

"JUDGE SIN NOT SINNER" IS HYPOCRISY

Judging a person as a sinner may be disguised as merely condemning the action not the person. But if hypothetically you had a choice - to make x who does wrong never have existed and make y who is a better person exist you would un-create x completely. You deny x the right to exist.

Judging the sin is a way of saying judging the sinner

Teachers judge children when they punish them. So do parents. The law of the land punishes. And all of these may claim to love the sinner and hate the sin. They seem to think that loving the sinner means hating the sin in the sense of justly punishing it.

If you refuse to see the person as evil then why care if they are virtuous or not? It doesn't matter then about encouraging people to be honest or humble etc. Those who claim to judge sin not the sinner constantly prove that they do in fact see sin as describing a person not merely actions, they see the sin cannot be separate from the sinner because it is a symptom of being a sinner. The only problem with the actions is what they say about the person.

To call a person evil is hate speech. If you are to hate and eradicate evil then it follows that if evil people exist then they should be destroyed and regretfully tolerated if they cannot be eliminated. But none of that proves that judging the sin not the sinner is the answer. It only proves that some people try that route to get around the problem. They are doing it in fear and desperation. The danger of classing people as evil does not prove that evil people are a fiction. Judge sin and not sinners is in fact based on fear of the truth and the consequences and its supporters are intolerant and suspicious of those who know the truth. The person who judges a few people, eg Stalin, Moses, King Herod and God as evil is demonised by the hypocrites all in the name of loving sinners and hating sins. Whose side are they on?

Impersonal judging would be worse than judging people

Judging the sins is impersonal. If you do that and punish people while keeping the focus on punishing sins not them then you will be danger of hurting them more than they deserve. You treat both their sins and themselves as objects. This is far worse than judging people. Judging sins has consequences for people for sin is based on the notions of law and punishment. Law and punishment are about afflicting law-breaking people. Its the people they target.

People know that if you hate their sin you personify it and treat it like a person whom you want to see suffering punishment and retribution. You end up as hateful and twisted as you would if you had the honesty to hate them and hate them directly.

We tend to be grateful to things when they benefit us. We feel a sense of gratitude towards the car that gets us to hospital. We kick and curse the car and swear at it when it breaks down. We treat events and things as if they consciously bless us and curse us. If you really hate a sin, you are personifying it and you are as good as hating a person. That hate will be just as poisonous as hating a person and make you bitter and dangerous.

What is happening is the hate of sin is disguised as love for the person and the sin is effectively treated like it was a person. So in reality when somebody sins and their sin is hated the believer in religion ends up seeing two people - the sin and the sinner and hating both personally.

In the following ways, it is worse to hate a thing (sin) than a person because

*Hate by definition and by how we experience it is a person to person thing. You are lying to yourself if you say you hate sin and love all the sinners who commit them

* Some people say that the reason you hate others is because you view them NOT as people but as things - you dehumanise them in your head.

*Hating a sin understood as an force not as a person is good practice for hating people.

*If you hate a thing intensely you will soon start hating people for hating somebody's bad habit soon leads to hating the person. We are programmed to hate and fear people rather than sins.

*It is irrational to try and hate a thing such as sin. It is self-hate because hate is not good for you poisons you and hate can only be sustained by creating new hates. Self-hate is an ingredient that you need in the recipe for hating others.

* If you need to hate a person, then turning a sin into a person into your head is trying to satisfy that need. What if it does not work? Inventing persons to direct hate at is the sign of a twisted lunatic and a totally vindictive person.

Why judge sin not sinner?

Some say you cannot hate the sinner with the sin for you are a sinner yourself. But you can hate yourself as well. If you can hate sinners as the hate sin doctrine suggests then why not love yourself despite your sins and hate everybody else for their sins? You cannot love the sins of others just because you are a sinner yourself. The Christian "gospel" makes that clear.

Some say it is terrible to judge others - it is really the only they we believe in. If judging others is so terrible, then it follows that if there is a choice between judging yourself or others then judge yourself. Degrade yourself to spare others. Better to sacrifice one for many. Better to judge yourself for at least you are you and can judge you better than anybody else. The ban on judging thrives on self-hatred and self-hatred is no basis for love.

Some say you cannot hate the sinner with the sin because you cannot judge for you don't know to determine what extent a person's guilt is. You don't know how guilty the person is or what pressure they are under when they sin. Nobody tells everybody everything about themselves. But is it really any comfort if I am a sinner and I know that people hate my sin and therefore me though they cannot be sure I sinned in a specific act or to what degree I sinned if I did? They hold that I might be a terrible sinner so any love I get from them is limited or reserved. It is given to me not because I deserve it but because they are not sure what to make of me. How can that satisfy me and make me happy in life? A sin is to be hated for it's a sin. The degree of sin has nothing to do with it.

Blackmailing those who see through it

The Christians say they don't judge people but sins. Yet they say that if you sin seriously then you are identifying yourself with your sin and making a complete choice for evil and against God. Some of them say that everybody in Hell is there because they believe the sinner cannot be separated from the sin and that sin reveals the sinner so to hate sin is to hate the sinner. This doctrine is an attempt to blackmail and scare people into accepting the lie that you and God really can love the sinner and hate the sin and love yourself and hate your sin. If the lie is seen for what it is, religion loses its purpose for existing and its virtue is really a passive-aggressive hatred for sinners. Judge sinners not sins is an attempt to manipulate. It is not about real love for you. You cannot even love the saint if you have the following outlook, "If you sin I will pretend to judge your sins and not you. I will use you to feed my hypocritical ego."

Judge sin and not sinner a form of moral relativism

The absurdity of the doctrine of loving sinners and judging/hating sins has driven its victims who swallowed it into moral relativism - the notion that good and evil or right and wrong do not exist but are mere social opinions and preferences. It is in fact a form of moral relativism itself though it is in denial about this. You cannot protest about moral relativism when you in fact encourage it and set the stage for it. Moral relativism is far from adorable but sadly it is what the Church and society have got. One religion creates moral codes while another sets up a contradictory one. This fuels relativism.

It backfires!

If you judge a person as seriously ill or possibly seriously ill, nobody cares for it may save a life. It is thought that upsetting the person is better than the alternative. If the local priest thinks you are committing hell-deserving sin and is wrong many would say you should not care because better that than him saying nothing and maybe you going to Hell. Misjudging you is worth it if it warns you about Hell.

Suppose you are not to judge the sinner and are to judge the sin instead. What if you say you do this and cause great distress to sinners and treat them as if you hate them? The rule applies to you as well so people should take the most charitable view of you. They should say that you judge sins and not sinners but go the wrong way about carrying this out.

If people persecute you because of your race or religion or whatever you would say, "They do not judge us but what they think our sins are. This is the safest way to interpret their behaviour for we have no right to accuse them of hating us. They are trying to judge and hate sin (or perceived sin) but not sinners and may be bad at expressing that or implementing it. But it is their intention that counts. Loving the sinner and hating the sin can be confusing for anybody so that is all they are trying to do."

If for example nobody argues that whoever judges you because of your skin colour does not judge you as a person then why is anybody falling for the love the sinner and judge the sin instead rubbish? There is something more "judgy" about struggling against somebody for what they do to hurt you than against them for their skin. So to assert its judgemental to judge over skin colour is to admit it is far more judgemental to judge over a personal affront.

The hypocritical notion that you judge actions never people is harmful. You are left unable to judge anybody as a hater of another. This would be a hellish and dangerous view to take. It is the sea in which racists and other bigots swim for their bigotry is treated as nothing.

Also, the rule makes the attitude of personal hate the the worst sin. So it is not the murder that is the moral problem but the hate it was done with. If we are to love sinners and hate sins that is a very basic rule. So the person who challenges it is worse than any murderer and more evil.

If you believe that all sin as an attitude is equally vile and unjust (it is possible for sinners to mean the same malice by sinning while the sins themselves may differ in the harm done to others) then there is no use in accepting "INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY." That principle endorses judgement of the person and fairness.

Finally

Judge sin is a different way of saying judge the sinner. Apart from that, there is no difference. Only extreme pride (humility can be a mask for pride and a form of pride - eg look how many humble people like an audience and even want to believe that God sees their "secret" acts of humility) can enable a person to fool themselves that they judge sins but are too good and fantastic to judge the sinners who commit the sins. To state that you can do the unnatural and love sinners and not let their sins affect this love is manifest pride. It is a boast dressed up as a statement.

If you hurt sinners to punish sin and not them, then you are cruel and evil. Your intention is bad. You may as well hurt the innocent for you are hurting those who you tell yourself are innocent!

When you do wrong you are a wrongdoer if there is no God. You are a sinner as well if there is so it is worse if there is a God. People who believe, "Judge the wrong but not the wrongdoer" have more right to judge the person than anybody who inserts an accusation of sin into it as well making it, "Judge the sin and not the sinner." It is less vicious.

To judge a person is to accuse them of intentionally becoming not doing evil. It is the becoming that is the problem. It is about hurting the person and causing and risking damaging them further than they have or may have damaged themselves.

If X or Y has to die, and you have to choose, you will choose the person who you know will unintentionally do some evil such as having sex outside of marriage. You are even worse if X or Y has done the evil purposely. People who are told to judge the sins and not the sinners see themselves as being harmless to the sinner. They are not. Hypothetically and in principle, they would harm the person if they had to.

Bad means that which should be willed out of existence. If it were possible to make evil vanish by the power of your will you would have to do it. Religion says you should feel you want it to cease to exist. Thus calling somebody bad is hate speech. It is saying the person should cease to exist if he or she is bad. If something deserves it, then you should feel with all your power that it should be destroyed. Your feeling of hate reinforces your attitude of hate or the way you look at the thing as hateful. It makes no sense to view a thing as bad and want it destroyed. It only makes sense to see a PERSON as bad and want her or him destroyed.

Some say it should be love the sinner and help them resist their sin. Helping a person stop doing something bad is judging them.

To judge a sin while denying the sinner has anything to do with it is not about changing or improving the sinner at all. It is wanton hate through which you try to keep smelling of flowers. It is not about endorsing what is for the best. How could a person who takes such an attitude be trusted when they claim to love sinners and hate sins?

Hypocrisy often describes a person with double standards. A better way to understand it is referring to how people pretend to follow a standard they don't follow. We all pretend to follow a standard we do not follow. For example, to love a good person is to hate a bad one because to love x means to hate what is not x or that would destroy or corrupt it. Love and hate go together for to hate one is to love that one's opposite. To say you hate judging people is to lie for you are admitting to hating people who judge righteously.

Seneca stated that if you judge one man as evil you must also judge human nature in general as being no better and hiding its bad side. Imagine what he would say about those who dish out judgments that are like a manure heap covered by snow and thus who are the best friends that judgementalism ever had? An honest bigot is better than a sneaky advert for bigotry.

THE WEB

www.shilohcommunitychurch.org/love_sinr.htm

TRUE OR FALSE? GOD LOVES THE SINNER BUT HATES THE SIN, FALSE, Errol Hale

www.ffrf.org/fitoday/back/hatred.html

With Perfect Hatred by Dan Barker

<http://www.godhatesfags.com/>

A Baptist anti-gay site