

## Love sinner and hate the sin in the light of how moral flaws allegedly put you on a slippery slope to big "sins"

The Christian teaching that we must judge sins and not sinners needs translation. The translation is, "Sins are perfectly bad and sinners are perfectly good." Merely to state such a doctrine is to prove it is hypocritical nonsense.

The Church always says that if you start by stealing a marble or two you will end up robbing banks down the line. The slippery slope then is a large part of every evaluation the Church makes concerning whether something is immoral or moral. The public fear the slippery slope too though they make mistakes about when they are actually on it. But in principle they regard it as being decisive when considering if something is right or wrong. The public gives religion great esteem for sharing its concern with it.

It is incredible how much moral thinking is based around fear of the slippery slope. Catholics for example argue that to allow the right to death for a very few cases opens up the door to it being liberalised and soon doctors will be fabricating medical reports to kill people who are not terminally ill. They point to how abortions for no reason at all take place under laws that decree that abortion is only permitted to save the mother's life. If something led you down the slippery slope in the past that does not mean it is probable that it will in the future.

Slippery slope arguments are great when religion uses them to get the people to vote in a way considered acceptable to the religion. They point to how a vote to introduce limited abortion will be abused and soon abortion will be granted for any excuse or reason whatsoever. The problem is that the changes are not just down to the vote. If politicians and medical professionals were honest they would keep in place what the people voted for. The slippery slope that led to abortion on demand was not the vote but corruption. Condemnation of sin is seen as a preventative measure. If condemnation is too soft or does not happen then a bad slippery slope is expected.

Slippery slope arguments can be used selectively. To say you bring legal consequences on yourself if you commit a crime is not true. What happens is the crime happens and people set up slippery-slopes around it and what you suffer is the consequences of their actions mainly. Some of the things they will do will not be because you broke the law but because they use your case as an excuse and permission to do what they want. For example, is it really your fault if you get a whopping six months for stealing a bar of chocolate? When people celebrate legal justice what they are celebrating is not justice so all we can call it is revenge. It is hardly justice if a man is put in a cell with somebody who will probably cut his throat. You cannot know the circumstances but you can know

The slippery slope contradicts innocent until proven guilty. If you have to prove that A has done something terrible before you can accuse her, why is it okay to treat her as paving the way for grave harm if she liberalises abortion? Most of the harm has not happened yet. And until it happens there can be no proof that she has created a slippery slope. Also, to accuse her of opening a Pandora's box is to accuse her of being very bad indeed even if she is not deliberately bad. If you do something that has bad results you are blamed for them though you may not have foreseen them. A huge pile of evil accusations is dumped at your doorstep.

After all that it is astonishing that religion can still insist it does not judge people unfairly! It is lying about not judging people.

The slippery slope thing poses big ethical dilemmas and problems. If it is complicated, that is because life is complicated. Atheists and believers both have to face the problems and their consequences. It is foolish to think that religion is going to help any better than anything else. It is not simple.

The danger with religion is that it seeks to deal with the agonising uncertainty by saying God knows what is best and we must obey him even if we suspect he is wrong. This only produces more uniformity in how people think but agreement is not a good thing if those in agreement are misled. It is selfish to say, "God forbade this or that" just to relieve your fear of making the wrong decision.