

HATE FOR SIN IS PERSONAL

How love sinner hate sin is a ploy to avoid admitting your feelings against sinners are something personal

Religion advocates cold-blooded hatred and dresses it up so that it still manages to come up smelling of roses. I am referring to its doctrine: "Hate the sin but love the sinner". To hate is to oppose the wellbeing of. To oppose the wellbeing of anything is an act of violence. The absurdity of hating a thing and wanting to hurt it, does not mean you cannot be stirring up love of violence in you. It means you are stirring it up because stirring up such emotions is irrational anyway.

Christianity shouts, "Love the sinner and detest the sin!" the loudest. Hate means to dislike intensely and with violence of emotion, not necessarily action. Religion commands hating the sin. If we do this then it is really treating sin like a thing. To hate a thing like sin is irrational. You cannot hate a thing and be rational. When we hate a thing, it is because an irrational emotion has kicked in. The hate is emotional but it is not us being truly ourselves. Proper hate involves and necessitates us being truly ourselves. Religion warns that you can hate the sinner and imagine you hate the sin not the sinner. It admits that anything can be counterfeited and warns us that our hearts can fool us.

To pretend the sin is not part of the sinner actually means you refuse to look at how you can hurt the sinner by hurting and hating it. It contradicts the alleged love you have for the sinner. It puts the sinner at the risk of suffering at your hands. Or perhaps you will give at least passive support by silence if other people hurt her or him. Love the sinner and hate the sin could be the principle that is behind our tendency to be kind to people while at the same time being absolutely delighted should somebody hurt them and inflict misfortune on them. We hate them but are too smug and keen on looking good but not on being good in reality to actually make that hate obvious and put it into violent action.

When somebody hates your sin you can be sure that it is you they really hate. We all know that to hate sin is personal for it feels personal. If you really separate the sin from the sinner you will feel about the sin the same way as you would the book that falls on your head. But you know it feels personal. Christianity calls on you to lie to be a Christian by pretending that it doesn't. You don't forgive the book for falling on you for it is not a person. You don't resent the book. If a person dropped the book on you for spite you would resent the person. You cannot forgive the sinner unless you hate them first at least a little bit. Christianity offers only pretend forgiveness which is why it never lasts and never takes away the resentment which soon explodes in religious bigotry or some other form.

Religion argues, "Cancer isn't bad. It is just something that is living and growing in the wrong place. It's the place that is wrong not the cancer for life and growth are good. Therefore you cannot hate cancer. You hate its consequences but not the cancer. You don't have anything personal against the cancer or its wrongness." The hater of sin does not hate the consequences of the sin only but the sin itself. The consequences are not the sin - and it is a fact that if bad things happen you following your sin it does not follow that your sin is to blame for all of it. The hater of sin hates it as a needless deliberate punishable evil. Her or she hates the person that chose to do the evil for sin is essentially an evil choice. It is personal. If you really loved the sinner you wouldn't be able to have a personal hatred of the sin.

Compassion for the sinner and not the sin makes no sense. It means you have compassion for the sin and hardness of heart and coldness towards the sin as if it were a person. It is not the sin that is getting the hardness and coldness but the person. Compassion for the sinner is extremely patronising and unloving. Compassion is only due to people who experience misfortune that is not their own fault or who seek and need help now even if it was their fault for they cannot change the past. It can only be given to people who are afflicted with evils that they cannot stop. Can you have compassion for an intelligent man who goes to an exam and deliberately messes it up? Compassion for sinners insults them by saying it was not their own fault. If it is not their own fault then they are not sinners and so what is the compassion all about? Who would want compassion from people who act as if they couldn't help sinning? Christianity is pure hypocrisy and is pretending to feel a compassion it does not feel at all.

The advice hate the sin and love the sinner demands that you don't hate the person to any degree at all which is impossible if you hate the sin. So it condemns you as bad. It brings turmoil on you. It is turning anger into yourself. It makes you a time bomb. To hate outright would possibly result in less harm overall.

Nothing can be more ridiculous than saying you trust the sinner but not the sinner's sins. It is the sinner you mistrust not the sins. How can you mistrust sins? They are not people or robots. Mistrust here is a personal feeling and verdict, it can only be personal and involve persons.

To succeed in being angry at the sin and not the sinner would actually show you have damaged yourself psychologically.

That could lead to you becoming a danger to perceived sinners as you are not trying to make yourself worse. To love a sinner by making yourself ill is a strange kind of love. If you would do that to yourself its only a short step towards starting to do it to others.

Hatred is a form of warped love. That is why indifference, not giving a toss about a person if they live or die or are happy or not, is the real opposite of love. The person who hates you hates you because of something you support or are a part of or do. They do not hate you because you are a person. They attack you and are angry at you because of something else. There is no difference between this and loving the sinner and hating the sin.

Nobody feels loved when somebody claims to hate their sin and to love them. If you oppose the sin like you oppose a mistake, the person could feel loved but that is not hating the sin. In hatred for the sin you are asked to hate sin not just oppose it. It feels like personal hatred or hatred for the person.

With the love the sinner and hate sin ideology, it is no wonder some people are conditioned to swallow the lie, "I only hurt you because I was taking my problems out on you. It was not personal! Love me for I don't hate you and consider me separate from what I did to you for it was not about hurting you." People have to suffer and be manipulated because religious believers want to maintain their hypocritical pleasures and holy standing!

The madness of love the sinner and hate the sin shows the power of religious manipulation and conditioning. When the conditioning is that strong and that dangerous, religion should be opposed as full of harmful potential.

Do you love your father when he does acts of great evil? It is possible to feel both love and hate for a person. It is possible to treat them deliberately badly out of love. When people say they love their evil children but hate their sins what they really mean is that they love and hate them at the same time. It is not the sins they hate but them. To hate the sin is always to hate the sinner even if there is a part of you that loves them. The advice hate the sin and love the sinner demands that you don't hate the person to any degree at all. All that does is screw up the relationships. Many of us do great good because we both love and hate our families and friends. The gentle soul is the one that will let a friend throw her life down the drain.

If you dislike a person's sin, they will take it personally. They will be hurt when you hate their sins. Do not bully them into feeling any different by saying, "You cannot have the right to take it so personally, I hate your sin not you." That only makes it worse.

Love is not liking. The difference is this, love is doing whatever is needed for the wellbeing of another. Liking is about feeling good towards another person and you can like a person and not help them.

You cannot like the sinner and dislike their sin then how can you love the sinner and hate the sin? If you dislike the sin and you still like the sinner as much as ever then it follows that you don't dislike the fact that they committed the sin but that the sin had unpleasant results. So it is not the sin at all you dislike. The sin is not an action or the results of sin but something that a person becomes. To dislike or hate the sin is to dislike or hate the sinner.

If you love yourself and hate your sins how can you feel angry or guilty or have any motivation to correct yourself when you are declaring that your sins are separate from you and have nothing to do with you? There are believers who feel free to sin believing Jesus doesn't condemn them but condemns their sins so they don't worry about the sins and leave it to him to do that. They are an example of people who use a scapegoat to dump their sins on.

Suppose you are not supposed to hate sin and sinner alike but you do. That is a sin. If you are to treat others as you would be treated - and Jesus said you are - then you are to go into denial about how you hate the sin and the sinner alike.

The hatred in one who pretends he doesn't hate is far worse than the hatred in one who admits it.

If somebody says they are a fool, you know this is not true. They are not summed up by any mistake they make or any wrong they do. But if you believe in sin that deserves and takes you to the everlasting punishment of Hell, mortal sin, then clearly you are to be summed up by your mortal sin. No wonder the Church says that if you commit a mortal sin of say masturbation and do not repent all the good you do will bring you no merit before God. He will not reward it for he sees it as you trying to be good on your terms not his. Mortal sin and hate go together.

Bizarrely, the world considers it great and noble to say, "He attacked me. But I would rather it was done to me than be the attacker". In other words, immorality is fine as long as it is not me who is doing it. Rather him degrading himself than me! It is another example of the hypocrisy of altruism.

If somebody writes a letter and asks you what you think of it and you say it is a disgrace and rubbish and rude. The person will say you are accusing him or her of being a disgrace and rubbish and rude. After all he or she knows that if you uphold

love the sinner and hate the sin you see her or him as a sinner. The person will feel that your attack is personal. And the person will be angered. The person will not accept your excuse, "But I didn't say it about you but about the letter." The person knows that it is his or her choices in producing the letter that are called disgrace and rubbish and rude so it is him or her who is being attacked. The attack might look indirect but it is actually direct. His or her choices are being attacked. The wording you deployed makes it look indirect but the meaning shows it is direct.

If you maintain you love the sinner all you do is fuel the sinner's rage for he or she feels pressured to pretend that you tell the truth when knowing that you do not. You provoke the person to hate and anger while hiding the provocation. Because it is hidden you are telling him to pretend there is no hatred or anger aroused in him. You rig it to get him to sublimate them or suppress them so that they will eat at him and cause ill health and ignite temper and violence outbursts. Love the sinner and hate the sin is a manifesto of passive aggression. The sinner will be mad at your hypocrisy - and if he is to believe in love the sinner and hate the sin, the sinner has to sublimate and try to repress that hate to the point that he cannot see it is there though it is there. An angry sinner is bad enough without you banning him from admitting his anger is there and is part of him which will only make it worse. Love the sinner and hate the sin only fuels the fire of hate.

What of you then the critic of the letter who hides a direct attack on the writer under the guise of hating the actions or condemning? You are a hypocrite. When you are on the receiving end of what you did to him you will learn a lot. You will make yourself a person riddled with grudges but who pretends that the grudges are against what people have done not what they are. When the writer of the letter accuses you of attacking her or him personally, you will accuse her of him of another sin - of not believing in loving the sinner and hate the sin. For believers, not believing that is the ultimate sin.

Love the person and condemn the action ruins your trust in morality and in others for it is hypocrisy. When your trust is ruined, hate will come to you so easily and naturally.

This tells us that we cannot ever understand how far from God and good evil is. Any view of evil we have will be watered down. It may not feel that way but it is. We cannot care the way God cares. Our caring for another no matter how deep is idolatrous for it is a mere imitation of how God cares. Thus if we hate sins it will never be the same as how God hates it. Our hate for sin masks hate for the sinner. Even if loving sinners and hating sins is achievable for God, we should be sceptical of humans who claim to do it. And especially so if it is achievable for God!

There is no doubt that if we think about what the principle of loving sinners and opposing their sins does that its incoherence becomes plain. We know by instinct that the principle is a lie. Trying to delude ourselves that Christianity with its hatred of sin is true cannot paper over this instinct.

Love the sinner and hate the sin is personal and hates the sinner. Admitting it opens the door to finding a solution for the hate and the misery it causes. Denying it only makes it worse and is an oblique way of increasing the danger to others posed by your hate of them for their sins.

BOOKS CONSULTED

- BEYOND GOOD AND EVIL, Friedrich Nietzsche, Penguin, London, 1990
CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, Veritas, London, 1995
ECUMENICAL JIHAD, Peter Kreeft, Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1996
GOD IS NOT GREAT, THE CASE AGAINST RELIGION, Christopher Hitchens, Atlantic Books, London, 2007
HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS, Peter Kreeft and Ronald Tacelli, Monarch, East Sussex, 1995
HOW DOES GOD LOVE ME? Radio Bible Class, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1986
IN DEFENCE OF THE FAITH, Dave Hunt, Harvest House, Eugene, Oregon, 1996
MADAME GUYON, MARTYR OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, Phyllis Thompson, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1986
MORAL PHILOSOPHY, Joseph Rickaby SJ, Stonyhurst Philosophy Series, Longmans Green and Co, London, 1912
OXFORD DICTIONARY OF PHILOSOPHY, Simon Blackburn, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996
PRACTICAL ETHICS, Peter Singer, Cambridge University Press, England, 1994
PSYCHOLOGY, George A Miller, Penguin, London, 1991
REASON AND BELIEF, Brand Blanshard, George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1974
REASONS FOR HOPE, Ed Jeffrey A Mirus, Christendom College Press, Virginia, 1982
THE ATONEMENT: MYSTERY OF RECONCILIATION, Kevin McNamara, Archbishop of Dublin, Veritas, Dublin, 1987
SINNERS IN THE HANDS OF AN ANGRY GOD, Jonathan Edwards, Sword of the Lord, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, undated
THE BRIEF OF ST ANTHONY OF PADUA (Vol 44, No 4)
THE IMITATION OF CHRIST, Thomas A Kempis, Translated by Ronald Knox and Michael Oakley, Universe, Burns & Oates, London, 1963
THE LIFE OF ALL LIVING, Fulton J Sheen, Image Books, New York, 1979
THE NEW WALK, Captain Reginald Wallis, The Christian Press, Pembridge Villas, England, undated

THE PROBLEM OF PAIN, CS Lewis, Fontana, London, 1972

THE SATANIC BIBLE, Anton Szandor LaVey, Avon Books, New York, 1969

THE STUDENT'S CATHOLIC DOCTRINE, Rev Charles Hart BA, Burns & Oates, London, 1961