to hate the other for they are one and the same! If that is not double-speak and weasel words what is? The Church advocates hatred in sneaky ways. It wants people to hate but to hide it. That stops people from doing anything about it.

Making a severe and harsh accusation against a person must be seen as incitement to hatred. Whoever, for instance, accuses women who have abortions of being necessarily murderers - in some cases they are - is inciting hatred and the law needs to bring them into line. The priest sits as judge in the confessional. He judges the little boy who masturbated freely, as someone who has rejected God and everybody else for all eternity. If he were God and the boy died he would inflict that on him. That is clear hatred though it may be well covered up by saccharine words.

The state and anti-hate legislation

The state must be clear on what hatred is. Hatred is a strong dislike accompanied to by a wish to see pain befall another. Mild disapproval of other races, the opposite sex, a religion is not hatred. We cannot punish everything so we will have to overlook these. But to say one would refuse a job to someone who falls into a category you don't like, or that they will go to Hell forever, or that they are serious sinners for being what they are, is to be seen as hatred. The state has a responsibility to work against hatred. Doing it by educating is more important than trying to stamp it out by legal penalties.

Religious hate

Check background. Self-identifying members of a particular religion are what you must access. It is true that lots of these may be liars but the secular state has no choice but to take their word for it. Are too many of these people violent or deceptive?

Does the faith endorse violence in its holy books as being the will of God?

Does the religion provide a placebo for the troubled conscience?

Does it slander other religionists? Religionist slandering religionist is one thing but a faith slandering people of other religion is another. Consider the difference between Christians say hating Jews and how the Christian religion as a faith accuses Jews of murdering Jesus and gives no independent evidence for this accusation.

Does it openly advocate that others be hurt for disobeying it or not being part of it?

Does it advocate hate in a crafty way by saying that it is God's will that unbelievers perish or by saying that women who have early abortions are murderers?

Merely advocating for God is effective for instilling hate. You cannot make it obvious that you are trying to get people to hate each other. Everybody hates sometime. What puts hatred for evil and evil people in you? Is it just nature? Or God. Both? Why does it matter? God controlling nature which puts it in you is the same as God putting it in you directly. Hate is seen as a form of devotion to God in this scheme.

The secular state cannot heed "love the sinner or wrongdoer but hate their sin or wrong" because that is a faith proposition. It cannot obligate somebody to heed it. The law accepts that a good person can be defined by one act - eg a charity worker who abuses a child as in a once-off has to be defined by it. Other problems are that there are people who make a consistent habit of unconstrained evildoing. Saying that those two kinds of person are loved rings hollow and is only passive aggression.

The rule is very unconvincing when for example somebody kills another for it is the only way to stop some terrible evil. Does anybody really think that the mother who kills the molester approaching her child kills him lovingly? The rule is virtue signalling and does not stop killing or hurting.

Conclusion

Religion potentially causes great problems for anti-hate legislation and its implementation.