

JESUS HATES SINNERS HE HAS NOT FORGIVEN

Jesus taught that those who die in sin or without having turned to him for salvation will suffer in Hell forever. He said he hates sin more than anybody else can or does. The Church says that Jesus has dealt with sin in the universe and robbed it of its power. That is a shameless lie for it is obvious that sin has been with us for centuries and shows no signs of being diminished never mind destroyed. Where is Jesus' empty hate for sin now?

Matthew 15, Jesus says, 17 “Don’t you see that whatever enters the mouth goes into the stomach and then out of the body? 18 But the things that come out of a person’s mouth come from the heart, and these defile them. 19 For out of the heart come evil thoughts—murder, adultery, sexual immorality, theft, false testimony, slander. 20 These are what defile a person; but eating with unwashed hands does not defile them.”

This says that actions are not the problem. It is the people being bad as people that is the problem. Love the sinner and hate the sin is being repudiated here.

Love the sinner and hate the sin denies that we sin because we are sinners or have a sinful nature. It is not loving if it denies what we are.

Jesus said that sin is in the heart - its the person that is the problem not the action. He said that nothing that goes into you makes you sinful and only your heart does that. He said that sin defiles the person. There is nothing here about pretending the person is not the same as the sin. Sin is really another word for person who sins. Human nature can love and hate the same person at the same time only because human nature is inconsistent and you can have one feeling opposing another at the same moment. Jesus was certainly making it right to hate the person to some degree at least.

The starting point of Christianity is that we are all to hate sin. We are to hate our own sins and the sins we see others commit. But the problem with hate is, "I want to hurt you because I think you are offending and hurting and threatening me". Hate is to imagine that someone or something is the cause of your pain and sense of danger and one must try to get it forcibly stopped with condemnation and punishment. But you make your hate. It is you torturing yourself over somebody else's actions or perceived actions. If you do that, you blame them for your pain and you only fuel the hate. Imagine then how much Jesus the perfect hater of sin must hate.

Obviously if you are resurrected to sin forever in a place called Hell forever and burn in it without being destroyed and if you want to stay there forever despite the torment then there are several miracles here. God preserves your life after death and raises your body to suffer forever in a fire and enables you to want to stay there in that pit when you wouldn't stay in semi-hell on earth - these are the miracles. Miracles demand extraordinary evidence for they are extraordinary claims. To violate this law in order to believe in Hell shows that believers are eager to believe it. You wouldn't convict a killer on weak evidence and you are asked here to believe in the miracles of Hell for which there is no evidence so that you can believe that those who hate God will go there forever. That shows that the doctrine implicitly commands hatred of sinners and those in Hell. God asks you to believe in Hell so God hates them too.

The Church will say that though there is no evidence for Hell we have evidence that the testimony of Christ to its existence is reliable for Christ did miracles to prove his mission and doctrine. But bearing in mind that we need very strong evidence the stranger or more unlikely a claim is this is unacceptable. If Jesus does ten miracles and you can verify them all but the last then you can't believe in the last one. You must consider him a liar if he asks you to believe in it. If a man commits ten murders and you can only prove he committed nine of them you are not permitted to believe he committed the odd one out.

The Church admits that it cannot conclusively prove every miracle reported of Jesus in the Bible or outside of it when you consider every miracle by itself. To claim a miracle happened is such a serious claim that naturally the evidence has to be very serious as in strong and good and convincing and every individual miracle requires it. You can't say the resurrection of Jesus is provable so the other miracles of Jesus must have happened as well for Jesus rose to prove his teachings and claims and miracles to be real. Every miracle is so serious so it has to be checked out on its own. Christians know that miracles are very serious for they as good as suspend or change natural law and you need near if not actual impossible evidence to believe in them. Imagine the evidence you would need to justify believing in the tooth fairy – a miraculous being. A miracle that doesn't have extraordinary evidence backing it up isn't worth talking about.

So if Hell exists and God wants us to believe in it as the Church and Jesus say then we are to hate the damned.

Jesus said love your neighbour and didn't say love the sinner. To love your enemy is not the same as to love the person as a sinner for the enemy might have the best of intentions and see you as a threat.

In the book, *The Bible Tells Us So*, it is plainly asserted that the Bible never states that God loves the damned. “Although the Bible tells us that those who failed to walk in God’s way because they did not know it will be beaten with fewer stripes than will those who failed to walk in God’s way although they knew it [Luke 12:47, 48], it nowhere intimates that God loves the damned” (page 62). Small wonder when Hell serves no good purpose. Hopefully it should be different with living sinners for they can change unlike the damned but that would require you to hate them as long as they won’t change and hope they will change. But God must have done something to the damned to make them stay in Hell therefore it would be more evil of him to hate the damned and not living sinners. Living sinners have to be hated far more than the damned.

Then the book declares, “Paradoxical as it may be, when the unregenerate blatantly defy the Most High and brazenly give vent to their hatred of him, the regenerate are constrained by their very love for God to exclaim, “Do I not hate them, O God, that hate thee? I hate them with a perfect hatred: I count them mine enemies’ [Ps 139:21, 22]” (page 124). The curses put by Paul on the wicked though he claimed to be writing God’s word and blessed worse implies his God is a God of hate. He never cursed anybody as much as those who disagreed with him. He singled them out for special abuse.

The imprecations of the saints in Heaven upon the incorrigible unsaved (Revelation 6:9, 10) support the notion that God hates those who are in Hell. Their curses were not pronounced so that the unsaved would suffer and repent through it for the unsaved were in a totally godless and immoral world. The spells were woven not because of a desire to help but out of malice.

Remember, if the damned are hated and God approves of this and hates them himself then there is no reason why he cannot torment them vindictively and more than they deserve. Nothing justifies devaluing a person and if it is right to do that then tormenting and abusing them is acceptable. God cannot complain if we wish we could abuse them.

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. 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.

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

Christian experts such as the fathers of the Church asserted God hates sinners. "There is no one God detests and repudiates

more than the person who bears a grudge, whose heart is filled with anger" St John Chrysostom Homily 2, Barielle, 3.

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.

CONCLUSION

Jesus was vindictive if he lived. It is only those who don't know him who think they love him.

BOOKS CONSULTED

Catechism of the Catholic Church, Veritas. Dublin, 1995

Christ and Violence, Ronald J Sider, Herald Press, Scottsdale, Ontario, 1979

Miracles in Dispute, Ernst and Marie-Luise Keller, SCM Press Ltd, London, 1969

Moral Philosophy, Joseph Rickaby SJ, Stoneyhurst Philosophy Series, Longmans, Green and Co, London, 1912

Objections to Christian Belief, DM Mackinnon, HA Williams, AR Vidler and JS Bezzant, Constable, London, 1963

Putting Away Childish Things, Uta Ranke-Heinemann, HarperCollins, San Francisco, 1994

Reason and Belief, Bland Blanshard, George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London, 1974

Robert Schuller, Satellite Saint or High Flying Heretic, Cecil Andrews, Take Heed Publications, Belfast

The Hard Sayings of Jesus, FF Bruce Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1983

The Resurrection Factor, Josh McDowell, Alpha Scripture Press Foundation, Bucks, 1993

The Truth of Christianity, WH Turton, Wells Gardner, Darton & Co Ltd, London, 1905

Why I am Not a Christian, Bertrand Russell, Touchstone Books, Simon and Schuster, New York, undated

The WWW

Kooks and Quacks of the Roman Empire by Richard Carrier

www.infidels.org/library/modern/richard_carrier/kooks.html

THIS SITE ARGUES THAT JESUS WAS EVIL AND WAS NOT A GOOD EXAMPLE www.nobeliefs.com/jesus.htm