

THE EDIFIER

**“You shall reprove your fellow-countryman frankly,
and so you will have no share in his guilt.” NEB Le 19:17**

**“Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, ...
for the Son of man's sake.” Lk 6:22**

HATE: WHAT IS IT? AND WHEN IS IT A CRIME?

Today in these United States, the Cold War between tyranny and liberty continues, as evidenced by the huge push for “Hate Crime” legislation. This assault by the enemy within¹ is led by a coalition of groups with often overlapping memberships, i.e. humanists, liberals and sodomites. True to the atheist doctrine of ‘separation of church and state,’² they aim to completely suppress any trace of Scriptural morality (hence Liberty³) in civil law. Indeed, pacifism in the face of this oppressive threat exposes just how rampant apostasy is in nominal Christianity, Judaism and other faiths based on the Judeo-Christian Scriptures, and how successful the enemy within has been in infiltrating and corrupting much of organized religion⁴ and virtually all of public education.⁵

Truly, for those of Faith it is written: “Is the throne of [iniquity] joined with Thee? A framer of [perversity] by statute?”⁶ Yes, those of Faith, and others opposed to chaos and tyranny, and devoted to the preservation and extension of individual liberty (under Natural and Revealed law), can have nothing to do with the insidious and perverse, the enemy within. Rather, they must see the rise of corruption, despotism, and immorality as a test from the Almighty for all who claim to abide in, confess, and worship Him. “They [the corrupt, etc.] band together against the righteous and condemn the innocent to death.”⁷ Indeed, those who would be faithful and free must heed the Scriptural cautions: “Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness.”⁸ “Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core (Heb. Korah).”⁹

Yes, whether of a Judeo-Christian Scriptural faith or not, for the sake of sanity, much less justice, people must ask “Just what do you mean by “hate,” and on what basis is it a crime?” Of course, the current “Hate Crime” pushers say anyone who questions or opposes Sodomy, or any part of the Sodomite political agenda, is homophobic and guilty of “hate.” But is it hateful to question or oppose Sodomy, when the practitioners of that abomination have a temporal life-expectancy but a little more than half that of monogamous heterosexuals, and no spiritual life-expectancy at all?¹⁰ And is such questioning or opposition a “crime.”

So, what is hate and when is it a crime.

Scripturally, we see the royal law of love (Lev 19:17,18; Lk 17:3; Gal 6:1; Ja 2:8; 1 Jn 2:9-11; 3:15) not only forbids hating your neighbor, but requires rebuking him (meekly) for his sin as well. **Take note!** Not rebuking your neighbor for sinning, as sin leads to death, is an act of hate, a sin of omission.¹¹ Thus, contrary to all the false teachers who

counsel 'non-judgmentalism,'¹² failing to rebuke a sinner is an act of hate that incurs (sin) guilt upon the one failing to rebuke.¹³

Civilly, as the basis of all law and morals in America is the immutable (moral) Code of Scripture¹⁴ and any enactment contrary thereto is an "absolute nullity"¹⁵, we see the Scriptural definition of hate is in effect for our civilization. And for that civil definition of hate America's standard lexicologist (Noah) Webster notes:

HATE, *v.t.* [Sax. *hatian*, to hate, and to heat; Goth. *hatyan*; G. *hassen*; D. *haaten*; Sw. *hata*; Dan. *hader*; L. *odi*, for *hodi*. In all languages except the Saxon, *hate* and *heat* are distinguished in orthography; but the elements of the word are the same, and probably they are radically one word denoting to stir, to irritate, or rouse.]

1. To dislike greatly; to have a great aversion to. It expresses less than *abhor*, *detest*, and *abominate*, unless pronounced with a peculiar emphasis.

How long will fools *hate* knowledge? Prov. i.

Blessed are ye when men shall *hate* you. Luke vi.

The Roman tyrant was contented to be *hated*, if he was but feared. *Rambler*.

2. In *Scripture*, it signifies to love less.

If any man come to me, and *hate* not father and mother, &c. Luke xiv.

He that spareth the rod, *hateth* his son. Prov. xiii.

Webster also notes that which is *hateful*; is: "Odious; exciting great dislike, aversion or disgust." And, consistent with Ps 11:5; Zec 8:17; Lu 16:15, he also goes on to specify: "All sin is *hateful* in the sight of God and of good men."

Thus, we see not only what *hate is* but what *is hateful* both in Scripture and America, i.e. *sin*. Also, we see that hate can be good or bad depending on what is being hated. So, it may be fairly stated, as creatures made in the image of our Creator, one of the good things we can do as His children is to hate (have a great aversion to) sin.

But how, then, does this affect our regard for the sinner? Taken in the context of the royal law of love, our awareness of our neighbor's sin, as noted above, not only rules out inaction but requires corrective action on our part. We must rebuke the sinner, not out of hate for him, but out of love, and to avoid being guilty of hate ourselves. Yes, our rebuke must spring from our hate of sin, love of our Father, and love of our neighbor. As the Matthew Henry Commentary puts it:

"We are commanded to rebuke our neighbour in love (v. 17): ... Therefore rebuke him for his sin against God, because thou lovest him; endeavour to bring him to repentance, that his sin may be pardoned, and he may turn from it, and it may not be suffered to lie upon him. Note, Friendly reproof is a duty we owe to one another, and we ought both to give it and take it in love. Let the righteous smite me, and it shall be a kindness, Ps. cxli. 5. Faithful and useful are those wounds of a friend, Prov. xxvii. 5, 6. It is here strictly commanded, "Thou shalt in any wise do it, and not omit it under any pretence." Consider, (1.) The guilt we incur by not reproofing: it is construed here into a hating of our brother.

We are ready to argue thus, "Such a one is a friend I love, therefore I will not make him uneasy by telling him of his faults;" but we should rather say, "therefore I will do him the kindness to tell him of them." Love covers sin from others, but not from the sinner himself. (2.) The mischief we do by not reproofing: we suffer sin upon him. Must we help the ass of an enemy that has fallen under his burden, and shall we not help the soul of a friend? Exod. xxiii. 5. And by [tolerating] sin in him we are in danger of bearing sin [on account of] him, as the margin reads it. If we reprove not the unfruitful works of darkness, we have fellowship with them, and become accessaries ex post facto—after the fact, Eph. v. 11. It is thy brother, thy neighbour, that is concerned; and [one would be] a Cain [who would say], Am I my brother's keeper?"

In this Wycliffe concisely concurs:

“Rebuke (from *yakah*) involved reproofing him, telling him where he was at fault. Doing this sincerely would reveal not only a lack of hatred but also a desire for his improvement. A word of rebuke left unsaid might well encourage him to continue in sin, thus bringing sin upon one's self.”

By all the above we see how demonic and duplicitous the current “hate crime” effort really is. For, by seeking general approval and encouragement of Sodomites, it seeks nothing less than their death, both temporal and eternal. So, by the law of love, we of Faith see this is a defining moment for us and the whole country. We cannot avoid speaking. The only question is whether our speaking will be by action or inaction, from love or hate. By opposing the death-incurring sinning of our neighbor we would be speaking from love. By our silence we would be speaking from hate. Hate for our sinning neighbor. Hate for ourselves. Hate for our country, and hate for the Being, Name and Word of our Creator/Father. A hate, as all of history shows, that would inescapably result in the death of our neighbor, ourselves and our country.

But if we speak up, opposing “hate crime” legislation, won't the humanists, sodomites, et al., spew their hate on us? In all probability, yes. But can they separate us from the love of the Anointed One? Hardly. But what about the press and public opinion? Won't we be attacked and ridiculed? Almost certainly. Yet, whom do you fear? Do you fear those who can throw sticks and stones, maybe even kill your body? Or do you fear Him who can kill both your body and soul in the fire? Yes, this is why the current controversy is a true and unavoidable test of our Faith. What will your choice be? Love? Or hate? Life? Or death?

If you would choose love and life, please contact your elected State and federal representative and Senators. Share with them your concern and real love for your neighbor, and your desire to see anti-sodomy education programs and laws maintained and strengthened to include aversion and extrication counseling. For assistance in witnessing on this topic, please contact one of the following resources.

Evergreen International
Bob Davies & Lori Rentzel
211 East 300 South, Suite 206

Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 363-3837 Toll Free 1-800-391-1000

Family Research Institute PO Box 62640
Dr. Paul Cameron
Colorado Springs
Colorado 80962-2640
(303) 681-3113 or www.familyresearchinst.org

For Truth, Liberty, Justice, and Mercy,

Eric Gentile

Semper Probitas

End Notes—

1: Enemy within or fifth column: “clandestine group or faction of subversive agents who attempt to undermine a nation's solidarity by any means at their disposal. The term is credited to Emilio Mola Vidal, a Nationalist general during the Spanish Civil War (1936–39). As four of his army columns moved on Madrid, the general referred to his militant supporters within the capital as his “*fifth column*,” www.britannica.com/eb/article?eu

2: In fact, 'separation of church and state', is a euphemism for mandatory public atheism, the exact opposite of the freedom of religion (true religious diversity) which the federal Constitution provides. Indeed, "separation..." is a basic tenet of Marxism as noted in the constitution of the former Soviet Union. ("The church in the U.S.S.R. is separated from the state and the school from the church." Art. 52).

3: American “Father of Independence” Samuel Adams

“every man has a right to think and act according to the dictates of his own mind . . . subject to no other control and can be commanded by no other power than the laws and ordinances of the great Creator of all things.” “On Liberty” (1750).

“Just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty”, in matters spiritual and temporal, is a thing that all men are clearly entitled to by the eternal and immutable laws of God and nature, as well as by the law of nations and all well-grounded municipal laws, which must have their foundation in the former. In regard to religion, mutual toleration in the different possessions thereof is what all good and candid minds in all ages have ever practised and, both by precept and example, inculcated on mankind. And it is now generally agreed among Christians that this spirit of toleration, in the fullest extent consistent with the being of CIVIL society, is the chief characteristic mark of the true Church. Insomuch that Mr. Locke has asserted and proved, beyond the possibility of contradiction on any solid ground, that such toleration ought to be extended to all whose doctrines are not subversive of [Christian] society.” Samuel Adams, "Rights Of The Colonists", November, 1772.

4: “Religious humanism maintains that all associations and institutions exist for the fulfillment of human life. The intelligent evaluation, transformation, control, and direction of such associations and institutions with a view to the enhancement of human life is the purpose and program of humanism. Certainly religious institutions, their ritualistic forms, ecclesiastical methods, and communal activities must be reconstituted as rapidly as experience allows, in order to function effectively in the modern world.” Humanist Manifesto I, 1933.

“Some humanists believe we should reinterpret traditional religions and reinvest them with meanings appropriate to the current situation. Such redefinitions, however, often perpetuate old dependencies and escapisms; they easily become obscurantist, impeding the free use of the intellect. We need, instead, radically new human purposes and goals.” Humanist Manifesto II, 1973.

- 5: Corrupt NEA pushes “Heather Has Two Mommies,” Nonjudgmentalism, etc., etc.
- 6: Ps 94:20 (YLT).
- 7: Ps 94:21 (NIV).
- 8: Is 5:20.
- 9: Jude 11.
- 10: Homosexual Lifespan: Paul Cameron, Ph.D., William L. Playfair, M.D., and Stephen Wellum, B.A. Paper presented at Eastern Psychological Association.
Also cf. 1 Co 6:9; Ga 5:19-21; 1 Ti 1:10.
11. Sin of Omission: cf. Le 19:17; Lk 12:47; 17:3; Jn 9:41; Gal 6:1; Ja 4:17.
- 12: Samples of Non-judgmentalist *mis*information:
“Judge not, that ye be not judged. A command of Jesus to his followers in the Sermon on the Mount. The teaching implies that because all people are sinners, no one is worthy to condemn another.”
The New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy, Third Edition. Edited by E.D. Hirsch, Jr., Joseph F. Kett, and James Trefil.
Copyright © 2002 by Houghton Mifflin Company.
[Edifier note: Houghton Mifflin’s interpretation of Mt 7:1 is directly refuted by the teaching in Mt 18:15-17 & John 7:24. The Messiah never taught nonjudgmentalism but how to judge rightly, i.e. not harshly or superficially.]
“Nonjudgmentalism has been described as the practice of and belief in suspending judgment of others for the betterment of self and society. This "ism" is a constant reminder for me to be involved in a more diverse, tolerant and multicultural society. Jesus reminds us not to be a hypocrite when he says: "Judge not, that you be not judged." Abraham Lincoln, in his second inaugural address, added compassion to nonjudging when he sought to quell hawkish Northern critics who demanded severe punishment of the wayward South. Yoga master, Swami Satchidananda, said, "Truth is One, Paths are Many." Sandra Schrifft, Personal Success and Business Coach
www.schrift.com/newsletter/3m090202.htm
[Edifier note: See above note. Also cf. Is 33:6; Col 2:8; 1 Ti 6:20]
- 13: “Rebuke” in the “Love Chapter” of Leviticus (19:17), means firm but caring and constructive reproof, it is better rendered today by “admonish,” cf. Bible Knowledge Commentary, Matthew Henry Commentary, Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament (Word nr. 0865), Wycliffe Bible Commentary, et al.
14. 1 Blackstone’s Commentaries on the Law § 38, p. 39 & § 40, Declaration of Independence “The Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God,” et al.
15. *Borden vs State*, 11 Ark. 519, 526 (1851).

QUOTES OF NOTE

“Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, "where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?" And

let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." - George Washington

"That government is best which governs the least, because its people discipline themselves." - Thomas Jefferson.

"We have no government armed with the power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion... Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." - John Adams

"It can not be emphasized too strongly or too often that this great nation was founded, not by religionists, but by Christians; not on religions, but on the Gospel of Jesus Christ." - Patrick Henry

"I predict future happiness for Americans if they can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them." - Thomas Jefferson

"... Providence has given to our people the choice of their rulers, and it is the duty as well as the privilege and interest of our Christian nation to select and prefer Christians for their rulers."

"National prosperity can neither be obtained nor preserved without the favor of Providence." John Jay, first Chief Justice to the U.S. Supreme Court

"The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity, as the rule of their faith and practice ... We are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those impostors [other religions] ... It is also said, and truly, that the Christian religion is a part of the common law ... proven by the volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of utterances that this is a Christian nation. We find everywhere a clear recognition of this same truth." Chancellor Kent the great commentator on American law, Chief Justice to the Supreme Court of New York

"Our laws and our institutions must necessarily be based upon the teachings of the Redeemer of mankind. It is impossible that it should be otherwise; and in this sense and to this extent, our civilization and our institutions are emphatically Christian."

"No purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation (State or National) because this is a religious people ... this is a Christian nation." United States Supreme Court - 1892

"We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being ... When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions. For it then respects religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual needs. To hold that it may not would be to find in the Constitution a requirement that the government show a callous indifference to religious groups. That would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe ... We find no Constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influence." United States Supreme Court – 1952 ~