

THE HERESY OF PROPORTIONALISM - CONDEMNED BY THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

"Proportionalism ... that nothing is bad in itself, but only in proportion to others; with proportionalism it was possible to think for some subjects - one could also be paedophilia - that in some proportion they could be a good thing. Now, it must be stated clearly that this was never Catholic doctrine. There are things which are always bad."

Benedict XVI, World Youth Day, Australia

Aristotle and human experience show that if we do "evil" we do it because we see good in it or think it will result in good. Thus it is a contradiction to say that anything can be intended to be completely bad. It is said that it may be completely bad even if not intended to be. But the intention is what it is all about and it must have a good element so how could it be totally bad? An action that would be totally bad without the partly good intention then cannot be totally bad for the intention will be there.

Thomas Aquinas believed that when we sin we are attracted by the good we think we see in the sin and its consequences. This would mean that sin is essentially self-deception.

The rejection of proportionalism by the Church proves that it is lying when it tells us to love the sinner and hate the sin. Hate the sin means you see it as intolerable in itself. Only that which is bad in itself can freely make what is bad in itself. To hate the sin requires that you hate the sinner. If you can separate the two, the requirement makes it wrong to.

Also, the sinner is the sin for the sin shows what kind of person she is. To hate one is to hate the other.

Evil in the eyes of Christianity means that the person misuses themselves through their free will to produce evil. So the person is the only problem accurately speaking and strictly speaking. To separate the sin from the sinner so as to love sinner and hate sin is a worse evil than identifying the two. And identifying the two as one might seem bad but at least if it is the truth then it is best option. At least identifying means recognising the evil while separating it from the sinner refuses to recognise it. If you cannot let yourself see the problem you will come up with wrong and inaccurate solutions and actually end up empowering and worsening the problem. Separating sin and sinner indicates that you do not understand what evil and sin are. The harder you try to separate the two the more you facilitate the evil and promote distortion of the truth. Why should you be believed when you say you love the sinner and hate the sin when that philosophy is based on deceit and refusal to admit the truth? You will be no example for those who need good example.

If a person said they hated my sin and loved me, I might believe them if they praised the part of my evil that I did show good in. For example, they would tell me that it is great that I was so clever when I committed that crime but sad that I abused that cleverness. If they see no good at all in my action they do not see good in me as I am the cause of the action.

If you put down the acts of the Holy Spirit to the Devil, it is an eternal sin according to Jesus. Some theologians say he meant that instead of waiting until death to make the final decision to reject God forever and go to Hell some make their final decision long before death. They say that Hell is our own fault and this is our own choice. These doctrines imply that if you reject God's teaching that homosexual sex is gravely sinful then you commit this sin. The notion of a final choice for evil implies that you can make your will and actions completely bad even if they don't look that bad. How well they look is part of their badness and guile. Jesus said in the Old Testament - if his claim that he was the Word of God from all eternity is true - that gay people who have sex together are an abomination.

Religion is guilty of hate or potential hate by over-judging wrong by calling it 100% intolerable and evil. If that is not true, then the sinner is being slandered and demonised.

Alvin Plantinga wrote, "The premise is that there is real and objectively horrifying evil in the world. Examples would be certain sorts of appalling evil characteristic of Nazi concentration camps: guards found pleasure in devising tortures, making mothers decide which of their children would go to the gas chambers and which would be spared; small children were hanged, dying (because of their light weight) a slow and agonizing death; victims were taunted with the claim that no one would ever know their fate and how they were treated...Naturalism does not have the resources to accommodate or explain this fact [the existence of objective evil] about these states of affairs. From a naturalistic point of view, about all one can say is that we do hate them; but this is far short of seeing them as intrinsically horrifying. How can we understand this intrinsically horrifying character?...A good answer (and one for which it is hard to think of an alternative) is that this evil consists in defying God, the source of all that is good and just, and the first being of the universe. What is horrifying here is not merely going against God's will, but consciously choosing to invert the true scale of values" (The Shorter Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, p. 326).

Plantinga was merely voicing the Christian doctrine that sin is intrinsically horrifying in itself.

Religion says that evil and sin in a sense are not real. Religion says that they are not powers but they are simply goodness that is lacking its full potential. For example, hate is falling short of love. Suffering is falling short of happiness. So hate and suffering are good after all! Religion claims that God cannot make evil if evil is a power for that would make God evil. So it argues that he makes all things good and evil is just good in the wrong place. So it would be the case that hating evil if it is not real but a lack should not be as strong as hating it if it is not a lack but a power in its own right. No revulsion would be too much. Suppose religion is right to see evil not as a reality but as a negation of good. In terms of emotions, emotions are not and cannot be fully sensible in terms of rational, it follows that your feelings will see hate and sin and suffering as real powers. It will react as if they are not just good that falls short but actual evil forces. No matter what religion says in theory or in its theology, it is still guilty of causing people to feel hate. To even risk that would be hideous.

Religion endorses extreme hatred of evil so what is the point then of saying evil is misplaced good? You may as well say it is an evil force and that evil is a reality. Is the teaching that evil is good in the wrong place merely lip-service? It is how they treat evil that counts. And they treat it as if it were a force. It will only lead to people being forced and threatened into obeying religion.

If evil is not a defect or a falling short but a real power and as real as electricity, then nobody can say you must love the sinner and hate the sin. If you believe that water should be destroyed with relish then it follows that you are saying people should be destroyed with relish for they are composed of a high percentage of water. Get the idea?

If you love the sinner and hate the sin you are denying that there is evil power in the sinner. You are denying that evil is a real entity or force. Even believers in the rule say it is rubbish if evil is as real as good and is a power and not to be understood as good in the wrong place. Then the person would be evil. But religion never clarifies this to people. It is only in dusty tomes that nobody reads. Thus religion is forcing people to hate sinners with the sin all the while as it refuses to take any responsibility.

Also, there is the fact that hate really is a power - an emotional power. It is real. Pretending it is just a good emotion that is put in the wrong direction makes no sense. Thus religion is failing to admit that to hate the sin is to hate the sinner. If Hitler was not an evil man but just a saint who fell short of what he could have become, then if you cannot see into somebody's heart, what right have you to assume he fell short? If you don't know how far he fell short in his heart and intentions, then maybe he did his best and didn't wilfully fall short? Who are you to judge?

We conclude that love the sinner and hate the sin is based on the dubious notion that a sin is not an energy or entity like electricity or lead but is a mere misplaced good and that religion does not really believe the notion.

Proportionalism is just a fancy word for hiding what is going on. It is a version of, "The end justifies the means". That concept was condemned by Paul the apostle in the Epistle to the Romans.