

To Wish Harm on the Sin is to Wish Harm on the Sinner

As Christianity is about opposing sin it claims that sin is everybody's business. It says you don't have to pry into the sins of others but you know they do sin and you try to help them deal with that. This gives rise to love the sinner and hate the sin.

Hate implies wishing more than something didn't happen or exist but expresses the wish to hurt it as well. It's a violent emotion and you can't want to hurt the sin without wanting to hurt the sinner for to hurt the sin you have to hurt the sinner.

You hurt or offend against the sinner by hating them. It would be foolish to want to hurt sin if you separate it from the sinner and it wouldn't be possible. When you hurt things it is your way of taking it out on a person. For example, the fiancée who flushes the engagement ring down the toilet does it not to spite the ring but to spite her fiancé.

If you hate the sin you must hate the sinner for the sinner freely commits the sin. Sin is a quality a person has and you are your qualities. For one to hate your sin and wish evil on it is to wish evil on you and hate you. If a person hated your kindness, you would know that is only another way of saying they hate you. So why pretend they don't hate you if they hate your sin?

If the sin is hateful the sinner is as well for the sinner freely causes the sin. There would be no sin without the sinner and how could you love the sinner if you pretend that they had nothing to do with their sin? It is hypocritical to separate the person from the sin as if the person was not to blame for the sin. That is not love at all for it is blessing their sins by developing the attitude that their sin is not part of them. To love the sinner and not the sin is to pretend that the sinner has had nothing to do with the sin which is hardly loving or sincere for the sinner needs to be freed from the sin for sin must be bad for her or him when you have to hate it.

The reason you can love the sick person but hate the disease is because that person is not causing the disease so those who say we must love the sinner and hate the disease of sin because we can love the patient and hate the illness have to be deliberately trying to mislead. They insult people who battle disease too.

To hate the sin and to love the sinner makes out that there is a distinction without a difference. It is like saying, "I hate you but I love your religion." "I oppose everything about you and everything that you do but I don't oppose you." "I am glad you are alive but I am opposed to the fact that you are breathing."

If you told a black person you loved them but you hated their skin colour it would be rightly disbelieved that you really love them. A sin or evil character is more personal than skin colour so you hate the sinner if you say you hate the sin. Notice how it condones racism by implication?

If you say John's essay is stupid that is the same as calling John stupid though many pretend it is not. If to call John clever is to say John is clever that means to call John stupid is to say John is stupid. Religion pretends that it doesn't think John is stupid. This shows it is wilful dishonesty and false charm. It makes altruism impossible for it is meant to be free from lies but this bases it on lies.

Belief in love the sinner and hate the sin (we call it belief for the sake of argument - but can a person truly believe it? NO!) does not stop the person feeling outraged and hated and degraded if somebody admonishes their sin. Those who believe, "Love the sinner and hate the sin means you do not condemn the sinner as bad and worthy of hate" are not helping at all - they only look as if they do. What is the point of the doctrine if it makes one no different from people who hate sinners? You get angry at being called a sinner and the sin being condemned simply BECAUSE you know the condemner knows you have a good side. Really what you have is the believer in loving the sinner and hating the sin and the person who believes in hating the sin with the sinner doing the same thing except the first pretends to be any different from the second.

Some act as if they hate the sin when the sinner does it but as the sinner stops it and may do better after they tend to look at the person as a whole. For example, you steal thousands but afterwards you behave better and redeem yourself in their eyes. This is not hating the sin and loving the sinner. It is hating the sinner until the sinner stops the sin.

Insults God

It is bad enough to be an unbeliever and promote the lie of loving wrongdoers and hating wrong but it is worse to say that God does the same, to blacken the being you say is all good. Despite all its "love" for God, God-religion is intrinsically blasphemous and deepens vice. The atheist will have the best hope of entering the kingdom of Heaven if there is a God just

like Jesus said adulteresses and tax collectors would have more hope than the respectable Jewish leaders.

If God hates sin and not the sinner, then he loves the evil demons in Hell as much as he loves the greatest saint. The wrath and hatred of God are only directed at sin. It is not the sinner. But then if that is true the demons should be released from Hell. If their sin is the problem and they are not then their punishment is unjust. Why are they bearing the consequences of their actions and choices if they are not in some way the sin they are being punished for?

Hate is hate and if you start hating the sin as if it were a kind of person that is only opening the door to hating people. The person who hates one person soon starts increasing the number.

THE WEB

www.shilohcommunitychurch.org/love_sinr.htm

TRUE OR FALSE? GOD LOVES THE SINNER BUT HATES THE SIN, FALSE, Errol Hale

www.ffrf.org/fttoday/back/hatred.html

With Perfect Hatred by Dan Barker

<http://www.godhatesfags.com/>

A Baptist anti-gay site

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, 1986

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

