Original Sin Biblically Refuted

The doctrine of Original Sin basically boils down to this:

1. I have a sinful nature by birth.
2. I have "inherited" this sinful nature from Adam.
3. This sinful nature is going to make me sin, or is a causative something back of the will.
4. I am unable to keep the requirements of God's Law.
5. God is going to condemn me to Hell for having this sinful nature.

If I have inherited this sinful nature from Adam, how is this sinful nature passed on to me? What part of me is it, in which this sinful nature is passed on? In what part of my being does this sinful nature reside? Sin has to do with choice, not something you inherit. No one inherits sin or a sinful nature. How can God condemn you for something in which you had no choice?

Hopefully, when we are through, you will understand the truth and be able to discern the error of this teaching. Should you disagree with me, I welcome your comments, but your conclusions must agree with Scripture rather than based on experience or a particular brand of theology. I would also ask that you pay close attention to what you read and take it at face value. In other words, please do not assume or read more into what is written that I haven't said. In other words, try not to jump to conclusions. I have noticed in the past that many assumptions and decisions are made before any serious searching of the Scriptures to see whether these things be so.

Before we begin, please keep in mind that sin is a transgression (1 John 3:4), it is not transmitted from one person to the next as though sin were a substance. The following is a list of Scriptures that are quoted to try and prove this false doctrine. We shall look at each one in their context.

Scripture #1. 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 is used to teach that man lost the image of God because he has inherited the sin of Adam. This is not to mention that Seth is the third son! (Gen. 4:25) What about Cain and Able? Was sin not passed onto them? Were they not made after the likeness and image 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, man is attempting to redefine sin as a *genetic substance* rather than a choice. If sin is not a choice because of our physical makeup, then there can be no freewill. Sin is a choice, not a constitution. Sin is a transgression of law (1 John 3:4).

If sin is a choice it cancels out constitution, if sin is in our constitution it cancels out the choice!

We can’t have it both ways, it is impossible! How can one even tell a sinner to repent?

Carefully think about this. How can a person feel responsible for something that does not spring from his choice but rather *governs* his choice?

How can he feel responsible? How could there be a struggle between good and evil if all one has is a sinful nature? How can you approach a homosexual, a thief, a drunkard, etc., and tell him he is supposed to stop living that lifestyle if it springs from his nature? How can we rebuke him and encourage him to repent? He would only be acting within his nature, which you tell him he has, a sinful nature! If it is his nature, his constitution, born that way, we can’t expect him to stop the sin, period. How could Jesus say, “Go and sin no more” if this nature is not eradicated until physical death, as we are taught? The only conclusion to this false idea is that “physical death” is our Savior from sin, and not Christ!

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 hypothesis that we lost the image of God and are born sinful,
and the New Testament confirms all are created in the image of God. (1 Cor. 11:7 and James 3:9).

**Scripture #2** Gen. 6:5

*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. Gen. 6:5*

Did this include everyone? Noah was blameless.

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 earth with a flood to kill everyone on the face of the earth. This great wickedness was not the result of babies, but something the adults were doing.

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

**Scripture #3** Ex. 20:5; 34:7; Deut 5:9

1. Eze. 18:20 clearly shows that God does not hold the son guilty for the father’s sin.
2. If sin is “transmitted” to the third or fourth generations, how can any of us be guilty of Adam’s sin?
3. In Deut. 5:9, please read verse 10, “And showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.”
4. Ex. 20:5 shows the same. Notice verse 6, which is the same as Deut. 5:10, “And showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.”

There is a difference between spiritual and physical consequences. There are physical consequences of sin, but this says nothing about being spiritually guilty of the father's sin, nor Adam's sin.
Scripture #4 Ps. 14:2

“The LORD looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God.”

Note the Psalmist is not classifying himself among those who do not seek after God. Those who seek Him will find Him. (Jer. 29:13; Prov. 8:17)

Scripture #5 Ps. 58:3

"The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies." - Ps. 58:3

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.

Although this verse is usually cited in support of saying we are born lost, upon closer examination, this verse actually adds to the argument against all being born in a 'lost state.' If one is going to insist upon a literal interpretation of this verse, then let's look at it literally. We have the wicked and the righteous. This implies two classes of individuals:

The wicked
The righteous

If it is the wicked who go astray, then the righteous do not go astray. Therefore, not all are born lost. If all are born lost then they cannot go astray. They are already astray! I cannot go outside of a house unless I am first inside it. I cannot leave a place unless I am first there. This verse cannot be used to support that all people are born in a lost state because it teaches the exact opposite. Who goes astray? The wicked. Who then does not go astray? The righteous. The false doctrine of 'Original Sin' teaches one class at birth, not two.

Please read in context the whole Psalm (vss. 1-11). Notice he is not addressing children, but ADULTS, "O congregation.....O ye sons of men?" He also says, "Yea, in heart ye work wickedness; ye weigh the violence of your hands in the earth." He is speaking to adults about their heart and their violence. He's not accusing infants of being violent.
It’s not about God taking vengeance on babies. It's about God taking vengeance on the wicked who have done nothing but engaged themselves in violence and bloodshed. Who are the wicked? The wicked are those who forsake God's law.

Scripture #6  Isa. 48:8

"Yea, thou hearest not; yea, thou knewest not; yea, from that time that thine ear was not opened: for I knew that thou wouldest deal very treacherously, and wast called a transgressor from the womb." - Isa. 48:8

Here we are to believe that babies are already transgressors from the womb.

If we look at the context we can deduct that the "womb" is Egypt; however, the majority of Christendom use this verse to teach that babies are born sinners, but we'll look and see what the passage says beginning in verse 1.

"Hear ye this, O house of Jacob, which are called by the name of Israel, and are come forth out of the waters of Judah, which swear by the name of the LORD, and make mention of the God of Israel, but not in truth, nor in righteousness."

According to the verse above, to whom is this addressed? Is it addressed to infants or to the house of Jacob?

This is God dealing with Israel, whom he chose out of Egypt. God chose them in the furnace of affliction and refined them there. Egypt is known as the furnace of affliction (v. 10). He called them, the house of Jacob, a transgressor from the womb prophetically. God predicted that they would deal treacherously and live in sin. Note that God did not say they were transgressors before they were born. ".... for I knew that thou wouldest deal very treacherously, and wast called a transgressor from the womb." God called them a transgressor from the womb. 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.

Scripture #7  Isa. 64:6
“We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away.” Isa. 64:6

Why are they unclean? It is because the state of their birth? What made them unclean? If they became unclean, then the indication is that they were once pure. It is their "iniquities" that caused them to be unclean, it says nothing about the state of their birth or because of Adam.

Scripture #8 Jer. 17:9

"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" -Jer. 17:9

Again, context. If we look at the context and 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's a man's ways, it is the "fruit of his DOINGS." There is nothing in Scripture that says it was the state of his being.

Scripture #9 Ps. 51:5

"Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." -Ps. 51:5

Here we are to believe that from the moment of conception a sinner is being formed. What will be growing in that womb for the next nine months will produce nothing but a dirty rotten sinner. In other words, we are to believe the essence of his substance, in soul and body, will be nothing but 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. 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).
Where in the verse does it say or even imply he was born a sinner or that was the state of his birth? David makes no mention of Adam or Adam's sin. David says his mother conceived him in sin. (See David's Mother) 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. The Jewish writers who wrote of this Psalm say the same thing. David is saying that he was born into 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. His mother was guilty of sin and so were all around him; thus, he soon learned to sin like one learns a language.

**Scripture #10** 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?” -Job 15:14

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).

Jesus was born of a woman: Gal 4:4 was He depraved?

The verse does not say every women is inherently unclean or that all are born depraved. To name a few; Moses, Enoch, Noah, Isaiah, Paul, Jesus, are proof that a man can be born of a woman and be "clean".

“How then can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?” -Job 25:4
It is obvious that Job is one of the books in the Bible that is most quoted out of context. Like all the previous verses quoted, we have seen it demonstrated over and over how passages are used without acknowledging the surrounding text.

In the book of Job we know that Job was a perfect and upright man, one who feared God and eschewed evil. Job's world began to crumble when stricken with evil, and not once did he curse God. As much as Job suffered affliction, he still praised God. God never accused Job of being sinful and disobedient, that charge came from his friends. Job suffered the loss of his family and suffered a lot of physical pain and at one point in his life Job wished he had died at birth rather than continue in that awful condition. Job insisted that he was not afflicted as the result of unrighteousness or perverseness.

The questions above from Job 25:4 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. The friends of Job were very wrong in their assessment of mankind. 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 as a result of their folly (Job 42).

At this point, I would like to quote A.T. Overstreet who comments concerning Job 14:4; and 15:14:

Job 14:4 "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one."

*This text is supposed to teach that sinful parents will bear sinful children. But this is to completely ignore its context, which shows that Job had his eye wholly on the frail and dying state of man, and not at all upon his moral state. Job 14:1-6. The whole sense of what Job was saying was that no one can bring other than frail and dying offspring from frail and dying parents. To arbitrarily force this text to teach something that is completely foreign to its context can only be another example of an interpretation dictated by a prepossessed belief in the doctrine of original sin.*

*If this text teaches that a sinner invariably produces another sinner, it teaches blasphemy. For if the doctrine of original sin is true, then Mary, the*
mother of our Lord, was born a sinner. So if Job 14:4 really does teach that a sinner must produce another sinner, there could be no way of escaping the blasphemous conclusion that our Lord also was born a sinner.

Job 15:14 "What is man that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?"

It should first be said that these are the words of Eliphaz and so cannot be quoted as inspired truth. God himself testified that Job's comforters did not hold the truth. Job 42:7. But suppose we did accept this verse as inspired truth, what does it teach? It certainly teaches nothing about a morally depraved physical constitution. It merely implies the sinful condition of all mankind, without saying anything about how men got that way.

Scripture #11 Jer. 13:23

“Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil.” Jer. 13:23

This supposedly teaches one is born in sin. Note it says they 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 can't change, then they cannot do any good and no one would be able to be saved. However, Ezek. 33:13-16 teaches that all man has a freewill to do good or evil and will be judged concerning his conduct.

Scripture #12 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." -Rom. 3:10-12.

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 wicked people (ex. Gen. 7:1; Gen. 18:23; Gen. 38:26; Job 1:1; Luke 1:6; etc.) There are many instances of people like Abraham,
Isaac, Jacob, David, Zechariah, Sarab, 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, a lack of heart understanding. It's not that he couldn't understand. Understanding is always available 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 blanket statement of all mankind is to make the Scriptures to be in contradiction. The Lord himself says, "And ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart" (Jer. 29:13)

Scripture #13 Rom. 3:23

"For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." -Romans 3:23

Paul says all have sinned. 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.

Scripture #14 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:" -Rom. 5:12

Notice this does not say men are born in sin. It says death comes because we HAVE SINFED. The word "sinned" is an action verb. This means we have an active part in our own demise. 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 God. He had two options: obedience or disobedience. God gave us a free will. Adam chose the wrong path and so did we at some point in our life.

- Adam’s act brings death. In choosing to follow Adam’s path we die.
- Jesus Christ’s act brings life. In choosing to follow Jesus’ path we live.

But whether in Adam or in Christ (the second Adam), we make a choice. The end result is the result of that choice.
Side note: Romans 5 is not speaking about physical death. It is about spiritual death from sinning for sin separates us from God.

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.

Also, if "death" in Romans 6:23 means physical death, being justified would mean that we would not die physically!

Scripture #15 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." -Rom. 5:19

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 doesn’t 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 can’t be saved unless we make a decision and choose to follow Christ. Likewise, we don’t die spiritually until we choose to disobey God. Ultimately, whether we live or die, comes about by a choice 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 also teaches that the very same 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. (See Spiritual Death) The simple truth is that we are condemned when we commit sin (v. 12), but are saved when we obey Christ.

Scripture #16 Heb. 7:9-10

"And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him."

This is supposed to prove that all sinned in Adam. As Overstreet has said so well.

To teach from this passage that either the good or the evil that our ancestors have done is actually done by us is to wrest this passage from its context and to torture it into teaching utter nonsense. For instance, such an idea would make all the descendants of a Christian automatic Christians if his children were yet in his loins when he believed. Also, it would seem to make all the descendants of one who rejects the Gospel automatic unbelievers for coming out of the loins of an unbelieving father. In fact, if this theory is true, every good act of a man or every evil act of a man is counted as done by all of his offspring. But the problem with all of this is that we know that many godly men have had descendants who were enemies of God and vice versa. Abraham is an example of this. The Bible says that Abraham believed God and that his faith was counted unto him for righteousness and Abraham is called the father of the faithful because of his faith. But Abraham has had millions upon millions of descendants who have not believed and have been lost. Yet according to the theory under question, all of Abraham's descendants should have been justified by his faith, for they were all yet in his loins when he believed God and was justified. Esau was a descendant of Abraham but God said, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Rom. 9:13. God destroyed the children of Israel (who were descendants of Abraham) in the wilderness for their unbelief, even though they were "yet in the loins of Abraham" when he believed.

The problems with this nonsensical theory multiply when you realize that every one of us have been "in the loins" of numerous ancestors going all the
way back to Adam. This means that we actually participated in all the good and evil not only of Adam, but also of all our intervening ancestors as well. What an awful lot of good and evil we have done. We have all been busy for thousands of years in the loins of our ancestors doing good and evil!

Now, do we get to pick and choose among our ancestors, choosing the ancestors whose deeds we like most, or must we heap them all together and take what they all have done? I am afraid that to do the latter would make our character quite a confused and conflicting thing. What if some of our ancestors were Christians and others were unrepentant sinners? Would we balance the good ones out against the bad ones and come up with what was left over?

But the whole idea of sinning in Adam is a theological fiction that has been perpetuated to a large extent by Jerome's erroneous translation in the Latin Vulgate of Romans 5:12. He translated the Greek phrase eph o pantes hemarton by the Latin phrase in quo omnes peccaverunt, which means in whom all have sinned. This translation was in error, and Greek students agree that it was. Nevertheless, this error has helped to form and perpetuate the false doctrine that men actually sinned in Adam when he sinned.

The teaching that men sinned in Adam directly contradicts the Bible's plain teaching that men sin in themselves and not in someone else, and there is no other way that men can sin. Paul spoke in Romans 5:14 of "them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." Paul referred here to those who had sinned before the giving of the law and so had not sinned against a positive precept as Adam had, but only against the law of conscience and reason. Paul said they were sinners, but the fact that he said they had "not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" shows that Paul did not consider the sin of Adam to be their sin. Then in Romans 9:11, Paul, speaking of Jacob and Esau in the womb of their mother Rebecca, says, "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil..." Now here were two very remarkable children who for thousands of years had been in the loins of ancestors all the way from Adam through Abraham and Isaac, and during all those thousands of years of being in the loins of different ancestors, they had never done anything good
or evil. This astonishing fact is hard to reconcile with the idea that every human being was supposed to have actually sinned in Adam, and that Levi actually paid tithes in Abraham.

Scripture #17 Eph 2:1-3

"And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; 2 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: 3 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 were saved, 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 it NOT what the Bible says. “Born” is not in the passage.

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 our position that people are in sin because of their own conduct, not Adam's conduct.

2. "Nature" here refers to a person's character which comes as a result of repeated practice, not by inheritance. What do you 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.

Scripture #18 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" (1 Co. 15:21-22).
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? 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). As follows, man physically dies due to being separated from this tree. Jesus having the same flesh as ours came under the same physical consequence. He had a body that aged. He had blood cells that died and reproduced. He got tired, hungry, etc. etc.

Odd and Ends

As you can see, none of the verses quoted above was taken out of context and is in harmony with Scripture. There was not one verse that said all babies are born sinners. I use the word "babies," because all adults started off as infants. I don't mind if you disagree, but if you write to me, you must be able to support your doctrine with Scripture, not philosophy and then try to fit it into the Scriptures. "For what saith the Scripture." (Rom. 4:3)

A lot of times the immediate reaction of people when you try to tell them this doctrine of Original Sin/Sinful Nature is a false doctrine is anger, or they can't believe how confused you are that you should turn your back on an established doctrine that has been around for centuries. The fact is, false doctrine has been around for centuries.

The other immediate reaction is to spurt off standards texts, like the ones quoted above. Once you are able to prove this doctrine is false and show how it contradicts other Scripture passages, their philosophy keeps jumping to the surface rather than just take the Scriptures at face value. An honest believer will follow the example of Christians found in Acts 17:11, "These were more noble than those in
Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so."

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's the influence of Greek philosophy that has crept into the Church. See The Influence Of Greek Philosophy On The Development Of Christian Theology.

There Cannot Be An Age Of Accountability

For those who hold to the doctrine that babies are born sinners, there can be no such thing as "age of accountability". If everyone is condemned for the sin of Adam from birth, as they teach, there is no certain age before they become accountable. Why? Because this false doctrine, whether the babies sinned or not, makes them guilty and under God's wrath from birth, period.

Sensing the injustice of this awful doctrine, they have to find a way out of this dilemma! We will be told, "Babies and young children are taken care of by God's grace and go to heaven." Even this type of answer is not satisfactory, for according to Revelation 21:27 nothing defiled shall enter Heaven. So, in answer to this they must say, "But he doesn't take his sinful nature to Heaven with him. It is also taken care of by God's grace." Well, they are apparently unaware of what the Scriptures have to say about the continuation of the established character and personality of the individual. Revelation 22:11 states very plainly that there will not be any change that will take place after death. Also see Proverbs 27:22. Even if the body is destroyed, the foolishness that is part of his character would remain.

To make someone a sinful substance from the time of conception is to attack the character of God. How can you 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 a 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 can't 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 you cannot choose other
than evil, then you cannot be blamed. You have the best of all excuses for continuing in sin.

My dear brothers and sisters, God never made you a sinner against your 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. What do you do with these sample of verses?

“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

“How can someone charge God with making sinful beings in light of the Scriptures above? God didn't make you with a corrupt nature. The Bible is clear that man corrupts himself.

"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. Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people and unwise? Is not he thy father that hath bought thee? Hath he not made thee, and established thee...." Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee." Deuteronomy 32:5-6, 18

Now, why do we 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 duel personality, sinful nature, the Adamic nature, old nature, etc., etc..

But just the same, Original Sin must be protected. As Brother Mike Miller put it,

What are the effects of denying original sin? What other doctrines depend on original sin? What Bible doctrines are put in jeopardy by rejecting original sin? Does throwing out the doctrine of original sin upset the whole biblical idea of forgiveness and atonement for sin? According to one reformed theologian everything depends upon original sin. He said, "Were this Article of faith (Original Sin) taken away, there would be no Original Sin; the promise of Christ would become void, and all the vital force of our religion would be destroyed." Wow! This doctrine really is the foundation for everything to him!

How can they look around them at this world filled with iniquity and say that there is no need of redemption and no need of a Saviour? Why must the doctrine of original sin, as prescribed by the Catholic Church, be true or
there is no need for redemption? “All have sinned and come short of the glory of God” is a very obvious fact, with or without the doctrine of original sin. Sin is a reality in the world we live in. It is pure absurdity to say that unless we accept the doctrine of original sin there is nothing that needs fixing. This world is full of sin and in need of a Saviour, but what it needs is a Saviour that will save them from sinning – not just give them a free ticket to heaven while they continue to live in sin, which is exactly what the doctrine of original sin makes provision for.

The real issue here is the ORIGIN OF SIN. We are taught that sin is part of our physical makeup, and the Bible flatly teaches otherwise. The Bible is clear that a person is born innocent and without any knowledge of good and evil and that we GO ASTRAY, WE TURN ASIDE everyone to his own way. (Ps. 14:3, Eccl. 7:29, Is. 53:6, Matt. 18:12, Rom. 3:12, 2 Pet. 2:15, 1Pet. 2:25.) The Bible is clear that a person is born innocent and corrupts himself to be controlled by his own lusts. 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 won't 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 and prove blood has moral properties.

"For he did put his life in his hand, and slew the Philistine, and the LORD wrought a great salvation for all Israel: thou sawest it, and didst rejoice: wherefore then wilt thou sin against innocent blood, to slay David without a 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's 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 doesn't!), 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."

"Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you."

Precious means of great price; costly; as a precious stone. Highly valued; much esteemed. Nothing in there about moral properties in the blood of Jesus Christ.
Jesus shed his precious blood for our sins. He gave up his life for us. JESUS IS THE LAMB without blemish and without spot. He never sinned!

God is not flesh and blood – He is a 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. We have heard a lot about the sinless blood of Jesus, but the fact is, He was entirely sinless; his hands, his feet, his eyes, his tongue, He was the sinless Saviour, but it wasn’t because his flesh was somehow different than ours. He was tempted “in all points” as we are, but He overcame temptation.

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

As said above, this doctrine of Original sin makes sin as a part of our physical makeup. You will often hear that Adam's sin was imputed to all his posterity. That IN ADAM ALL SINNED. This is not Bible doctrine. It does not say “in Adam all sinned.”

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

"Yet say ye, Why? doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father? When the son hath done that which is lawful and right, and hath kept all my statutes, and hath done them, he shall surely live. The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son....." -Ezekiel 18:19-20

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 word of the LORD came unto me again, saying, What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord GOD, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall
die. But if a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right, ....Hath walked in my statutes, and hath kept my judgments, to deal truly; he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord GOD. If he beget a son that is a robber, a shedder of blood, and that doeth the like to any one of these things, ....shall he then live? he shall not live: he hath done all these abominations; he shall surely die; his blood shall be upon him. Now, lo, if he beget a son, that seeth all his father's sins which he hath done, and considereth, and doeth not such like; he shall not die for the iniquity of his father, he shall surely live.” Ezekiel 18: 1-17

Nowhere in the Bible 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. Romans 9:11 states,

“For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil.”

And,

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

The Bible teaches that unborn children are not sinners, nor are they born saints. To charge children that they are born evil sinners is foreign to the word of God. Additionally, according to Rom 5:13, they are not accountable for Adam's sin because 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. This doctrine certainly is not in the word of God.

We have seen in the word of God that sin is not inherited and nowhere in the Scripture does it say you 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 of something 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.

First and foremost, I am thankful for God's word and I wish to thank the brothers
and sisters whom I have gleaned and compiled this study. You may take this
material and freely distribute to those whom you think will benefit from this study in God's word.

In His Service,

Sandy