

JESUS REJECTS LOVE SINNER AND HATE SIN

God is supposed to be the only perfectly and absolutely good being. He supposedly made us and it is our duty to him as our maker to obey him. Disobedience to God is called sin. God will judge sin if he is fair.

Christ said that you must love your neighbour as yourself. This does not actually say we must love ourselves. It only assumes we do love ourselves. It does not indicate approval for loving yourself. Loving yourself is so natural that it cannot be commanded. It is as absurd and impossible as commanding your dog to breathe. Even those who have bad feelings towards themselves love themselves - they just have warped self-love. The commandment implies that the neighbour actually comes first. How? Though we cannot be commanded to love ourselves, part of us would like to be. Also, if my self-love is warped, I am not allowed to inflict warped love on others. In that case, the commandment means, "If your warped love for yourself makes you want to starve yourself, give the food to your neighbour because you want them to benefit from real healthy love."

If we love God with all our being and more than any person or thing or benefit as Jesus commanded so that we would be willing to undergo crippling depression forever for him we must have an extreme dislike of sin and a hatred for it. This is because to love God means to hate sin for it opposes him. The more you love God the more ferociously intolerant of sin you will become.

Religion says there is a difference between the person and what he or she does. The person is bigger than any action of theirs. That is true. If you steal a pen, you cannot be seen simply as the stealer of the pen. You are other things too. You are a good son. You are friendly and cheerful and so on. But this difference has absolutely nothing to do with distinguishing a person from their sin. It is an attempt to obscure the fact that religious people hate sinners. In fact the reason why you can hate somebody is because they have good points. The good points fuel your hate for you see that they could be better people instead of doing wrong that provokes you to hate. Jesus himself made the same point in Matthew 25:14-30 which clearly says that the good points in a sinner are a reason to hate and abuse him not a reason to love him. Jesus said that the kingdom of Heaven is like a man who rewards those to whom he gave his money for safekeeping when they made a profit for him and who called a servant who simply returned the money without trying to turn it to profit for him a good for nothing. The man says that the servant who is profitless whatever good he has will be taken from him and he will be thrown out into the dark where there will be weeping and grinding of teeth in agony. This is a denial that there is any good in the sinner. The good will not be acknowledged unless it bears fruit. As unfair as this seems, it explains why the servant is called wicked and lazy.

Jesus never said that hatred is against the rights of the evil person. He seemed to think that, "Hate is bad for the hater. Free yourself from it by forgiving." In other words, we must not hate just because we can't. If we could we would. An attitude like that easily leads to hate. It is planting the one seed that hate needs to flourish. The Catholic Church is worse than Jesus. You will never find an official citation from it that says hate is a sin for the evil person deserves to be loved. Many will say that they will hate up to a point that suits them.

The Jews, according to the New Testament, were sinners though respectable ones. Despite lying in religious affairs and taking the houses of widows to finance the faith, they were looked up to. Jesus however condemned them for condemning others such as prostitutes and tax collectors. Jesus preferred the sinners who were looked upon as filth. The reason the condemnations by the Jews were considered to be so socially acceptable was because people believed that good people condemn sin in an effort to root it out. The leaders then were claiming to love the sinner and hate the sin.

When Jesus condemned the Jews for condemning sinners though they were no better themselves, he thereby rejected their excuse that they were condemning the sin and not the sinner. He said that you must not see the mote in your brother's eye when you ignore the plank in your own and that the judgment you pass on others will be passed on you so judge fairly (Matthew 7:1-5). He was admitting that you cannot love the sinner and hate the sin. They had to use this excuse because everybody would have hated them and they would have been hated by one another. Jesus was being purely spiteful for his teaching left it wide open for his followers to make the same excuse! How? Because he taught loving the sinner and hating the sin too. If you love the sinner and hate the sin you have to hate the sins of others even if you are a sinner yourself. And Jesus said that all people were sinful. The Christians say they love the sinner but hate the sin and that they condemn the sin not the sinner which if true means they can condemn the actions of a person who is not as bad as they are. And if you can really love the sinner and hate the sin then why not condemn the actions of people who are worse than yours? Why not condemn people's sins because you want them to be better off than you and cleaner in the sight of God? When Jesus commanded the hatred of sin, he went as far as to say you should wish you could lose an eye rather than lustfully look at a woman with it, he was commanding the hatred of sinners and he knew it.

If you can really love the sinner and hate the sin, it makes no sense to forbid ANYBODY from judging their neighbour. To forbid is to acknowledge that the love is counterfeit.

Those who believe in free will believe that it is possible to sin. If you can love the sinner and you must hate the sin then you must consider it a duty to condemn and judge the sins of others even if you are as bad or worse yourself.

How can you hate a sin if you don't judge people guilty of sin? Refusing to judge is the best thing you can do if you want to encourage sin and turns you into a worse hypocrite than the person who condemns people who do wrong though he is not great himself. So believers are having one on us when they say they do not condemn sinners but sins.

If you hate only the sin you find yourself guilty and claim that you cannot judge others as sinners and hate their sins for you don't know what their sins are then then you will naturally hate others for you can't then think much of yourself.

They can do all the condemning they wish if they are attacking sins and not sinners. But how could this console sinners? If a very evil person criticises your sin of adultery you will be offended and outraged. The fact that sin is believed to be worse than being punished for it though the sin is fun and the punishment is not makes us even more resentful of religious morality and godliness. The hypocrisy of making such a fuss about condemning and then no fuss at all about certain sinners going to jail or Hell is no help either.

There is just no point in saying you condemn the sin only when that teaching is so easily abused. Somebody could be condemning you and looking down on you while lying saying they do not condemn you but your sin and there is nothing you can do to know one way or the other. Verbally, condemning the sin cannot be seen to be different from condemning the sinner. Both sinner condemners and sin condemners talk as if they condemn the sinner. You don't go up to a murderer and say: "Oh that sin in you is evil". What you say is, "You are an evil sinful person". You don't separate sin from yourself. You, if you are religious in any shape or form, will call YOURSELF not it or whatever a sinner. A sinner means a bad person. Sin is part of you for a person commits it, you and to hate your sin is to hate yourself. When you call yourself a sinner then to forbid you to say it about anybody else is simply saying that individuals don't matter and are entitled to disrespect themselves for that is not fair!

The fact that the God and Jesus of the Bible want us to say we are sinners and not people with sins proves they knew and taught that loving sinner and hating sin was impossible. The term sinner identifies people not as people but as sinners and so it is derogatory. It is an insult for the same reason as the expression disabled people is, for the expression should be people with disabilities. The Bible God and Jesus most clearly say that the sinful person should be identified in terms of sin when they say sinners belong to the Devil (for example God says it through John at 1 John 3:8) which is dehumanisation. To do good for people with that attitude towards them would be to degrade yourself for you act as if they are there to be dehumanised.

You know that when people criticise that chances are, they are condemning you because we all know that we hate our actions being criticised for they express what we are. You know you are being condemned as a sinner for there would be no sin without your deliberation. If condemning sin and not the doer of the sin were possible, we would like our sins being criticised or at least not mind so the way we react to it accentuates that he who attacks our sins attacks us as well.

Jesus said that no man can serve two masters. He said that he will love one master and hate the other.

He went on to say you cannot serve God and money. So we see that to love money is to hate God.

The Church says he didn't mean hate by the word hate. He only meant prefer less. But surely it would be possible to love God and money equally. Jesus meant hate. He meant hate as in willing evil to happen to another for evil's sake.

The implication is that the atheist or anyone who does not love God then hates him. That person is evil. He implied the same thing about anybody who loves their child or lover or whoever most instead of loving God most.

The psychological lesson from all this is that for Jesus there is only love or hate. No in-between. He has not grasped the fact that there is a third - indifference. Indeed, indifference, not hate, is considered the true opposite of love.

There is another lesson. To love those who hate God is to wish them well so that they can vent more hate on him. Its an act of hate for God. You cannot love God and sinners.

If you cannot love God and money, then you have less hope of being able to love God and those who detest him.

FINALLY:

Jesus is proof that atheism is not only the only true philosophy but the best. Any advantage theism has can still be enjoyed in Atheism. Let us go and proclaim Atheism to every creature because we don't truly come as near to caring about others as we can if we don't. Jesus is only a role-model for hypocrites.

BOOKS CONSULTED

- A CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, CTS, London, 1985
A HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY, VOL 6, PART II, KANT, Frederick Copleston SJ, Doubleday/Image, New York 1964
AQUINAS, FC Copleston, Penguin Books, London, 1991
BEYOND GOOD AND EVIL, Friedrich Nietzsche, Penguin, London, 1990
BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, Association for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, Dublin, 1960
CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, Veritas, London, 1995
CHARITY, MEDITATIONS FOR A MONTH, Richard F Clarke SJ, Catholic Truth Society, London, 1973
CHRISTIANITY FOR THE TOUGH-MINDED, Edited by John Warwick Montgomery, Bethany Fellowship, Minnesota, 1973
CRISIS OF MORAL AUTHORITY, Don Cupitt, SCM Press, London, 1995
EVIDENCE THAT DEMANDS A VERDICT, VOL 1, Josh McDowell, Alpha, Scripture Press Foundation, Bucks, 1995
ECUMENICAL JIHAD, Peter Kreeft, Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1996
GOD IS NOT GREAT, THE CASE AGAINST RELIGION, Christopher Hitchens, Atlantic Books, London, 2007
THE GREAT MEANS OF SALVATION AND OF PERFECTION, St Alphonsus De Ligouri, Redemptorist Fathers, Brooklyn, 1988
HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS, Peter Kreeft and Ronald Tacelli, Monarch, East Sussex, 1995
HONEST TO GOD, John AT Robinson, SCM, London, 1963
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
RADIO REPLIES, 1, Frs Rumble & Carty, Radio Replies Press, St Paul, Minnesota, 1938
RADIO REPLIES, 2, Frs Rumble & Carty, Radio Replies Press, St Paul, Minnesota, 1940
RADIO REPLIES, 3, Frs Rumble & Carty, Radio Replies Press, St Paul, Minnesota, 1942
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 BIBLE TELLS US SO, R B Kuiper, The Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, 1978
THE BRIEF OF ST ANTHONY OF PADUA (Vol 44, No 4)
THE GOOD, THE BAD & THE MORAL DILEMMA, G R Evans, Lion Books, Oxford, 2007
THE GREAT MEANS OF SALVATION AND OF PERFECTION, St Alphonsus De Ligouri, Redemptorist Fathers, Brooklyn, 1988
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, Pembroke Villas, England, undated
THE PRACTICE OF THE PRESENCE OF GOD, Brother Lawrence, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1981
THE PROBLEM OF PAIN, CS Lewis, Fontana, London, 1972
THE PUZZLE OF GOD, Peter Vardy, Collins, London, 1990
THE SATANIC BIBLE, Anton Szandor LaVey, Avon Books, New York, 1969
THE SPIRITUAL GUIDE, Michael Molinos, Christian Books, Gardiner Maine, 1982
THE STUDENT'S CATHOLIC DOCTRINE, Rev Charles Hart BA, Burns & Oates, London, 1961
UNBLIND FAITH, Michael J Langford, SCM, London, 1982