

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT BELIEF IS VINDICTIVE

Christian doctrine is that if you die without letting God cleanse your sins you will enter everlasting punishment. The doctrine comes from some Bible texts and some statements by Jesus. It comes from other doctrines by implication. Jesus knew that nobody could obey the command to love God with all ones heart and soul and self and mind which implies we are already condemned to sin forever unless we let God do a miracle on us to enable us to love properly.

Believing a doctrine can be objectively vindictive or subjectively vindictive or both. Eternal justice or eternal punishment or whatever you will call it is top of the list as an example of such a doctrine.

God supposedly ratifies the eternal damnation chosen by the sinner. Its a kind of, "O have it your own way!" kind of thing. If somebody chooses something they choose it. There is nothing anybody can do about it. Letting somebody choose is not ratifying - there is nothing you can do but let them. Letting them choose is strictly speaking impossible for they will choose what they choose. Letting them is not an act because you can't make anybody choose something or not choose it. It is nonsense to speak of ratifying somebody's choice unless you have the power to stop them changing their minds but decline to use it. The Bible speaks of everlasting punishment by God meaning he must ratify this punishment. If the damned torment themselves then this is not punishment. The jailbird cannot call jail punishment when the jail door is left open for him and he won't use it. Eternal punishment is not punishment by God even if it is punishment. The doctrine of Hell implies that God is right to set it up so that a sinner will be attracted to sin forever and punished forever. Its vindictive.

If I decide you committed a crime just because I felt you were guilty then I am vindictive. If I decided it because of the evidence then it is completely different. And so it is with the idea of Hell. Christianity actually wants to believe in Hell. The Christians don't look for evidence that people can be stubborn enough to go to Hell for all eternity. No. They decide people can be bad enough just because Jesus Christ or somebody said so. If they started with evidence from human nature their adopting the belief might not be motivated by vindictiveness. Indeed evidence itself wouldn't justify belief that human nature could go to Hell and stay there. Proof would be needed. The less evidence the more vindictiveness lurks there. It may be stronger subliminally than consciously. But it is no less real.

No genuinely good person would say that we must be capable of hating everybody for all eternity just because we can't call Jesus and the Church liars. Yet the Catholics emphasise and parrot this very idea. If the pope said that paedophiles want to become demons at death to possess children what would we think of somebody who argued that we must accept this for we must not call the pope mistaken or a liar? It shows plenty of concern for defending the doctrine-maker but none for the slandering of the human person. It is no excuse to say that no specific person is being accused. To say somebody in a group is a liar and bad is to put suspicion on all members of the group. There is nothing to be praised in being unspecific. To say any person could choose to be evil for all eternity insults us all for you could be speaking about anybody.

Catholics are not only to hold that the teachings of their faith are true or real. They are to treat and perceive these beliefs as realities. In other words, if you are a Catholic and you believe in everlasting torment in Hell you are TRYING to make it a reality for those who you believe should go there. You might not know who these are but that is not the point. You are still vindictive in principle. Whoever believes in Hell is not a good person no matter how much charm or alms they have to give.

Catholics do not believe in a God who will punish them. They don't like that concept. They don't mind the thought of a God who will punish other people as much. If we are all sinners as they say, and if we sin many times every day as the Bible teaches, then clearly we should see the doctrines of a punishing God and everlasting punishment as mainly motivated by a vindictive desire to see people suffer. Jeremiah spoke of Jewish righteousness as being filthy rags. Jesus said that a sincere Pharisee who did good works and thanked God for helping him to do them was still rejected and his good works did nothing for him. Those teachers are saying that even in the midst of doing good works we might still be actually evil.

If you believe in a being as impossible to love as the Devil, you will believe that sinners are opening their hearts and indeed have opened them to his influence and are hence co-conspirators with him. How could you love sinners if you believe in the Devil and that they are part of something even worse than the sins they commit?

The doctrine of Hell does no good. It does not deter many from sin. Teenagers and young people do not feel they can die so it will hold no fear for them. Also you can repent on your deathbed anyway. To accept such a horrible but useless doctrine is to indulge in nasty wishful thinking. When a harmful doctrine does no good it is held for vindictive reasons.

Christians often teach, "Damned people feel they are right and that is why they stay in Hell. The unforgivable sin

mentioned by Jesus is actually people believing they know better than God. The damned in Hell sincerely believe that God is wrong. They are so sure of it that they refuse to turn to him despite their suffering." That would unsettle anybody. You can think you are good and be sure you are sincere and still be committing this sin.

If you can justify God sending people to Hell to sin and suffer for all eternity you can justify anything. This point alone shows that spite is a motivation for the doctrine. If that is not spite then nothing is.

If you are able to believe that the demons and lost people in Hell want us to be tempted to sin and indeed try to tempt us so that we may be damned with them then does that not indicate that you would have liked or like people to go to Hell yourself? If you are able to believe that people can be bad enough to endure the agony of everlasting despair in Hell over petty spite then does that not draw suspicion on you?

Trendy liberal Christians tend to lie that Hell is not a torture chamber. But that is not the point. All agree that being cut off from God forever is the worst thing about Hell and that any physical pain would be nothing compared to that. The liberals cool the fires of Hell or say they are a symbol. They comfort people with that. That is manipulation for they still think the fires represent something far worse than the torment of fire.

There is no need for God to judge us. He is almighty and ultimately in control of all things. A God of judgment is a God of hate.

If virtue it's own reward then vice is its own punishment. So there is no need for God. His Hell is vindictive.

All Christians believe that you can get a free pass into Heaven. You can live a life of sin and still go there if you repent and receive Jesus' forgiveness at the end. The repentance might be weak enough but Jesus takes it as enough and wipes your sins away.

This proves that the doctrine of Hell is not about helping to make the world a better place at all. There can only be one conclusion. The doctrine is vindictive.

Few Catholics can give reasons to justify belief in Hell and that it is an ethical idea. Most Catholics just accept it out of habit or because they are expected to. This certainly shows they care more about what they want to believe than what they should believe. They say they believe when they really mean that they feel there is a Hell. To base such a gruesome doctrine on feeling is vindictive.

If we are sinners and need religion and the state to curb our behaviour and thinking, then Hell not worth the risk of making some vindictive. We all know believers who relish the doctrine and hope their enemies will burn in Hell. Even if there is a Hell, the fact remains that the doctrine has spawned more spiritual poison than any other. The hatred of Christian fundamentalists towards members of non-Christian religions and towards atheists is well documented in America. They will be told outright that they are going to Hell.

If I were an evil person but didn't have the guts to hurt people, I would have to comfort myself with the thought that there is a Hell for them to suffer in forever. The smile which they think is a mark of friendship is really a smirk as I revel in the thought of them being damned. The doctrine is just what an evil person would invent.

Some say that you can hate the sinner by loving them to sin and loving their sin for their sin degrades them and will eventually, if unrepented, destroy them in Hell. They are perfectly right if there is a Hell.

Sometimes the Christian likes to be smug and think he is too great to go to Hell and that it only happens to other people especially people like Trampy Tina the local whore down the road. That is horrible.

Everlasting punishment is such a terrible and dangerous doctrine that we are entitled to assume that Christians believe it out of a desire to hurt themselves, or more likely, to see others hurt. If we are entitled to assume anything at all, we would certainly be entitled to assume that.

Would it be good to know if a person goes to Hell? Perhaps you need to know of a few. God could reveal this carefully and choose carefully so as to make examples of them. If their suffering is good for nothing that is because God won't use it to teach others. Only an evil God would fail to show us examples of what happens when he is finally rejected. Teaching only goes so far and this is better. Go to Spain to learn about Spain properly. It is not the same as reading books on Spain.

Some say, "Maybe It would be because God wants us to know some people go to Hell but not at the expense of showing us examples for the thought that it could be our relations or us that could go there might and should destroy us." If it is a warning then that is all the better. If he is going to help us stay out of Hell then so what?

If we really care about our loved ones and believe in Hell, the thought that they could go there should give us nightmares

regardless of whether some people are clearly in Hell or not.

When it is right that there should be a Hell if there is a God then that is only logical that we need the warning driven home by having examples of people. Religion says, "He does not tell us not because it is bad to know. It cannot be bad not to know of some good examples of people who ended up in Hell. And sometimes it is good to know things that are terrible to know. If he does not tell us then he has reasons which must be very good ones." But you cannot just speculate that he is doing right or that he really is doing that. It is too serious for that. For certain matters of grave seriousness you need clear evidence and not speculation. But they have none and act irresponsibly. The doctrine of Hell then is vicious and evil and vindictive.

Roman Catholicism is steeped in hypocrisy which is why its use of the eternal Hell dogma is a major crime against humanity. It is worse than a brutal murderer approving and sanctioning the execution of a man who committed murder in a crime of passion. The hypocrisy is evident and shocking.

To say that God sends people to Hell or they put themselves there does not necessarily mean you are or can be ethical in doing so. It is possible that even if it is true, that we cannot say it is not because it is true but because part of us wants it to be true. If we are brainwashed to believe in Hell, that does not rule out the possibility that we let ourselves be brainwashed and in some way want to be. The doctrine is not necessarily coming from good motives. No all good God could ask dodgy vindictive human nature to preach Hell for him! It is a boast when you say he has asked you!

We need to pay back evil for evil to show that the law is serious when it forbids crime because lawlessness brings pain and suffering. But God has no need to punish in Hell or to let the dying suffer for their sins. The Church will say that he needs to prove he means it when he condemns crime. But he can mean it and not punish. Their view that a law that doesn't punish those who break it is no law at all is false. A law that cannot be carried out is still a law. Murder is still illegal in a country that is too chaotic to deal with murderers. A punitive law should only be carried out only when it is right to execute this punitive law and when it is not done that the law is not a real law for a law with genuine authority for true law reflects and implements justice. It does less harm to let sinners curse God forever and to lock them away in some paradise than to punish them for it. The Catholic God is spiteful and cold. To love him is to become evil.

The Church opposes good and puts a clever counterfeit in its place. It says that God is boss and there is no precept over him that he must obey. So good then is not what is objectively good but only what God commands. If God commanded child rape it would be good. The Church claims to oppose the idea that God invents morality but this is not true. If it were true then good would have to be something that God is subject to. He would have to do the good thing for it is the law and he didn't make the law. The Church then adds lying to its wickedness. These problems show the true motivation for proposing and promoting the doctrine of Hell. Even if a Catholic never mentions Hell but adores a God who preaches Hell they are still being bad. They are still being okay with evil.

The Church says you can be forgiven by God through the priest for a sin that you are repenting partly because there is something in it for yourself. If this something is the fear of punishment then though it is not the sin you hate in so far as you do this but the punishment the Church forgives you and says God forgives you. This is blasphemy. The Church at the Council of Trent used its infallibility to come up with the incredible doctrine that God can forgive you through a priest's power even when your only reason for turning away from sin is purely to avoid punishment from God! That is not repentance of sin but fear of the punishment. Sin can only be pardoned when you want rid of it purely because it is evil and offends God and not because there is anything in repenting for yourself. A religion with such a horrific doctrine has no right to say anybody should go to Hell for sinning. It is evil how some are spared from Hell just for going to the priest for forgiveness and they are not truly sorry while others who may be better people than they are despite their hell deserving "sins" go to Hell.

