

if you love sinners you won't invent sins

If love the sinner and hate the sin is an invention itself it is no wonder if believers invent further sins.

Love the sinner and hate the sin would imply that we treat sin harshly. If you love your son you are harsh about his drinking. If you are not, it is because you think it will make it worse. So you are still harsh but have to keep it under wraps. You manipulate your son.

If you want to be harsh but don't want to be seen as too harsh, the solution is not to condemn sin severely but to invent non-existent sins. Religion is full of those sins.

How can the Church be said to love sinners when it invents more than half the sins? It exaggerates how sinful premarital sex is - assuming it is wrong at all. It says that anybody that can't see that Jesus is the Son of God is too evil to let the Holy Spirit give them some light so that they might believe. Dirty language for example is supposed to be immoral. The Church says people are right to be offended by it. But those who see it just as a bit of harmless fun are the smart ones. It can be harmful like when an unbalanced person uses it to get sexually aroused when there might be a danger of sexual assault. There is no doubt that this would not make the talk wrong but would make you being careless wrong. But insultingly, the Catholic cult often tries to blame the victim for talking dirty.

Christianity is responsible for the universal consensus that the good die young. The Church invents many sins which causes guilt, self-esteem disorders, anxiety and being passive when someone does the dirty on you and finally all this results in bad health and an early death. The Church does not believe in love your neighbour as yourself. What it really believes in is love the rules of Jesus and the Church more than yourself and anybody else. It is a form of humiliating altruism. It has invented the hypocritical rule of love your neighbour as yourself which is never practiced in real life but sinners are condemned for breaking it. If you rob a bank the Church says you don't have to turn yourself in. (When the law commands otherwise the Church never worries yet it pretends to respect the state for the common good.) But how could you love your neighbour as yourself if you do that and then send a burglar who stole your diamond necklace to jail?

Religion is full of rules it cannot prove. Who can prove that it is wrong to miss Mass on Sunday? Who can prove that it is wrong to let a day pass by without praying? Who can prove that artificial birth control is a sin? Who can prove that it is sinful to believe that a freshly fertilised egg is not a human person with as many rights as a grown up human person? Who can prove that it is sinful to disagree with Jesus who said that whoever doesn't believe in him and all he says is condemned by God? The more rules there are, the more the claim to love the sinner can be doubted. Against psychology, Roman Catholicism says that if you commit a mortal sin you are completely opposing God - if that were true such sinners would not be praying for the grace of repentance! And it is said to be immoral to disagree with the Church! It is best to have as few rules as possible and to have only well-authenticated ones. Religion puts more blocks in the way of loving the sinner if there are not enough already.

The Church believes in more sins or wrongs than society does. Society does not for instance consider white lies and contraception to be sinful. The Church does. The Church regards such things as opposition to any public displays of faith, missing Mass and doubting the veracity of the Bible as sinful. Society does not. When an organisation is lying about loving the sinner and hating the sin and then invents more sins than we need to believe in, that organisation is evil. It is a hate group despite all the whitewash it smears over itself. For an unbeliever, to hurt another person is just to do wrong against that person. For a believer, it is also to do wrong against God and God is thought to be even more important than any person so wronging God is the worst part of any sin. Belief in God deepens the evil and hypocrisy of love the sinner and hate the sin. We should get rid of belief in God for we don't need anything to make what is bad worse. God says in the Bible that he is a jealous God and can't tolerate anything that contradicts him being put first. He wants us to be jealous for him.

Religion makes our intentions when we do wrong far worse. If you think you offend and mock God by sin, then when you do wrong you end up intending that.

Remember, the following is hypothetical: If there was any hope of loving the sinner and hating the sin, it would follow that the more certain you are that an act in question is sinful then the more you can love the sinner. That is because the more you doubt or are unsure that the act is sinful, the more you intend an injustice and intend hatred for the person committing the act. Nobody would believe you if you accused somebody of a sin on very little evidence and maintained that you loved that person. So the person who has strong evidence that x is doing wrong loves x more than the person who has less evidence that x is doing wrong. The love would only be complete if there was absolute proof that x was doing wrong.

Religion that hates sin hates the sinner when it invents the sins and when it has people intending to hurt God when they do wrong which makes their evil far more evil.

Christians today often say that we alone exclude ourselves from enjoyment of the presence of God. Those who are in Hell, we are told, are accepted by God but they won't let God in. They are forgiven by God but they won't accept it. This doctrine in fact implies that there is no punishment for sin. There is no judgement. The notion of sinning so as to exclude ourselves from God is rubbish. If there is no punishment or judgement then there is no sin to speak of. All you have is not sin but a refusal to enjoy God. Hell and separation from God are not about morals or God but about you.

It is judgemental to say punishment is wrong for it accuses those who say it is lawful and right of being harmful.

It is judgemental to say that the people in Hell are wholly the cause of their own suffering for it is an attempt to make God look good at the expense of people. It would be better to argue that they are at least partly punished by God in their exclusion from God instead of trying to accuse people to save your image of God. Doctrines of God do not come before people. It is the other way around.

To say you love the sinner and hate the sin for sin is exclusion of the person from happiness with God is therefore incoherent. Sin is not mere exclusion but a break of divine law that needs to be punished. If the person turning away from God is what is the problem, then sin as such is not. So why talk about sinners and sin then?

Why not say, "Love the person who turns away from God but hate their turning away from him?" The reason it is not said is because it is humanistic - it shows concern for the person and not for God.

The real Christian doctrine is "Love the offender against God and hate the offense against God and hate it for God" only serves to put people off religion. The sinner will only rage against the person who wants them to change for God and not themselves or even mainly for God and partly for themselves.

To keep saying we must love sinners and hate sins is really inventing sinners and sins and bringing sin in where it has no need to be. It is malicious and futile.