

## **ACCUSING PEOPLE OF MORTAL SIN IS DIRECTING HATE AT "SINNERS" IMMORALITY AND SIN ARE NOT THE SAME**

Some people cause such great suffering that we condemn them for the harm they have done and have little or no concern for their actual intentions. It is possible for a person to intend to do a little evil while causing huge evil. For example, the person who thinks that if gay people are murdered God will let them into Heaven and will send them to Hell forever if they are not is not intending grave evil by doing grave evil. It is what the person does not what they intend that we look at. Therefore the person who says they love the sinner and hate the sin is lying.

Some say that Jesus though he hated sin saw some good in tax collectors and prostitutes. In fact, he only saw in them a power to turn to God. This power does not make them good or mean there is good in them. In fact, they were bad for they were not using it.

Catholic teaching says that Hell is not punishment by God but created by people who refuse to be with God. They die estranged and keep it up forever.

The Church says a saint who sins gravely and then suddenly dies after 100 years of holiness still should go to everlasting punishment in Hell for his sin was so malicious and inexcusable. But in the law of the land and the law of humanity, if somebody does wrong you consider their previous good character and show mercy. The Church is taking a very vicious and inhuman stance. But it is forced to by Jesus' insane doctrine of everlasting Hell.

It is clear that even if cohabiting is a grave sin, that very few if anybody who commits it would be intending to sin gravely. Hardly anybody really intends to reject God forever by their sin. If we did, we would display no good qualities at all if we sin.

Plus if cohabitation is a sin, God holds that it is between you and your partner. God knows to mind his own business.

In short, nobody has the right to judge a cohabiting person as unfit for communion. To say that it is not about punishing them but making it clear that they are out of line with Church teaching is still implying that they are harmful even if unwittingly. It is still judgemental. Are we to think it is better to exclude a person over their views than over their morals? Certainly not!

Belief in good and bad is not the same as belief in holiness and sin. You can intend to do bad without intending to act immorally. Immoral means you are breaking a law and deserving and demanding blame and punishment. Being bad means you simply doing harm but you judge it in practical terms not moral terms. If an atheist does not believe in free will but that we are all programmed by deep inner forces she will see bad not as immoral or forbidden but defective. It is not about morality for she does not care about rewards or punishments or believe in them. A person can only sin - if sin is possible - in so far as they have moral knowledge that the act is wrong. Nobody can have full moral knowledge therefore nobody can sin mortally or intend to sever his relationship with God in full. You cannot blame a person for their sinful actions unless they could have done otherwise and unless they knew the moral qualities of their actions. If we are to love ourselves as sinners and hate our sins we simply cannot impute blame to ourselves but to our sins. Thus we cannot become really immoral. We can never reject God for all eternity.

A person who does good for his sake or that of his beloved family is considered selfish. The person who does good for its own sake instead of limiting it like that is considered unselfish. While it is considered holy to do good for yourself for its own sake it is considered sinful to do good for yourself for your own sake! In reality, both persons are good and it is just that one is less good than the other. It is not right to demonise anybody as non-good or evil or sinful.

In the name of tolerance, the Church needs to start saying that mortal sinners are virtually non-existent. The teaching of love the sinner and hate the sin needs to be changed to love the sinner and work against the sin in love. Hate is too strong for something that is not that intentionally bad. No personal sin can be meant to be bad enough to deserve hate. If the sinner unwittingly hurts himself by sin then it is pity he needs. Hating a sinner means that you judge them harshly - you can't claim to love the sinner then.

If we should hate the sin it follows that we must hate the sinner because sin does not change you as a person ever. What it does is reveal who and what you really are. To hate the sin is to hate the sinner.

Hating immorality is not the same as hating sinfulness. Hating immorality is hating a person for breaking a moral code. Hating sinfulness is the same except it is thought that the moral code comes from God. As God by definition deserves more

respect than man and man's morals sinfulness is worse than immorality. Any belief that causes you to oppose evil far more than you need to is making you hate. If you can hate the immorality but love the immoral that does not mean you can hate the sin and love the sinner. Quite the contrary!

If the Church ever teaches that mortal sin is hard or near impossible, it follows that it gives up any right to ban remarried divorcees or pro-abortionists or heretics or schismatics or Protestants or anybody at all who is baptised from communion. The day it signs that doctrine into part of the Catholic faith is the day it signs the death-warrant of the Church. Fraudulent visionaries will become more numerous than they are now for the fear that its a mortal sin to pretend to be having visions will vanish.

The state may decree conscience clauses. An example is how a Christian school may teach that it is a sin to be gay and be legally exempted from having to employ an exceptionally and remarkably good teacher and allowed to discriminate to choose a straight teacher. Another example is how a Muslim cannot be forced to deal with pork when working as a retail assistant. The clauses will only be created if it is established that the person or entity feels an action required by law is not just wrong but very very wrong. It is intolerable. However, if religion starts to say that there is no such thing as a really bad sin then it loses any right to demand a conscience clause from the state. It loses any right to encourage or permit or accept its members picketing and shouting outside abortion clinics and harassing people going in. Paradoxically, there is more tolerance in NOT granting the clauses if people take their moral dictates less seriously!

If the Church teaches that abortion and murder etc are venial sins - sins that are serious but not bad enough to drive God out of your heart - that is enough supposing the doctrine of sin really has any intrinsic value for us. I mean we should avoid sin if it is bad just because it is bad and not because of how serious or not serious it is. What is the use of condemning them as mortal? The Church may say, "But we have to for that is what they are! We cannot dilute the truth!" The Church means they are so serious that if the person commits them with full freedom and knowledge of their seriousness then they are subjectively and objectively mortal sins. If the person does not do them with full freedom then they are objectively mortal sins but they are not personally mortal sins. It is a person doing grave wrong without intending to. Strange that they don't teach that you can (and they deny that you can) get a reward from God by committing the sin of abortion for the right reasons without knowing it is a sin! They hate the sin with the sinner and won't admit it. Condemning sin more than you need to instead of kindly assuming that nobody intends to be very bad when they do wrong is hate of the sinner. The attraction this attitude holds for the religious people is that they can feel superior to those who seem to sin seriously.

It is interesting though how if a priest challenges the doctrines forbidding abortion and same sex marriage and papal authority he will be silenced or even dismissed. It seems unfair while the teaching on mortal sin is questioned by priests without any repercussions.