

Original Sin Biblically Refuted

Mainstream Christianity is basically “Reformed Theology.” Simply put, it is “Calvinism.” It is well known by an acronym: T.U.L.I.P.:

1. Total Depravity (also known as Total Inability and Original Sin)
2. Unconditional Election
3. Limited Atonement
4. Irresistible Grace
5. Perseverance of the Saints (also known as Once Saved Always Saved)

Some denominations may not hold to all five points. They may reject the second, third, and fourth, and cling to the rest. The erroneous belief, among others, is “Total Depravity” that teaches all are born in sin.



We are going to do some tiptoeing through the dying tulip. I do not want to get into every letter in the acronym because it would take too much time, not to mention that just a cursory reading of the scriptures, applied with some common sense should not confuse anyone. However, sad to say, people are gullible and fall for anything as long as it gets them off the hook and take responsibility for their own actions.

We have many golden tongue preachers out there who own the platform, whether from the pulpits, books, or T.V. land, who know how to deceive people by their great pious and swelling words.

I was running an errand one day and had my radio playing. I was listening to a preacher who said how babies are born drunkards, liars, fornicators, adulterers, etc., but they just do not know it yet. I thought to myself, “You’ve got to be kidding me!” I could not believe what I was hearing. I had one preacher tell me to my face that babies are born liars!

The grandbaby of Calvinism (Reformed Theology) is that we are all born sinners. The origin of this doctrine was blended into Christianity about the third century or fourth century by Augustine of Hippo” who is the daddy of this false teaching. I dare not call him a “saint.” Though Augustine was highly educated and a professor of rhetoric, he was also a false teacher!

This teaching implies that Adam and Eve’s sin is automatically transmitted to their posterity. The meaning that it is physically and genetically transmitted from the parent to child through sexual reproduction. (Of course, Jesus must be exempt from this so the Catholic Church came up with the bright idea of “Immaculate conception.”) Since this sin is transmitted to his posterity, the entire human race is utterly inclined toward evil from birth and said to be “born in sin,” (which the scriptures do not say in Ephesians 2:1). This makes the person entirely disabled, not able to do good, and intensely wicked to the core. Therefore, the human race sins by necessity rather than by choice.

Augustine blended into Christian doctrine the idea of “dual nature.” The term that comes up is “sinful nature,” and this has infected “The New International Version” which sometimes translates the word “flesh” (SARX in the Greek) to “sinful nature” when trying to support this doctrine of original sin.

Nowhere is this doctrine expounded upon by anyone in the whole bible. It is simply a “Gnostic myth.” This doctrine plainly contradicts other passages of scripture and wrongly makes God the author of sin.

When it comes to the false doctrine of original sin, we often hear this common response to try to support this ungodly doctrine that, “No one has to teach a baby to be selfish, self-seeking, or demanding.” The advocates of this doctrine try to prove we are born with a sinful nature by pointing to babies! A baby crying for his mother is called sin! A baby crying because he is hungry is called sin! A baby wanting his diaper changed is called sin! A baby wanting comfort in his mother's arms is called sin! People, please think about this. What utter lies. The only way a baby can communicate when in discomfort is to cry. Jesus had to do the same to get his mother's attention! Was Jesus therefore a constant sinner?

SIN IS NOT A SUBSTANCE – IT IS NOT IN THE DNA

The bible is so clear that sin is not passed onto others. Sin is not a substance. It is not in the DNA. Sin cannot be transferred from one person to the next. The bible simply says that sin IS A TRANSGRESSION OF THE LAW (1 John 3:4).

Ezek. 18:20 is clear that no one bears the guilt of the father nor the father bear the guilt of the son. No one inherits Adam's sin, but we do suffer the consequences of Adam's sin. Big difference. Mankind suffers the consequence of Adam's sin as in pain, sickness, and eventually physical death. However, no one inherits Adam's guilt. If a man is arrested for stealing, they do not put the parents on trial. The man is guilty for his own transgression.

SIN IS A MORAL ISSUE

Since sin is moral issue which is a transgression of the law and conscience (1 John 3:4; James 4:17), and babies are not able to make moral decisions, they are morally neutral! They are not responsible for their parent's sin. (2Kings 14:6; Deu. 24:16; 2Chr. 25:4; Ezek. 18:2-4; Ezek. 18:19-20) Babies are innocent. Children are neither guilty of evil, nor worthy of praise until they are able to make their own decisions. When anyone sins, they do not do it by necessity, but rather by choice (James 1:13-15). This is why every human is responsible for the 'things done in the body' and is judged according to what he/she has done, whether it be good or bad. (2Cor. 5:10)

There was a study done some years ago with six-month-old babies, and concluded the babies know the difference between good and evil. They did an experiment involving puppets and the babies showed they had a strong preference to 'good' helpful characters - and rejected unhelpful, 'naughty' ones. Now, I would not say that babies have the knowledge in the sense that they have the ability to reason, to compute, and to analyze. But God did make us with a nature that is good and upright (Ecc. 7:29), and the law written upon our hearts (Rom. 2:15), and everyone faces the day when they have to make moral decisions with the knowledge that they actually know when it is right or wrong. To me, the study showed that babies already see the difference because of the innate nature God has given them even though they do not have the understanding yet. (Isa. 7:15-16)

The bible is clear that it is our iniquities or our sins that separate us from God.

But **your** iniquities have separated between you and your God, and **your** sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear.

It was not at our birth. Moral character is never inherited. If this supposed "sinful nature" controls our life, please tell me, why blame someone for sinful behavior that is destroying his or her life and those whom the person loves? How can a person feel responsible for something that does not spring from his choice but rather *governs* his choice? He would only be acting within his nature! So how can we blame the guy who shoots an innocent person and kills him? How can we blame the drunk who runs over a child? According to original sin, he had no choice!

The doctrine of Original Sin boils down to this:

- I have a sinful nature by birth.
- I have "inherited" this sinful nature from Adam.
- This sinful nature is going to make me sin.
- God is going to condemn me to Hell for having this sinful nature.

Now I am going to go through some verses that supposedly prove the doctrine of original sin. Like the trinity doctrine, scriptures are taken out of context and ideas placed in the minds of people what scriptures do not teach.

Gen. 5:3

And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth.

This passage of scripture supposedly teaches that man lost the image of God because he has inherited the sin of Adam.

Nowhere in the passage is it stating the spiritual and moral state in which Seth was born. There is nothing about his moral condition. The other problem is the attempt to redefine sin as a genetic substance rather than a choice.

Adam begot children in his own likeness, after his image, in the sense of outward appearance, flesh. It does not say we are born in his moral likeness. Everyone is made in the image of God just as Adam was originally created. To say that man has lost the image of God because of Adam and his sin is untrue. Furthermore, Gen. 9:6 refutes the assumption that we lost the image of God and born sinful. The New Testament confirms all are created in the image of God. (1 Cor. 11:7 and James 3:9)

Gen. 6:5

The LORD saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every intention of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.

Note "that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" is not referring to babies. Please read the context of the passage. What God said preceded the flood. These people lived in wickedness and the wickedness was great. God told Noah, who was not wicked, whose heart was not continuously evil, that he would destroy the those on the earth with a flood. This great wickedness was not the result of babies, but something the adults were doing.

This verse does not teach universal depravity or babies born inherently evil. The condemnation is by the fact that they engaged in wicked deeds (God "**saw**") not that they were born evil, in sin.

Ex. 20:5; 34:7; Deut 5:9

The verses speak of God visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children and the children's children, to the third and the fourth generation.

Ezek. 18:20 is clear that God does not hold the son guilty for the father's sin. Furthermore, if sin is "transmitted" to the third or fourth generations, how can any of us be guilty of Adam's sin?

Please read verse 10 of Deut. 5:

And showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.

Ex. 20:5 shows the same, but keep reading and notice **why** God is visiting:

...visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation **of them that HATE ME.**

There is nothing said about being neither guilty of the father's sin, nor Adam's sin.

Ps. 58:3

The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.

This one verse is taken out of context to prove that all babies are born sinful. Notice the words; "go astray as soon as they are born," not that they were born that way. Also, notice the RIGHTEOUS in verse 10 who do not go astray.

Upon closer examination, it actually opposes the argument of all being born sinners and in a lost state. If one wants to take the interpretation of the passage literally, then let us be consistent. If we read the whole context, we find two classes of people:

- The wicked
- The righteous

It is apparent that the wicked go astray, but then we have the righteous who do not go astray (otherwise they would not be called righteous). Therefore all are not born astray. How can one be born lost and go astray when they are already astray! You cannot go off course if you already are.

So this actually teaches the opposite of what original sin advocates imply, because the original sin doctrine teaches one class at birth.

Please read the whole Psalm. Notice it is not addressed to babies, but **adults**. He speaks to the congregation, to the sons of men (v.1). He also says, "No, in heart you work unrighteousness; on earth you weigh out the violence of your hands" (v.2). This is not about seeking vengeance on babies. It is about taking vengeance on the wicked who do nothing but engage in violence and bloodshed.

Isa 48:8

And neither had you heard, nor did you understand, nor did you open your ear long ago.
Indeed, I knew that you would act very deceitfully, and they would call you a rebel from birth.

Just like the last verse, we must ask ourselves, is this verse speaking in a literal or figurative sense? This verse in Isa. 48 is similar to *the* previous verse. The house of Jacob is addressed, not babies. These people are rebellious and very wicked. It was not a title God attached to infants, but it was a title attached to **Israel** in lieu of what he knew they would become since their youth. I believe the womb is the same as youth ("nor did you open your ear *long ago*"). Babies do not come out speaking lies or go astray. Babies are not wicked; they are not born as rebels or transgressors.

Jer. 17:9

The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?

Again, context. If we read the verse following it, God tells us what he means by the deceitful heart. He said, "I the LORD search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings." Scripture says it is a man's ways, it is the "fruit of his DOINGS." There is nothing that says it was the state of his being.

Ps. 51:5

Now we come to the mother of all verses. Without a doubt, this will be the most quoted one to try to prove we are all born sinners. The verse reads:

Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.

Be careful of the NIV because it states, "*Surely I was sinful at birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me.*" This is not a translation, but rather an interpretation and shows the bias of the translators to promote original sin doctrine. In the New Testament, they use the phrase "sinful nature" such as in Rom. 7:18, 25. There is **no** such adjective found before the word nature (except in the NIV!).

No one is sinful before or at birth! Sin is not inherited, it is committed! It is a transgression of God's law (1 John 3:4). To be a sinner, one must commit sins.

According to original sin advocates, we are to believe that from the moment of conception a sinner is formed. The next nine months will produce nothing but a dirty rotten sinner. The essence of his substance will be saturated with sin that was passed down from Adam.

First of all, David did not say this is the state of his constitution at, or before birth. Furthermore, neither is it a verdict on all mankind. The subject of the verse is his conception. David does not state that he was born guilty. Verse one describes the guilt of his mother.

This is from a Psalm of David after his sin with Bathsheba. It deals with the sin of an adult, and shows the repentance of an adult (vs. 10-13). David makes no mention of Adam or Adam's sin.

David says his mother conceived him in sin. He was born into a sinful world "brought forth in iniquity". Sin is all around him from birth, just like the rest of us when we are born. We are born in a sinful environment.

So the verse describes the guilt of his mother. His mother is the one who was guilty of sin and iniquity when she conceived him and brought him forth. The first part of the verse, in Hebrew parallelism, is explained by the last part of the verse.

Consider parallel language in Acts 2:8. People were born in a native language or tongue:

And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?

Were you born in a language? No. Did they speak a certain language because they were born in it? No. The people around them spoke it, so they soon learned it. Likewise, David was not guilty of sin from birth, but he was born into a sinful environment and into sinful influences, thus, he soon learned to sin like one learns a language.

Job 14: 4; 15:14; 25:4

What is man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?

The entire human race, "born of a woman," falls into voluntary moral depravity because of the combination of influences in that direction (the world, the flesh, and the devil).

The verse does not say every woman is inherently unclean or that all are born depraved.

The questions from Job 25:4 (pronounce Jobe not Job) and 15:14 are directed to Job by his friends in response to Job declaring his innocence. The statements from his friends **are not** God's position on man. This is Bildad the Shuhite's opinion in chapter 25 who was echoing Elphaz the Temanite in chapter 15.

When it comes to Job's friends, God ordered them to offer sacrifices in Job's presence and to have Job pray for their forgiveness because of their folly (Job 42).

Jer. 13:23

Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may you also do good, that are accustomed to do evil.

This is not a doctrinal statement on mankind about their nature. It has to do with people who were "accustomed to do evil," it doesn't say they were born that way. God does not hold a leopard accountable for not being able to change its spots. If they cannot change, then they cannot do any good and no one would be able to have salvation. However, Ezek. 33:13-16 teaches that all man has freewill to do good or evil and will be judged regarding his conduct.

Rom. 3:10-12

As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one."

This refers back to Psa_14:1-3; Psa_53:1-6. God looks upon the children of men as a whole, but there are always some exceptions. All through scripture it speaks of righteous people in contrast to the wicked (ex. Gen. 7:1; Gen. 18:23; Gen. 38:26; Job 1:1; Luke 1:6; etc.) There are many occurrences of people like Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, Zechariah, Sarah, Ruth, Abigail, Elisabeth and a host of others, both in the Old and New Testaments, who are spoken of as righteous.

The lack of understanding is a moral failure. It is not that he could not understand. Understanding is always obtainable to those who want to know truth (Ps. 119:104, 130; Isa. 8:10; John 7:17, etc.). To make Romans 3:10 ("there is none that seeketh after God") a doctrinal statement of all mankind is to make the scriptures to be in contradiction. The LORD says:

And ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart" (Jer. 29:13)

Rom. 3:23

For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.

Note Paul did not say all babies are born sinners. He said, "all **have** sinned." The word "have" indicates an activity on every individual's part. Sin is voluntary. *All that have sinned are the ones who have sinned*, all who have broken God's law. What law does a baby break? Infants are incapable of sinning.

Rom. 5:12

Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.

Notice this does not say men are born in sin. It says death comes because we **HAVE SINNED**. Now we shall focus on the word "sinned." The word "sinned" is an **action verb**. This means we have an active part in our own failure. Sin is something we **DO** ourselves. Sin is an act we commit. We are not born condemned. The act of Adam gave men the choice to sin because sin was not present. Adam had the choice whether to obey or not obey the **LORD**. He had two options:

- Obedience
- Disobedience

God gave us a free will. Adam chose the wrong path and so do many others. Adam's act brings death. If we choose to follow Adam's path we die. Jesus' act brings life. In choosing to follow Jesus' path we live.

But whether in Adam or the last Adam (Christ), we make a choice. The end result is the result of that choice.

I also want to mention that Romans 5 is not speaking about physical death. It is about spiritual death (which separates us from God. I will explain later). Suffice to say, the context of Romans 5:12-21, Paul speaks of condemnation and justification. The condemnation is referring to spiritual death, for those who are justified **still die physically**. In addition, if "death" as in Romans 6:23 means physical death, being justified would mean that **we would not die physically!**

Rom. 5:19

For as by **ONE** man's disobedience many were **MADE SINNERS**, so by the obedience of **ONE** shall many be **MADE RIGHTEOUS**.

Neither does Romans 5:19 prove that all are born sinners. In Adam, we do not die until we choose to disobey. In Christ we do not live until we choose to obey. But the end result of either is from the choice we make to obey or disobey. Both choices we have exist in the world as a result brought about by the actions of these Adams. Adam's disobedience does not make every baby born lost anymore than Christ's death automatically makes every human being found. Through Adam, sin has

been set before us. Through Christ, righteousness has been set before us. If every human was born separated from God because Adam sinned and died, then every human being would be spiritually alive (saved) because Jesus obeyed and lives. But we cannot be saved unless we make a decision and choose to follow Christ (which the end result would be inheriting the kingdom with a life of immortality). Likewise, we do not die spiritually until we choose to disobey God (which the end result is to perish. John 3:16). Ultimately, whether we live or die, comes about by the choices we make.

Again, if all are condemned in Adam, then all are saved in Christ. We cannot make one absolute and the other conditional. In other words, IF Romans 5 says sin is transmitted to us through Adam in the unconditional sense, then the same chapter as well teaches that the entire race of humans are ALL saved unconditionally, because of what Christ did. This would teach Universalism! There is no other way around it. One cannot wrest the scriptures one way while interpreting the identical words another way. The truth is that we are condemned when we commit sins (v. 12), but are saved when we obey and follow Christ's example.

Eph 2:1-3

And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.

It is clear from reading the verses that before we decided to believe the Gospel Jesus preached, turning from our wicked ways, and following him, we were "dead in trespasses and sins." People like to misquote the verse by saying we are all "**born dead in trespasses and sins.**" That is NOT what the bible says. "Born" is not in the passage.

Furthermore, where does it mention Adam, Adam's sin, or us inheriting the guilt of Adam's sin?

Simply put: They were dead because of sins in which they once walked" (v2), and conducted themselves in the lusts of the flesh (v3).

1. This contradicts inherited depravity and proves the position that people are in sin because of their own conduct, not Adam's conduct.
2. "Nature" in the text refers to a person's character which comes as a result of repeated practice, not by inheritance.

What does one do with Rom. 2:14 where it says some people by nature obey God's will? The false doctrine of total depravity says that is impossible.

1 Co. 15:21-22

For since by man came death, by Man also came the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive.

This passage is used to support the representation theory that ALL (spiritually and physically) die due to the transmission of Adam's original sin. However, this passage is strictly speaking of physical death as the context is referencing the future (physical) resurrection of the dead (1 Co. 15). Hence, "even so in Christ all SHALL BE (future) made alive".

According to Paul, physical death is a consequence springing from the man (Adam), just as a glorified body shall come in the future through the Man, Jesus Christ. Now, how is it man dies on an account of Adam's sin? As said previously in another chapter. No human is immortal. I believe Adam was created mortal, that is, flesh and blood (Gen. 2:7; 3:19; 1 Co. 15:45-50).

Through his personal act of disobedience he lost for himself (and descendants) physical access to the "Tree of Life" which he (and we) must eat from to physically "live forever" (Gen. 3:22) in this physical body. As follows, man physically dies due to separation from this tree. Jesus, a living human being, born as all others, came under the same physical consequences. He had a body that aged. He had blood cells that died and reproduced. With each passing day, he was growing older. He got tired, hungry, thirsty, etc. etc. If Jesus had lived to be an old man, he would have eventually physically died.

As you can understand, the doctrine of original sin did not originate with the bible. Its origins can be found to come from Augustine. Calvin, who was a student of Augustine's writings, popularized this false doctrine. It is the influence of Greek philosophy that crept into the Christianity.

To make someone a sinful substance from the time of conception is to attack the character of God. How can we say enslavement to sin is a constitutional fault in our makeup? How can God hold us responsible for something we did not choose? This doctrine is blasphemy against God's character. It also leaves us with the conclusion that sinners should be pitied rather than punished because they were born of such a substance (in sin) and therefore cannot help but choose to live a life of sin! This makes sin a calamity, not a crime. This makes God to be some kind of monster. Reason can only conclude that since by nature we cannot choose other than evil, then we cannot be blamed. We have the best of all excuses for continuing a sinful life.

My dear brothers and sisters, God never made us a sinner against our will. Do not expect pity from anyone, especially God for your claim that He made you subject to have no control over your will by virtue of your natural birth and thus could not help but sin. Let us not disregard what scripture tells us:

Did not he that made me in the womb make him? and did not one fashion us in the womb?
Job 31:15

Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us? Malachi 2:10

Know ye that the Lord he is God: it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture. Psalm 100:3

Thy hands have made me and fashioned me. Psalm 119:73

Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright....Ecclesiastes 7:29

Notice the last verse. The full verse says:

Behold, I have found only this, that God made men upright, but **they** have sought out many devices.

Many will try to say that the **“they”** refers to Adam. Adam is not called, “they.” It has to do with his descendants that were involved in committing all kinds of lawlessness. They were guilty before God and had no forgiveness unless they repented (**stop**) their sinful behavior.

Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the LORD, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for **he will abundantly pardon**. Isa 55:7

God did not make you with a corrupt nature. The bible is clear that man **corrupts himself**, not born that way:

And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for **all flesh had corrupted his way** upon the earth." Genesis 6:5-7, 11-12

(They) **have corrupted themselves**; They have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it. Exodus 32:7-8

Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have **sought out many inventions**. Ecclesiastes 7:29

For I know that after my death ye will utterly **corrupt yourselves**, and turn aside from the way which I have commanded you. Deut. 31:29

They **have corrupted themselves**, their spot is not the spot of his children: they are a perverse and crooked generation. Deuteronomy 32:5

Why do people sin? Why did Lucifer sin? Why did the angels sin? Why did Adam and Eve sin? Does anyone need a "sinful nature" to sin? Of course not. The bible says, "But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of **his own lust**, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death" James 1:14-15. The bible says

man is tempted when he is drawn away of "his own lust," not by some fabricated story of some dual personality, sinful nature, the Adamic nature, old nature, etc., etc..

Sin is something that happens after we are born, not something that is in our genes, DNA, or chromosomes. This doctrine makes sin to be a physical problem, and this is exactly the belief in the majority of Christendom and the world. Those in the world think that some day they will be able find the cure for the "sin gene."

There are cults like the JW's who believe sin is in the blood. This is what the Watchtower teaches:

The blood in any person is in reality the person himself. It contains all the peculiarities of the individual from whence it comes. This includes hereditary taints, disease susceptibilities, poisons due to personal living, eating and drinking habits... The poisons that produce the impulse to commit suicide, murder, or steal are in the blood." (Watchtower 9/15/1961, page 564)

Watchtower is saying that such sins reside in physical blood. This is one of the reasons why they will not allow blood transfusions. Sin does not reside in the blood, nor does righteousness reside in the blood, and any scripture quoted is used as a smokescreen to enforce the Gnostic thinking. The bible does use terms like "innocent blood" and "righteous blood" ("righteous blood" only used one time. Matt. 23:38.), but this is not talking of the properties of blood itself. The innocent blood is speaking of one who was simply innocent from doing any crime, who are unjustly punished, and the righteous blood refers to those saints who were righteous, "righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias."

Here are two quotes some may use to try to prove blood has moral properties:

For he took his life in his hand and he struck down the Philistine, and the LORD worked a great salvation for all Israel. You saw it, and rejoiced. Why then will you sin against **innocent blood** by killing David without cause? 1 Sam 19:5

That upon you may come all the **righteous blood** shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Matt. 23:35

Note it is obvious that it is not referring to moral properties in the blood, for physical blood has no moral properties. A person who is innocent is one who is free from guilt; not having done wrong or violated any law. In Matthew Jesus talks about those righteous people from Abel right onto Zacharias! Jesus was not referring to these people in the sense of their blood having moral property (for it does not!), but of the people themselves living a righteous life, innocent, and whose blood was shed, from Abel to unto the blood of Zacharias.

Some people try to prove that Jesus had "righteous blood" flowing in his veins by quoting 1 Peter 1:19 for support. Nowhere in the passage does it say anything about "righteous blood." The text says "precious blood."

...but with the **precious** blood of Christ, like that of a lamb without blemish or spot. He was foreknown before the foundation of the world but was made manifest in the last times for the sake of you who through him are believers in God, who raised him from the dead and gave him glory, so that your faith and hope are in God. 1Pet. 19:20-21

Precious means of great price; costly; as a precious stone. Highly valued; much esteemed. There is nothing in there about moral properties in the blood of Jesus Christ. Jesus gave shed his life for our sins. He gave up his life for us.

God is not flesh and blood – He is Spirit. (John 4:24) Jesus on the other hand, WAS MADE like unto his brethren in all things. Nothing about the fleshly body of Jesus was different than anyone else ever born on the earth.

Sin is not a physical problem, it is a MORAL problem.

A careful examination of Old Testament Scriptures reveals that no one bears the iniquity of the father:

Yet you say, 'Why should not the son suffer for the iniquity of the father?' When the son has done what is just and right, and has been careful to observe all my statutes, he shall surely live. The soul who sins shall die. The son shall not suffer for the iniquity of the father, nor the father suffer for the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon himself. But if a wicked person turns away from all his sins that he has committed and keeps all my statutes and does what is just and right, he shall surely live; he shall not die. Ezekiel 18:19-21

Children do not bear the sin of their parents., i.e., a son does not bear the iniquity of the sin of his father. Every person born is responsible for his own sin and will pay the penalty for it.

The Scriptures clearly state:

The LORD said Ezekiel, I hear the people of Israel using the old saying, "Sour grapes eaten by parents leave a sour taste in the mouths of their children. Now tell them that I am the LORD God, and as surely as I live, that saying will no longer be used in Israel. The lives of all people belong to me—parents as well as children. Only those who sin will be put to death. Suppose there is a truly good man who always does what is fair and right. He refuses to eat meat sacrificed to foreign gods at local shrines or to worship Israel's idols. He does not have sex with someone else's wife or with a woman having her monthly period. He never cheats or robs anyone and always returns anything taken as security for a loan; he gives food and clothes to the poor and does not charge interest when lending money. He refuses to do anything evil; he is fair to everyone and faithfully obeys my laws and teachings. This man is good, and I promise he will live. But suppose this good man has an evil son who is violent and commits sins his father never did. He eats meat at local shrines, has sex with someone else's wife, cheats the poor, and robs people. He keeps what is given to him as security for a loan. He worships idols, does disgusting things,

and charges high interest when lending money. An evil man like that will certainly not live. He is the one who has done these horrible sins, so it is his own fault that he will be put to death.

But suppose this evil man has a son who sees his father do these things and refuses to act like him. He does not eat meat at local shrines or worship Israel's idols, and he does not have sex with someone else's wife. He never cheats or robs anyone and does not even demand security for a loan. He gives food and clothes to the poor and refuses to do anything evil or to charge interest. And he obeys all my laws and teachings. Such a man will live. His own father sinned, but this good man will not be put to death for the sins of his father. Ezekiel 18: 1-17

Nowhere so far does it say we are accountable to God for **Adam's sin**. We do not bear his iniquity, nor did we genetically inherit his sin, nor is it inbred into our hearts or will. No child is born a sinner.

...sin is not imputed when there is no law. Romans 5:13

According to Rom 5:13, no one is accountable for Adam's sin because sin, his sin, is not imputed (charged, accountable) when there is no moral law that has been personally and willfully broken.

Most religions teach that the Adamic sin is not something that is forgiven, but something that must be cleansed out, but yet will have it until the day we die! This doctrine certainly is not in the word of God.

We have seen in the word of God is that sin is not inherited and nowhere in the scripture does it say we lost the image of God. What man has done is **abuse that image**. They have corrupted themselves morally and physically.

There is so much more that could be said, how this doctrine affects other doctrines of the bible. I would like to conclude here what Charles Finney said concerning this awful doctrine of sinful nature:

Men plead a sinful nature for their excuse. And pray, what is this sinful nature? Do you mean by it that every faculty and even the very essence of your constitution were poisoned and made sinful in Adam, and came down in this polluted state by inheritance to you? Do you mean that you were so born in sin that the substance of your being is all saturated with it, and so that all the faculties of your constitution are themselves sin? Do you believe this?

I admit if this were true, it would make out a hard case. A hard case indeed! Until the laws of my reason are changed, it would compel me to speak out openly and say--Lord, this is a hard case, that Thou shouldst make my nature itself a sinner, and then charge the guilt of its sin upon me! I could not help saying this; the deep echoings of my inner being would proclaim it without ceasing, and the breaking of ten thousand thunderbolts over my head would not deter me from thinking and saying so. The reason God has given me would forever affirm it.

But the dogma is an utter absurdity. For, pray, what is sin? God answers--"transgression of law." And now you hold that your nature is itself a breach of the law of God--nay, that it has always been a breach of God's law, from Adam to the day of your birth; you hold that the current of this sin came down in the veins and blood of your race--and who made it so? Who created the veins and blood of man? From whose hand sprang this physical constitution and this mental constitution? Was man his own creator? Did sin do a part of the work in creating your physical and your mental constitution? Do you believe any such thing? No; you ascribe your nature and its original faculties to God, and upon Him, therefore, you charge the guilty authorship of your "sinful nature."

But how strange a thing is this! If man is in fault for his sinful nature, why not condemn man for having blue or black eyes? The fact is, sin never can consist in having a nature, nor in what nature is; but only and alone in the bad use which we make of our nature. This is all. Our Maker will never find fault with us for what He has Himself done or made; certainly not. He will not condemn us, if we will only make a right use of our powers--of our intellect, our sensibility, and our will. He never holds us responsible for our original nature. If you will observe, you will find that God has given no law prescribing what sort of nature and constitutional powers we should have. He has given no law on these points, the transgression of which, if given, might somewhat resemble the definition of sin. But now since there is no law about nature, nature cannot be a transgression.

Here let me say, that if God were to make a law prescribing what nature or constitution a man must have, it could not possibly be otherwise than unjust and absurd, for the reason that man's nature is not a proper subject for legislation, precept, and penalty, inasmuch as it lies entirely without the pale of voluntary action, or of any action of man at all. And yet thousands of men have held the dogma that sin consists in great part in having a sinful nature. Yes, through long ages of past history, grave theologians have gravely taught this monstrous dogma; it has resounded from pulpits, and has been stereotyped for the press, and men have seemed to be never weary of glorifying this dogma as the surest test of sound orthodoxy! Orthodoxy!! There never was a more infamous libel on Jehovah! It would be hard to name another dogma which more violently outrages common sense. It is nonsense--absurd and utter NONSENSE! I would to God that it were not even worse than nonsense! Think what mischief it has wrought! Think how it has scandalized the law, the government, and the character of God! Think how it has filled the mouths of sinners with excuses from the day of its birth to this hour!

Now I do not mean to imply that the men who have held this dogma have intelligently insulted God with it. I do not imply that they have been aware of the impious and even blasphemous bearings of this dogma upon Jehovah;--I am happy to think that some at least have done all this mischief ignorantly. But the blunder and the mischief have been none the less for the honest ignorance in which they were done.¹

¹ The Oberlin Evangelist, October 25, 1848 EXCUSES CONDEM GOD; Sermon by C.G. Finney. Reported by the Editory.

In mainstream Christianity (and the world), who believe we are inbred with a sin nature that causes us to sin, and thus call it a “disease,” sin is no more defined by what we DO (a transgressor of God’s moral code”), but rather by what we ARE!

The idea of teaching that we are born morally depraved violates reason and scripture, and makes God a cosmic tyrant. Why? Because then we have the best of excuses. We can blame God for telling us to do something good when He has made us totally incapable of doing it!