

Born Sinners?

Answers to Questions And Objections On the Nature of Christ, Nature of Man and Sin

Prepared by Restitution Ministries

www.acts321.org

For further information please visit;

www.thewordwasmadeflesh.org

Introduction:

The following compilation in this booklet is a result of numerous questions and objections that have arisen from both the proponents of the Original Sin/Born Sinners doctrine, and also those simply seeking for answers.

We have endeavoured to address every Bible verse/inspired statement used to support the Born Sinners teaching, particularly in regards to “Sin” and the “Nature of Christ”.

As one examines the objections quoted in this compilation it becomes unmistakably obvious that those holding and teaching that infants are born sinners do not have one clear Bible verse to support their view. It is also significant to note the term “Born Sinners” is never found in Scripture or the inspired writings of Sister White, not unlike its kindred antichrist heresy the Trinity.

We pray that this compilation will help many come out of the confusion of Babylon’s teaching’s, by standing on the platform of our pioneer’s and the message of 1888.

So as to better understand who the speaker is, we have selected different scripts for each speaker.

Restitution Ministries responses are in this script.

Questions and Objections are in this script.

Bible, Spirit of Prophecy and Pioneer texts are in this script.

CONTENTS

Chapter 1- Short Answers to Questions and Objections

- Was Jesus' nature like ours at birth? p 6
- What sort of mind did Jesus have in His human nature? p 8
- Was the Human Nature of Christ perfectly identical with our own? p 8
- The completeness of His humanity p 9
- Born Sinners- Romans 5:19, Psalm 58:3, Isaiah 48:8 p 9
- Objection - Everyone is born separated from God p 12
- Objection -We sin because we are sinful -Rom 7:14-17 p 13

Chapter 2 -Babies and Children

- Is a baby in need of redemption, yes or no? p 15
- Is a baby lost, because it is born as a human being? p 16
- Objection - The baby needs a saviour? p 17
- Objection - Babies die because of Sin? p 17
- If there would be one newborn who grows up, without ever sinning, is he saved through such "good works"? Doesn't he need a Saviour as well? p 18
- Did Jesus need a Saviour? p 18
- What makes Christ our Saviour, is it only His sinless life and His death for our guilt? p 19
- Is there any difference between Christ and us? p 19

- What does it mean that Christ is the second

- Adam? How do you understand this? p 24
- Infants in heaven (Rachel weeping for her children) p 25
- Moral powers strongly predominate p 26

Chapter 3- Nature of man

- What are these moral powers which are a part of man's nature? p 27
- How can you say that man, from birth, is separated from God, when inspiration says we are endowed (from birth) with moral powers from God? p 27
- Objection - Fallen nature is sin p 28
- Objection - What about Jesus? Jesus was born with fallen flesh – but He had a divine spirit or mind. He never had a carnal mind like us” p 29
- Objection - the carnal mind is sin p 32

Chapter 4 - Nature of Christ

- What about Jesus? p 36
- Objection - Phil 2:5 - “Let this mind be in you” p 38
- Objection - It is absolutely impossible to do anything good from birth p 39
- Objection - Hebrews 2:11 p 41

Chapter 5-Where Christ began

- Objection -Christ began where Adam first began p 47

Chapter 6 -What Is Sin? p 52

- Objection - “I am carnal sold under sin” p 52
- Objection -Romans 3:23 - “all have sinned” p 55

Chapter 7 - What does God hate?	p 57
• God hates sin not the Sinner	p 57
Chapter 8 - Psalm 51:5	p 60
Chapter 9 - Scriptural objections	
• Romans 5:12-21	p 63
• Romans 3:9, 10	p 66
• Psalms 58:1- 4	p 68
• Minor Objections -Job 4:17, Job 14:4, Job 15:14, Galatians 4:4, Job 25:4, Romans 3:23	p 70
Chapter 10 - Propensities	
• Do not set Him before the people as a man with the propensities of sin	p 72
• What is the difference between "propensities <u>Of</u> sin" and "propensities <u>to</u> sin"?	p 78
• Explain -A taint of or inclination to corruption	p 82
Chapter 11 - Hebrews 7:26	
• The Priesthood of Christ and the 1888 Message	p 85
• Jesus was Born-Born again?	p 92
Chapter 12 - Reformers	
• Misunderstanding of Righteousness by Faith	p 93
Chapter 13 - Lawful Prey of the Enemy	p 95
Chapter 14- Acceptance of Scriptural evidence	p 103

Chapter 1 - Short Answers to Questions and Objections

- *Was Jesus' nature like ours at birth?*

*“Bear in mind that Christ's overcoming and obedience is that of a true human being. In our conclusions, we make many mistakes because of our erroneous views of the human nature of our Lord. When we give, to **His human nature**, a power that it is not possible for man to have in his conflicts with Satan, we destroy the **completeness of His humanity**.” {6MR 341.2}*

*“The Lord Jesus came to our world, not to reveal what a God could do, but what a man could do, through faith in God's power to help in every emergency... The Lord now demands that every son and daughter of Adam through faith in Jesus Christ, **serve Him in human nature which we now have**.” {6MR 341.4}*

*Romans 8:3 “For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of **sinful flesh**, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:”*

Jesus here condemns sin in the same flesh as we have. But how much was Jesus like us in the flesh?

*Hebrews 2:14 “**Forasmuch**(G1893) then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise **took part of the same**; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;”*

Strong's concordance: **Forasmuch**= G1893 (as much as) this means that just as much as we are partakers of flesh, Jesus took part of the same.

*Hebrews 2:16 "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him **the seed of Abraham.**" How human was Abraham?*

*Hebrews 2:17 "Wherefore **in all things** it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people."*

*Hebrews 4:15 "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was **in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.**"*

"As one of us He was to give an example of obedience. For this He took upon Himself our nature, and passed through our experiences. "In all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren." Hebrews 2:17. If we had to bear anything which Jesus did not endure, then upon this point Satan would represent the power of God as insufficient for us. Therefore Jesus was "in all points tempted like as we are." Hebrews 4:15. He endured every trial to which we are subject. And He exercised in His own behalf no power that is not freely offered to us. As man, He met temptation, and overcame in the strength given Him from God." {DA 24.2}

- *What sort of mind did Jesus have in His human nature?*

*“A human body, a human mind, with all the peculiar properties, He was bone, brain, and muscle. A man of our flesh, He was compassed with the weakness of humanity... He trod our earth as man. **He had reason, conscience, memory, will, and affections of the human soul** which was united with His divine nature.”—16MR 181, 182. {TA 157.1}*

*“Christ did in reality unite the **offending nature of man** with his own sinless nature,” {RH, July 17, 1900 par. 8}*

*Rom 1:3 “Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of **the seed of David** according to the **flesh**;” How human was David?*

- *Was the Human Nature of Christ perfectly identical with our own?*

*“As God He could not be tempted: but as a man He could be tempted, and that strongly, and could yield to the temptations... **His human nature was created**; it did not even possess the angelic powers. **It was human, identical with our own.**” {6MR 111.1}*

*Remember; “We are led to make wrong conclusions because of erroneous views of the nature of our Lord. To attribute to his nature a power that it is not possible for man to have in his conflicts with Satan, is to **destroy the completeness of his humanity.**” {Signs of the Times 10 April 1893}*

- *The completeness of His humanity.*

“The completeness of His humanity, the perfection of His divinity, form for us a strong ground upon which we may be brought into reconciliation with God. It was when we were yet sinners that Christ died for us. We have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins. His nail-pierced hands are outreached toward heaven and earth. With one hand He lays hold of sinners upon earth, and with the other He grasps the throne of the Infinite, and thus He makes reconciliation for us. Christ is today standing as our Advocate before the Father. He is the one Mediator between God and man. Bearing the marks of His crucifixion, He pleads the causes of our souls.”-- Letter 35, 1894.

- *Born Sinners- Romans 5:19, Psalm 58:3, Isaiah 48:8*

Objection *-I believe that we are born sinners because of what Romans 5:19, Psalm 58:3 and Isaiah 48:8 say.*

Rom 5:19 does not say we are born sinners, that is your interpretation.

Rom 5:19 says; *“For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.”*

If you want to interpret *“many were made sinners”* to mean we are all born sinners, then you should use the same interpretation for the rest of the verse, which says *“shall*

many be made righteous.” You cannot escape this conclusion. This means by your rule of interpretation the second part of the verse teaches all are born righteous. This Brother wants to interpret the word “*many*” to mean all, therefore teaching all were made sinners, (at birth) and in reference to the second part of the verse, they say; only those who accept Christ are made righteous, once again they contradict themselves, because if they want to interpret “*many*” to mean all, then as we stated, they have to interpret it the same way for “*many*” meaning “all” are made righteous. According to his interpretation, we can use the same verse to teach “all” are born righteous.

The truth in both interpretations are **incorrect**, the verse means exactly what it says. Paul did not use the word “all” as in the previous verse but the word “*many*”. In verse 18 the meaning of the word “*justification*” is acquittal. Rom 5:18 is the key to understanding this passage. Christ took away the condemnation that came upon “*all men*” through Adam’s disobedience, “*even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.*” This too, means exactly what it says. “*All men*” are justified/acquitted through Christ, not just the saved, but “*all men*”, the same “*all men*” condemned by Adam. This took place in Eden, not at the cross, (please see Original Sin Are we Born Sinners pt1.)

“As soon as there was sin, there was a Saviour. Christ knew that He would have to suffer, yet He became man's substitute. As soon as Adam sinned, the Son of God presented Himself as surety for the human race, with just as much power to avert the doom pronounced upon the guilty as when He died

upon the cross of Calvary” (Ibid., March 12, 1901). {IBC 1084.8}

Therefore all men come into the world acquitted of all charges and justified before God. This is what Rom 5:18 teaches. Christ has set every man free to choose whom he will serve. Rom 5:19 begins with the word “*For*”. Paul is here following the same argument from verse 18, but in Vs. 19 he uses the word “*many*” instead of “*all*” men.

Even though the condemnation has been removed in Vs18, “*many*” will still choose to follow the path of disobedient Adam. Therefore Paul states “*For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners,*” Rom 5:19, on the other hand “*so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.*” Rom 5:19

This is what Rom 5:19 is teaching, “*many*” means “*many*” not “*all*”. Those who want to interpret “*all*” are born sinners from this verse, are putting their own preconceived idea into the verse.

Ps. 58:3; Isa.58:8; Both these verses are speaking in figurative language about God’s stubborn and rebellious people, for example - Ps 58:1, God is speaking to rebellious Israel, and in verse 2 he says; “*Yea in heart ye work wickedness*”, he talks about their “*violence*”, then in verses 3+4 he says;

Psalm 58:3 “The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.”

Psalm 58:4 “Their poison is like the poison of a serpent: they are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear;”

Notice the wicked He is referring to is the rebellious congregation of Israel, Verse 1. This is figurative language. God is describing how rebellious His people were from the very beginning. It is not speaking about babies being born. Can a baby speak lies? Can a baby speak at all? And is a baby's word like the poison of a serpent? Some of the people that teach born sinners have a very strange understanding of God and the children He brings into the world. We must remember God is the Father and Creator of every child.

Isa 48:8 is very similar to Ps 58:3. God is speaking to Israel, "*the house of Jacob*" (Vs. 1) God tells them they are "*obstinate*" "*and thy neck is an iron sinew*". Once again God is speaking about the stiff-necked, rebellious and stubborn ways from the beginning. That's why He says "*Thou was called a transgressor from the womb*" Vs. 8. Once again this verse is not speaking about babies being born transgressors. There is not a verse in the Bible that teaches babies are born sinners, and EGW never once used this term. No one can intelligently read these 2 passages Ps 58:1-4 and Isa 48:1-8 and conclude what these brethren teach.

- ***Objection -Everyone is born separated from God.***

This statement is untrue; this is what the pagans believe, and also what the devil would have us believe. Romans 5:18, 2 Corinthians 5:19, John 1:9 all teach we come into this world acquitted, justified and reconciled to God.

John 1:9 says "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world".

This is a very straight forward and plain verse; it says Christ is there to light every man that cometh into the world. This means from birth. So much for teaching; *“Everyone is born separated from God”*. Please view Original Sin part 3, especially the last 30 minutes, for some amazing inspired statements regarding how children come into this world.

- ***Objection -We sin because we are sinful.
Romans 7: 14-17***

While it's certainly true we sin because we are sinful, this does not mean that sinful nature is sin; that is a Catholic antichrist teaching. Sin is the transgression of the law; it is not your nature. Jesus had our sinful nature but never sinned. These brethren believe sinful nature is itself sin, that's why they seek to change Christ's nature.

“Now, we want to understand what sin is--that it is the transgression of God's law. This is the only definition given in the Scriptures.” {FW 56.1}

“Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.” This is the only definition of sin given in the Holy Scriptures, and we should seek to understand what sin is, lest any of us be found in opposition to the God of heaven.” {RH, July 15, 1890 par. 2}

“Sin is the transgression of the law.” This is the only definition of sin. Without the law there can be no transgression. “By the law is the knowledge of sin.”(MS 27, 1899). {7BC 951.3} (Not by birth)

When you have the correct definition of sin, everything harmonises and you don't need to change the nature of Christ. The brethren teach the carnal nature is sin and they quote Romans 7 as the Brother has done here. But we are still carnal now; the converted Christian still has a carnal mind, but it is kept subdued by his constant surrender to the Spirit. If the carnal mind is sin then the converted Christian is still a sinner. The carnal aspect of our nature is only removed at the 2nd coming when the saints are glorified. Also notice this inspired statement; Sister White quotes Romans 7:7-14, verse 14 is saying; *"But I am carnal sold under sin"*, the born sinners camp take great delight in this verse, and with it try to teach our nature is sin. But notice what the SOP says after quoting these verses;

"What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came [home to the conscience], sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which [if obeyed] was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is [a yoke of bondage, against me, and something to be trampled underfoot because it points out my sins?--No.] holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.

For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin." "But though we are carnal, we are to reckon ourselves "dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord". . . . {ST, October 1, 1894 par. 4}

Notice how the prophet correctly interprets Rom 7:14 She says "*we are carnal*", you see your carnal nature doesn't change, but it is kept dead by constant surrender and "*we are to reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin*". When she says "*we*" she includes herself and every Christian, we are still carnal, but through Christ we are not sinning.

Also keep in mind Lucifer, Adam and Eve all sinned while possessing a sinless/unfallen nature. Therefore nature is not sin; sin is the transgression of the law. They sinned by choosing to disobey God with an unfallen nature.

Chapter 2 -Babies and Children

- *Is a baby in need of redemption, yes or no?*

Yes, but the question that needs to be asked is, "from what", sin or the effects of sin? Why?

When we understand the difference between sin and the effects of sin, we will understand a new born baby does not need a Saviour from sin, it has not committed any sin by being born, nor has it inherited sin, (but rather its consequences, i.e. sinful nature). It needs a Saviour from the effects of sin. A baby is born fallen depraved and mortal and this depraved mortal state cannot enter Heaven, nor stand in God's presence, as Jesus said; flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. But those who teach a baby who dies at

birth needs a Saviour from sin instead of, from the effects of sin, are teaching Original Sin doctrine. In fact those who teach we are born sinners do not only teach a child is a sinner from birth, but also that it sinned in Adam 6000 years ago, this too is Original Sin teaching.

- *Is a baby lost, because it is born a human being?*

No; babies are not born lost, we are born on probation, and it is when our probation ends that we are saved or lost, not at birth. Some teach babies are born lost; this is a denial of the SOP and Romans 5:18.

For example;

“Children should be taught that they are only probationers here, and educated to become inhabitants of the mansions which Christ is preparing for those who love Him and keep His commandments. This is the highest duty which parents have to perform.” {AH 146.2}

“Let us not lose sight of the fact that we are probationers here, on test and trial, and that everything is at stake, to be lost or won. Individually we are daily deciding our own destiny either for eternal life or eternal death.” {YI, September 7, 1893 p. 1}

The Bible only teaches 3 ways you are lost and it is not at birth;

1. When you die.
2. Close of probation.
3. Committing the unpardonable sin.

- ***Objection -The baby needs a Saviour?***

Yes, the baby needs a Saviour, as stated above, but not from sin, it has not committed any sin, Romans 9:11

Romans 9:11 “(For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;)”

- ***Objection -Babies die because of Sin***

Babies die - because of sin, consequences of Adam. That sin is still called the transgression of the law.

We need to ask you; the sin which you are referring to, is it Adams or the babies?

- a. If it is the Babies sin, then you believe in Original Sin.
- b. If it is Adam’s sin, then the baby is not born a sinner, but receives the consequences of Adam’s sin, which is a sinful nature, mortality and death, which is what we believe.

Everything in this world is suffering under the curse of sin and needs a Saviour, that’s why Christ bore the crown of thorns, He bore the curse of the whole world, He redeemed not only man, but also nature itself.

- **Question -** *If there would be one newborn, who grows up, without ever sinning, is he saved through such "good works"? Doesn't he need a Saviour, as well?*

This question is not relevant; the Bible says "*all have sinned*" and the "*wages of sin is death*" we all need a Saviour. The question should be, is a child judged a sinner from birth, or when it transgresses the law? If you answer a sinner from birth, you contradict the Bible and SOP, plus you must change Christ's nature and deny He truly partook of our flesh; this is the spirit of antichrist. Nor can you have a correct understanding of Righteousness by Faith, (RBF) because you do not have an example, Jesus says;

Rev 3:21 "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne."

- **Question -** *Did Jesus need a Saviour?*

No,

Why? Because He never sinned,

But did He not partake of our fallen nature? Yes.

Can you see the difference between Nature and sin?

What about Lucifer in Heaven as a Holy Angel, or Adam before the fall, what caused their sin? Their nature? No, they had a Holy nature, it was the choice they made; so it was with Christ in our fallen nature, He never exercised His free will against His Father's law.

- **Question -***What makes Christ our Saviour, is it only His sinless life and His death for our guilt?*

No. His sinless life and death was not enough to redeem us, otherwise God could have sent an Angel. Christ was fully divine and fully human. In His divinity He paid for our sins, in His humanity He saves us from our sins, Rom 5:9-10, Heb 9:14, Acts 20:28 and;

“In all the fullness of His divinity, in all the glory of His spotless humanity, Christ gave Himself for us as a full and free sacrifice,” {FW 85.1}

- **Question -***Is there any difference between Christ and us?*

Yes, He is the divine Son of God. And He never ceased to be God.

“But although Christ's divine glory was for a time veiled and eclipsed by His assuming humanity, yet He did not cease to be God when He became man.”

“The human did not take the place of the divine, nor the divine of the human. This is the mystery of godliness. The two expressions "human" and "divine" were, in Christ, closely and inseparably one, and yet they had a distinct individuality. Though Christ humbled Himself to become man, the Godhead was still His own. His deity could not be lost while He stood faithful and true to His loyalty. Surrounded with sorrow, suffering, and moral pollution, despised and rejected by the

people to whom had been intrusted the oracles of heaven, Jesus could yet speak of Himself as the Son of man in heaven. He was ready to take once more His divine glory when His work on earth was done.” {5BC 1129.3}

“In the fullness of time He was to be revealed in human form. He was to take His position at the head of humanity by taking the nature but not the sinfulness of man. In heaven was heard the voice, "The Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord."--The Signs of the Times, May 29, 1901. {7ABC 447.1}

SOP is clear that;*“He took upon his sinless nature our sinful nature, that He might know how to succor those that are tempted.”--Medical Ministry, p. 181. {7ABC 450.5}*

He [Christ] was to take His position at the head of humanity by taking the nature but not the sinfulness of man. In heaven was heard the voice, "The Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord" (ST May 29, 1901). {7BC 925.4}

Clearly Jesus took our sinful nature, but “*the sinfulness of man*” refers to propensities of sin/ defilement of sin, which He never had nor experienced.

This sentence is found in 7BC 925 where only one other sentence of context is included. One thing we know for sure, EGW is not contradicting her numerous other statements on the nature of Christ. In harmony with her general teachings, EGW is simply saying that Christ took upon His sinless nature our sinful nature, “*but not the sinfulness of man.*” “*The sinfulness of man*” would be man’s sinning. In this He did not

participate. Also take note; “*His sinless nature*” refers to His divine nature and the “*sinful nature*” His human nature. This answer covers the following statements as well.

“In taking upon Himself man's nature in its fallen condition, Christ did not in the least participate in its sin. He was subject to the infirmities and weaknesses by which man is encompassed, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." He was touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and was in all points tempted like as we are. And yet He "knew no sin." He was the Lamb "without blemish and without spot." Could Satan in the least particular have tempted Christ to sin, he would have bruised the Saviour's head. As it was, he could only touch His heel. Had the head of Christ been touched, the hope of the human race would have perished. Divine wrath would have come upon Christ as it came upon Adam. . . . We should have no misgivings in regard to the perfect sinlessness of the human nature of Christ.”-- The SDA Bible Commentary, vol. 5, p. 1131. 7ABC 447.3}

Notice how “*participate in its sin*” is paralleled with “*He knew no sin.*” We have all chosen to participate in sin, Christ did not. It is not your nature that condemns you a sinner, but your thoughts and actions. Notice how well this is explained in the following statement;

“Christ took our nature, fallen but not corrupted, and would not be corrupted unless He received the words of Satan in the place of the words of God”.—Manuscript 57, 1890 (Manuscript Releases, vol. 16, pp. 180-183). {CTr 208.7}

“Christ was put to the closest test, requiring the strength of all His faculties to resist the inclination when in danger, to use His power to deliver Himself from peril, and triumph over the power of the prince of darkness.” (RH April 1, 1875). {7BC 930.2}

If Christ had “yielded” to this “inclination” the yielding would have been sin. He was tempted to protect Himself “when in danger” “to use His power to deliver Himself from peril.” If He had yielded to this inclination, He would have broken the covenant He made with His Father and would have sinned. We could give more examples of this, e.g., the wilderness temptation and Matthew 16:22-23 that clearly reveal Jesus had to battle the inclination or propensity to disobey/sin against His Father. Notice also the following statements;

“Adam was tempted by the enemy, and he fell. It was not indwelling sin which caused him to yield; for God made him pure and upright, in His own image. He was as faultless as the angels before the throne. There were in him no corrupt principles, no tendencies to evil. But when Christ came to meet the temptations of Satan, He bore "the likeness of sinful flesh." {BEcho, September 3, 1900 par. 10}

“The Son of God humbled Himself and took man's nature after the race had wandered four thousand years from Eden, and from their original state of purity and uprightness. Sin had been making its terrible marks upon the race for ages; and physical, mental, and moral degeneracy prevailed throughout the human family. When Adam was assailed by the tempter in Eden he was without the taint of sin. . . . Christ, in the

wilderness of temptation, stood in Adam's place to bear the test he failed to endure.”--*The Review and Herald*, July 28, 1874. {7ABC 448.1}

*“Avoid every question in relation to the humanity of Christ which is liable to be misunderstood. Truth lies close to the track of presumption. In treating upon the humanity of Christ, you need to guard strenuously every assertion, lest your words be taken to mean more than they imply, and thus you lose or dim the clear perceptions of His humanity as combined with divinity. His birth was a miracle of God. . . . Never, in any way, leave the slightest impression upon human minds that a taint of, or inclination to, corruption rested upon Christ, or that He in any way yielded to corruption. He was tempted in all points like as man is tempted, yet He is called "that holy thing." It is a mystery that is left unexplained to mortals that Christ could be tempted in all points like as we are, and yet be without sin. The incarnation of Christ has ever been, and will ever remain, a mystery. That which is revealed, is for us and for our children, but let every human being be warned from the ground of making Christ altogether human, such an one as ourselves; for it cannot be.”--*The SDA Bible Commentary*, vol. 5, pp. 1128, 1129. {7ABC 448.2}*

Without the taint of sin means not having sinned, that's what is meant by the words; *“Never, in any way, leave the slightest impression upon human minds that a taint of, or inclination to, corruption rested upon Christ, or that He in any way yielded to corruption.”* Jesus never yielded to self; therefore He was never tainted with sin. The letter above is called the “Baker

Letter” EGW repeatedly counsels Baker that Christ never sinned;

“Not once did Christ step on Satan's ground,” {13MR 19.3}

As we have seen Jesus had to deny self; the inward inclination to put self first. He clearly fought propensities/inclinations to put self first, which is sin, but He never yielded to this weakness, (law of sin)thus He “condemned sin in the flesh,” this is why it says; *“Do not set Him before the people as a man with the propensities of sin.”*

- **Question -What does it mean that Christ is the second Adam? How do you understand this?**

Christ took Adam’s place at the head of humanity. In other words as the first Adam condemned us all, so the second Adam freed us of that condemnation. We come into this world innocent and justified before God, because of what Christ promised in Eden and fulfilled at the cross. This is what is meant by Isa 9:6, He is our everlasting Father, and Romans 5:17-19, 1 Corinthians 15:22-23, 45-47.

*Romans 5:18 “Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one **the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.**”*

*2Corinthians 5:19 “To wit, that **God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them;** and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.”*

1Timothy 4:10 “For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living **God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe.**”

Before we were born, He took responsibility for us and gave man a second chance. In Gen 3:15, in the Garden of Eden, Christ promised to take our sins and defeat Satan. By this promise man was freed from any condemnation of Adam’s sin. He was acquitted of all charges and justified before God, plus man was promised help. Christ promised to put enmity in man, a hatred for sin that would help man in his conflict with Satan. It is not true that we come into this world hopeless lost and condemned, Christ is the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. The Bible says He is the Saviour of all men. No one is born lost, but a free moral agent on probation. Yet we know that not all men will be saved because the majority will not adhere to the conditions of the Gospel, as Waggoner says; they spurn the gift so freely offered them.

- ***Infants in Heaven; (Rachel weeping for her children)***

1. *Matthew 2:17, 18: “Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, **Rachel weeping [for] her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.**”*

2. *Jeremiah 31:15,16: “Thus saith the LORD; A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation, [and] bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her*

children, because **they [were] not**. Thus saith the LORD; **Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the LORD; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy.**”

3. Deuteronomy 1:39: “Moreover your little ones, which ye said should be a prey, and your children, which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil, they shall go in thither, and **unto them will I give it, and they shall possess it.**”

SOP: "We passed through the woods, for we were on our way to Mount Zion. As we were travelling along, we met a company who were also gazing at the glories of the place. I noticed red as a border on their garments; their crowns were brilliant; their robes were pure white. As we greeted them, I asked Jesus who they were? He said they were martyrs that had been slain for him. With them was an **innumerable company** of little ones; they had a hem of red on their garments also. [Jeremiah 31:15-17. Matthew 2:18.]" {WLF 17.1}

- **Moral powers strongly predominate**

“In some children the moral powers strongly predominate. They have power of will to control their minds and actions. In others the animal passions are almost irresistible. To meet these diverse temperaments, which frequently appear in the same family, fathers, as well as mothers, need patience and wisdom from the divine Helper. There is not so much to be gained by punishing children for their transgressions, as by

teaching them the folly and heinousness of their sin, understanding their secret inclinations, and laboring to bend them toward the right.” {HR, October 1, 1877 par. 3}

Chapter 3- Nature of man

*“The nature of man is threefold, and the training enjoined by Solomon comprehends the right development of the physical, intellectual, and **moral powers.**” {CG 39.1}*

Question; *What are these moral powers which are a part of man’s nature?*

“The great moral powers of the soul are faith, hope, and love.” {GW92 91.2}

Can you see the sinful/carnal nature is not sin? Our nature, though fallen, also comprises of the great moral powers of the soul, that’s why the people in Romans 2:14-15 are keeping God’s law even though they have never heard of God’s law or His requirements.

Question - How can you say that man from birth is separated from God, when inspiration says we are endowed (from birth) with moral powers from God?

Also, *John 1:9 declares; “That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world”.*

This verse clearly teaches Jesus the true light is there to light every man that cometh (born) into the world. So how can you teach we are born separated from God?

- ***Objection - Fallen sinful nature is sin.***

This is what the Original Sin doctrine falsely teaches. We just read from inspiration that “*we are carnal*” and she was speaking about herself and other converted Christians. You say this nature is sin, therefore according to you a converted Christian is still a sinner. And what is worse still, you have to acknowledge that God creates us as sinners. And you also contradict Ezekiel 18:20, because you teach a child inherits sin from its parents. And then, you deny you believe in Original Sin.

You are teaching that the fallen sinful nature is sin - this is Original Sin (OS) teaching, this is exactly where OS doctrine developed from. Augustine believed fallen human nature is itself sin, therefore Rome had to develop the Immaculate Conception to change Christ's nature.

Those who have permitted their minds to become beclouded in regard to what constitutes sin are fearfully deceived. Unless they make a decided change they will be found wanting when God pronounces judgment upon the children of men. They have transgressed the law and broken the everlasting covenant, and they will receive according to their works. {9T 267.1}

He who does not obey the commandments of God is a sinner in the sight of God. {ST, June 20, 1895 par. 5}

- *Objection-What about Jesus? Jesus was born with fallen flesh - but He had a divine spirit or mind. He never had a carnal mind like us."*

This is Immaculate Conception teaching; you just cut Christ off from all humanity. You're confusing His Divinity with His humanity. Christ was fully Divine and fully human, but both natures retained their essential character and properties, notice the following statement.

"His finite nature was pure and spotless, but the divine nature that led Him to say to Philip, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father" also, was not humanized; neither was humanity deified by the blending or union of the two natures; each retained its essential character and properties." {16MR 182.1}

And the "*properties*" of His human nature were the same as ours; they were fallen, meaning self would seek to prevail. Notice the following statement;

*"A human body, a **human mind**, with all the peculiar properties, He was bone, brain, and muscle. A man of our flesh, He was compassed with the weakness of humanity. The circumstances of His life were of that character that He was exposed to all the inconveniences that belong to men, not in wealth, not in ease, but in poverty and want and humiliation. He breathed the very air man must breathe. He trod our earth as man. He had reason, conscience, memory, **will**, and*

affections of the human soul which was united with His divine nature.” {16MR 181.4}

Inspiration declares Jesus had a human mind and will. But you gave Jesus a fallen flesh/body, combined with a divine mind; by this teaching you make Christ a hybrid. We agree that Jesus was fully Divine on earth, but you are giving Him a human body with a divine mind. But the above statement clearly states *“both natures retained their essential character and properties,”* Notice it goes on to say, *“neither was humanity deified by the blending or union of the two natures,”* this is exactly what you have done, you have deified His human nature by giving Him a divine mind, and your teaching destroys the completeness of His humanity. Notice the following statement;

“Bear in mind that Christ's overcoming and obedience is that of a true human being. In our conclusions, we make many mistakes because of our erroneous views of the human nature of our Lord. When we give to His human nature a power that it is not possible for man to have in his conflicts with Satan, we destroy the completeness of His humanity. His imputed grace and power He gives to all who receive Him by faith. The obedience of Christ to His Father was the same obedience that is required of man.” {3SM 139.4}

We have clearly seen that Jesus had a human mind and will, therefore His overcoming and obedience is an example for us, but you have given His humanity a Divine mind; you have just given *“His human nature a power that it is not possible*

for man to have in his conflicts with Satan” because we are not born with a Divine mind.

As the statement says; these “*mistakes*” and “*erroneous views of the human nature of our Lord,*” are because of your misunderstanding of sin. When we stay within inspiration regarding the true definition of sin, we don’t have to change Christ’s nature as you have done and we can accept “*that Christ’s overcoming and obedience is that of a true human being,*” and “*The obedience of Christ to His Father was the same obedience that is required of man.*”

You wrote; “*Jesus was born with fallen flesh - but He had a divine spirit or mind.*” If you give to Jesus on His human side a Divine mind how do you answer the following statement?

“The human will of Christ would not have led him to the wilderness of temptation, to fast, and to be tempted of the devil. It would not have led him to endure humiliation, scorn, reproach, suffering, and death. His human nature shrank from all these things as decidedly as ours shrinks from them.” {ST, October 29, 1894 par. 9}

Once again we see Christ in His humanity had a human mind and a human will and like the rest of us His “*human will*” would seek to please or protect self. We are just mentioning a few contradictions that **you** bring in. You must understand; there has to be harmony, with the Bible and SOP regarding the nature of Christ. **Your view** contradicts both.

- **Objection -*The carnal mind is sin***

Although the carnal mind is not in harmony with God nor indeed can be, but it depends on how we define the carnal mind. We have already seen from inspiration that as Christians we are carnal, and Sister White is speaking about the mind when she says “*we are carnal*”, because she goes on to say “*we are to reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin*”. This reckoning takes place in the mind. So it is not the carnal mind that separates us from God, but rather the “minding” of the carnal mind, (see Rom 8:6-7 marginal reading), because as the prophet says we are still carnal now. It is not the carnal/fallen nature that separates us from God, but the yielding to it that brings sin and separation from God, (see also Jam 1:14). Notice also the following statement;

*“The lower passions have their seat in the body and work through it. The words “flesh” or “fleshly” or “carnal lusts” embrace the lower, corrupt nature; **the flesh of itself cannot act contrary to the will of God.** We are commanded to crucify the flesh, with the affections and lusts. How shall we do it? ...**The corrupt thought is to be expelled.** Every thought is to be brought into captivity to Jesus Christ.” {AH 127.2}*

You should control your thoughts..... Yet God requires this of you; it is a duty resting upon every accountable being. You are responsible to God for your thoughts. If you indulge in vain imaginations, permitting your mind to dwell upon impure subjects, you are, in a degree, as guilty before God as if your thoughts were carried into action. All that prevents the action is the lack of opportunity. {2T 561.1}

This is exactly what we are saying; “*the flesh*” which she says is the “*corrupt nature*” and “*carnal lusts*” which of course apply to the carnal mind. SOP declares “***cannot act contrary to the will of God***”. The carnal mind can only **act** contrary to the will of God when we indulge the thought, as previously stated. It is not the carnal/fallen nature that separates us from God, but the responding to its leading that brings sin and separation from God. If we do not respond to the wrong thought, we have not sinned; we have not acted “***contrary to the will of God***”. As the statement says “***The corrupt thought is to be expelled***”. To insist that the carnal mind is itself sin is Original Sin teaching. Once again you cannot, with this reasoning, harmonise the above statement, or the earlier statement that rightly states, we are still carnal. You are teaching that a child from birth is separated from God, I quote; “*neither do we become separated from God after our first bad deed - we are born this way*”. This also is Original Sin/Catholic teaching. If you teach we are separated from God, how do you answer the following verses?

Psalm 139:13 “For thou hast possessed my reins: thou hast covered me in my mother's womb.”

Notice what the word “covered” means;(H5526)A primitive root; properly to entwine as a screen; by implication **to fence in, cover over, (figuratively) protect:** - **cover, defence, defend, hedge in, join together, set, shut up.**

You say we are born separated from God, this verse says even before birth, from the womb, God is covering us, protecting us, defending us, hedging us in, **joining us together with Him!**

Psalm 127:3 “Lo, children are heritage of the LORD: and the fruit of the womb is his reward.”

Notice what the word heritage means; (H5159)FromH5157 (in its usual sense); properly something inherited, that is, (abstractly) occupancy, or (concretely) an heirloom; generally an estate, patrimony or portion: - heritage, to inherit, inheritance, possession. Compare H5158.

The scripture says that children (whom you say are separated from God) are an inheritance from God, are a possession from God, and a reward from Him. Question - how can you inherit something from God if it is separated from God? And how can you receive a reward from God when it (the reward) is against God?

The scripture teaches in; *John 1:9 “That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world”*. How can you teach we are separated from God when this verse says Jesus lights every man that is born into the world? You teach that a child is born separated from God because of its nature, how do you answer the following statement?

“Love to Jesus, trust, repose, confidence, are all qualities that agree with the child's nature.” {CG 486.3}

This inspired statement says the exact opposite to what you wrote. You say a child's nature is against, and separated, from God; but inspiration declares the child's nature has

qualities like *“Love to Jesus, trust, repose, confidence”*, so how can you say the child’s nature is against God?

Inspiration says these Godly qualities *“agree with the child's nature”*. The word *“agree”* is the opposite of against; like we said you are teaching the exact opposite to what inspiration declares.

The point you made that we need to be born again is irrelevant to this discussion. The born again experience is for the sinner, it requires recognition of one’s sins, penitence, repentance and faith in the Saviour. A new born baby is incapable of all of the above and it has nothing to repent of. It is because you believe babies are born sinners that you claim that they need to be born again. If a baby dies at one day old, what has it done that requires a born again experience? Of course nothing. Nor can anyone else impart a born again experience to an infant, for it requires the consent of the will and the conditions outlined above. This teaching is also subtle Catholic error, requiring some type of ordinance to cleanse a new born infant of sin.

If you look up the dictionary meaning of Original Sin, you will see it means total depravity, which means the utter inability to do anything good. This is what you are saying;

“We are not capable to do any good or keep God’s Commandments the way we are born,”

While we agree that we need a spiritual rebirth in order to keep God’s commandments, this does not mean that until then, we cannot do anything good.

Question - if man is not born with the spirit of God and Christ is not there to enlighten man in the right path, how does that

man come to desire repentance and conversion? Can you see how they have destroyed the gospel and Christ's work in every soul the moment they come into the world? See also Titus 2:11.

Chapter 4 - Nature of Christ

What about Jesus? Jesus was born with fallen flesh - but He had a divine spirit or mind. He never had a carnal mind like us.

"Now as to Christ's not having "like passions" with us: In the Scriptures all the way through He is like us and with us according to the flesh. He is the seed of David according to the flesh. He was made in the likeness of sinful flesh. Don't go too far. He was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, not in the likeness of sinful mind. Do not drag His mind into it. His flesh was our flesh, but the mind was "the mind of Christ Jesus." Therefore it is written: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." If He had taken our mind, how, then, could we ever have been exhorted to "let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus?" It would have been so already. But what kind of mind is ours? O, it is corrupted with sin also. Look at ourselves in the second chapter of Ephesians, beginning with the first verse and reading to the third, but the third verse is the one that has this particular point in it." {February 25, 1895 ATJ, GCB 327.1}

We also can quote Jones and Waggoner, especially on this subject. In fact we have a small compilation entitled "What is

Sin Are We Born Sinners” which harmonises many of the pioneer’s statements regarding this subject. If you are going to quote any of the pioneers, you must make sure they don’t contradict inspiration. We have seen Jesus had a human mind and will; this statement you quoted contradicts both SOP and the Bible. AT Jones also contradicts himself; here he is saying Jesus had a different mind to us, but notice how he contradicts himself in the following statement;

*“Then Satan took Jesus upon an exceeding high mountain and showed Him all the glory of them too--the glory, the honor, the dignity--he showed Him all that. **And there at that moment there was stirred up all the ambition that ever appeared in Napoleon or Caesar or Alexander or all of them put together.** But from Jesus still the answer is: "It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."* {February 25, 1895 ATJ, GCB 327.5}

Do your own research and see what the SOP says about ambition. How can he on one hand say; “do not drag his mind into it” and then a little later state that in Jesus’ mind **“was stirred up all the ambition that ever appeared in Napoleon or Caesar or Alexander or all of them put together.”** The very statement you quoted from to try and show **“He had a divine spirit or mind”** condemns your own conclusion, for from the article he states; in Jesus rose up all the ambition of three of the **most violent and ambitious** men that ever lived! And what’s worse is, he says; the ambition of **“all of them put together”**. Dear brother I hope you don’t believe for a moment that there was ever for a moment in Jesus’ mind, the ambition of all these wicked and violent men put together.

- **Objection - “Let this mind be in you” Phil 2:5**

The word “*mind*” in Philippians 2:5 is a “verb” (G5426) not a noun;

Transliteration - phroneō (**G54260**) - Part of Speech; **“verb”**

1) To have understanding, be wise

2) To feel, to think

a) To have an opinion of one's self, think of one's self, to be modest, not let one's opinion (though just) of himself exceed the bounds of modesty

b) To think or judge what one's opinion is

c) To be of the same mind i.e. agreed together, cherish the same views, be harmonious

3) To direct one's mind to a thing, to seek, to strive for

a) To seek one's interest or advantage

b) To be of one's party, side with him (in public affairs)

Phi 2:5 Have this mind among yourselves, which is yours in Christ Jesus: RSV

Phi 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: NIV

Phi 2:5 Have the same attitude that Christ Jesus had: GW

Phi 2:5 Have this in your mind, which was also in Messiah Yeshua: HNV

Phi 2:5 Make your own attitude that of Christ Jesus: CSB

Phi 2:5 You should think in the same way Christ Jesus does: NIRV

Phi 2:5 Your attitude should be the same that Christ Jesus had: NLT

Notice how in the following statement AT Jones correctly connects sin with choice, and not with nature.

*“Not without our choice. When God said, “I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed,” He set **every man free to choose** which master he would serve, and since that, **every man that has sinned in this world has done it because he chose to.** “If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not.”--**not them who had no chance to believe**; the god of this world blinds no man until he has shut his eyes of faith.” {February 21, 1895 ATJ, GCB 269.3}*

- ***Objection-It is absolutely impossible to do anything good from birth?***

If you look up the dictionary meaning of Original Sin, you will see it means total depravity, which means the utter inability to do anything good. This is what you are saying; *“We are not capable of doing anything good or keeping God’s Commandments the way we are born,”* While we agree that we need a spiritual rebirth in order to keep God’s commandments, this does not mean that until then, we cannot do anything good. To teach that men are enslaved to sin and Satan from birth and cannot do anything good comes from paganism. This was one of the main reasons the pagans would sacrifice children, and why the Gnostics, (deriving from paganism), denied God coming in the flesh. This is where Original Sin comes from.

The truth is, the moment Adam sinned, Christ stepped in on our behalf and man was acquitted, justified and given a second probation. Mankind was also given Divine help in our struggle with sin and the devil, as we saw earlier we are endowed with moral powers from birth. To teach that man can do nothing good from birth means he can only do bad. This is total depravity/Original Sin teaching and it denies the work of Christ in Eden. Even the simple everyday life experiences teach you that this is incorrect. How often do we see in the world people who go out of their way, sometimes even endanger their own lives, to help others in need? This is happening every day and they are not necessarily born again Christians, but simply normal everyday people who care for others, even strangers. Where did these moral virtues come from? They came from God.

Notice the following statements;

***"A spark of God's own life has been breathed into the human body, making man a living soul, the possessor of moral endowments, and a will to direct his own course of action. He has the privilege of becoming a partaker of the divine nature.** This will give him power to conquer evil, and love and choose that which is good. He has a conscience, which, under the control of God, will approve the right and condemn the wrong. And he may, if he will, have fellowship with God. He may walk and talk with God as did Enoch. This holy companionship is denied to none who will believe on Christ as their personal Saviour."* {ST, August 26, 1897 par8}

What are these moral endowments we possess from birth?

“The great moral powers of the soul are faith, hope, and love.” {GW92 91.2}

“To man alone, the crowning work of His creation, God has given a conscience to realize the sacred claims of the divine law, and a heart capable of loving it as holy, just, and good;” {NL 30.1}

Notice this statement says that God has given man a conscience and a heart that is capable of loving His law. We could add many more statements, but the following are sufficient to show we are not totally depraved.

“Even among the heathen are those who have cherished the spirit of kindness; before the words of life had fallen upon their ears, they have befriended the missionaries, even ministering to them at the peril of their own lives. Among the heathen are those who worship God ignorantly, those to whom the light is never brought by human instrumentality, yet they will not perish. Though ignorant of the written law of God, they have heard His voice speaking to them in nature, and have done the things that the law required. Their works are evidence that the Holy Spirit has touched their hearts, and they are recognized as the children of God.” {Hvn 97.3}

- **Objection - Hebrews 2:11.**

The teaching that Jesus was like “the sanctified ones”, not the unsanctified, was a major point made by R S Donell in William Grotheer’s document on “Holy Flesh”; and also by TA Davis in his book “Was Jesus Really Like Us”. Following is

concrete evidence for the truth of Heb 2:11, and a strong objection to the erroneous view of it.

Hebrews 2:11 “For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren,”

One little word, “**of**” in Heb 2:11 which is easily overlooked, means; **origin**, or the same start, or same starting point; following is the meaning from the concordance;

G1537ἐκ, ἐξ ek exek,ex

A primary preposition denoting **origin** (the point *whence* motion or action proceeds), **from, out** (of place, time or cause; literally or figuratively; direct or remote): - after, among, X are, at betwixt (-yond), by (the means of), exceedingly, (+ abundantly above), for (-th), **from** (among, forth, up), + grudgingly, + heartily, X heavenly, X hereby, + very highly, in, . . . ly, (because, by reason) of, off (from), on, out among (from, of), over, since, X thenceforth, through, X unto, X vehemently, with (-out). Often used in composition, with the same general import; often of *completion*.

Now look at the Biblical evidence; carefully look at the context of the passage from Heb 2:7-18, you should be able to see that the whole passage is dealing with NATURE (specifically Christ's Nature.) If the word “of” means Jesus started with the same origin as us, the conclusion should be clear. Now read below how most Bibles interpret this verse, it's not exhaustive; there are many more translations which say the same thing. You can read the highlight to save time;

Hebrews 2:11

Complete Jewish Bible

For both Yeshua, who sets people apart for God, and the ones being set apart **have a common origin** - this is why he is not ashamed to call them brothers

Common English Bible

This is because the one who makes people holy and the people who are being made holy **all come from one source**. That is why Jesus isn't ashamed to call them brothers and sisters when he says,

English standard version

For he who sanctifies and those who are sanctified **all have one source**. That is why he is not ashamed to call them brothers,

The Message

Since the One who saves and those who are saved **have a common origin**, Jesus doesn't hesitate to treat them as family, saying,

J B Phillips

For the one who makes men holy and the men who are made holy **share a common humanity**. So that he is not ashamed to call them his brothers,

Easy to read Version

Jesus, the one who makes people holy, and those who are made holy are **from the same family**. So he is not ashamed to call them his brothers and sisters.

New Century Version

Jesus, who makes people holy, and those who are made holy **are from the same family**. So he is not ashamed to call them his brothers and sisters.

NIV

Both the one who makes people holy and those who are made holy **are of the same family**. So Jesus is not ashamed to call them brothers and sisters.

New American Standard

*For both He who sanctifies and those who are sanctified **are all from one Father**; for which reason He is not ashamed to call them brethren,*

God's word translation

*Jesus, who makes people holy, and all those who are made holy **have the same Father**. That is why Jesus isn't ashamed to call them brothers and sisters.*

Good News Translation

*He purifies people from their sins, and both he and those who are made pure **all have the same Father**. That is why Jesus is not ashamed to call them his family.*

Holman Christian Standard

*For the One who sanctifies and those who are sanctified **all have one Father**. That is why Jesus is not ashamed to call them brothers,*

Interestingly, but not surprisingly, the prophet agrees;

*“But not to any class is Christ's love restricted. He identifies Himself with every child of humanity. That we might become members of the heavenly family, He became a member of the earthly family. **He is the Son of man, and thus a brother to every son and daughter of Adam.** His followers are not to feel themselves detached from the perishing world around them. They are a part of the great web of humanity; and Heaven looks upon them as brothers to sinners as well as to saints. The fallen, the erring, and the sinful, Christ's love embraces; and every deed of kindness done to uplift a fallen soul, every act of mercy, is accepted as done to Him.” {DA 638.4}*

E J Waggoner stated the following;

"Note that the stress is not on the being made perfect, but on the being made perfect through suffering. The Son of God,

*having taken upon Himself **the form and nature of man**, and having allied Himself with humanity, could, however holy He was, get back to glory in no other way than through death. Thus He gives light to them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death, opening to them the gates of eternal glory. Where He goes, all mankind may go. {February 12, 1903 EJW, PTUK 101.3}"*

"For They Are All of One .-This is the reason why it was fitting that Jesus should be made perfect through suffering: both He and they whom He would save were all of One, that is, He was One with them, and therefore He must necessarily share their sufferings." {February 12, 1903 EJW, PTUK 101.4}

*"Who is the One of whom are **"He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified?"**-Evidently it is God the Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all." Adam was the son of God (Luke iii. 38); and Jesus, the Son of man, traces His genealogy back to God through a long line of Adam's fallen race; therefore all the fallen sons of Adam are sons of God, although they have strayed far from the Father's house. Prodigal sons, covered with shame and disgrace, it is the Elder Brother's glad privilege to bring them to glory if they will come." {February 12, 1903 EJW, PTUK 101.5}*

*"Christ and His Brethren .-Jesus Christ is not ashamed of His poor relations. **"He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of One; for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren."** Someone says, **"Ah, but He doesn't call any people brethren, except those who are sanctified."***

Stop and consider the text. The proof that He is not ashamed to call them brethren is found in His declaration: "I will declare Thy name unto My brethren." Now it is evident that there would be no need to declare the name of God to those who knew it; but those who do not know it are heathen. Thus the heathen are regarded by Christ as His brethren. Again, think of the time when the Son must first have made this declaration. It must have been when He was yet "in the form of God;" for He came to earth for no other purpose than to declare God to men. So Jesus in heaven, the brightness of the Father's glory, and receiving the adoration of the angels, looked down to earth and saw the children of men doomed to death in their ignorance of God, and said to the Father, "I will declare Thy name unto My brethren." Thus He set the pattern for all missionary work. "Not to any class is Christ's love restricted. He identifies Himself with every child of humanity. That we might become members of the heavenly family, He became a member of the earthly family. He is the Son of man, and thus a Brother to every son and daughter of Adam. His followers are not to feel themselves detached from the perishing world around them. They are a part of the great web of humanity, and heaven looks upon them as brothers to sinners as well as to saints." The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the One "of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." Eph. iii.14, 15.{February 12, 1903 EJW, PTUK 101.6}"

That's the faith of our fathers; note the Ellen White quote in this last paragraph.

"When Jesus would uplift men to become members of the heavenly family, He humbled Himself to become a member of the earthly family, and by partaking of our nature He became the Son of man, the Son of Adam, and a Brother to every son and daughter of our fallen race."--Ms 58, 1896, p. 4. {17MR 25.3}

Note the upper case of the letter "B" in Brother. The Lord saw our day and was making a point.

Chapter 5 - Where Christ began

- **Objection - *Christ began where Adam first began;***

Did Christ, in His humanity, begin His life where unfallen Adam began?

*"Christ is called the second Adam. In purity and holiness, connected with God and beloved by God, **he began where the first Adam began.** Willingly he passed over the ground where Adam fell, and redeemed Adam's failure." {YI June 2 1898 par 1}*

Question - why do the Brethren quote this YI statement?

1. Do they seek to teach that Christ took the pre-fallen nature of Adam?
2. Do they seek to teach He took our fallen nature, but His mind and will were like Adam before the fall?

Both these points teach Immaculate Conception, both are cutting Christ off from the rest of humanity. Both teach Christ

did not truly come in the flesh (sarx), which the Bible says is the spirit of antichrist.

Note the following inspired evidence; it clearly teaches Jesus truly partook of our flesh, with a fallen human mind and will.

The following statement speaks of Adam in his pre-fallen state;

“Adam was then created in the image of God and placed upon probation. He had a perfectly developed organism. All his faculties were harmonious. In all his emotions, words, and actions, there was a perfect conformity to the will of his Maker. After God had made every provision for the happiness of man, and had supplied his every want, he tested his loyalty. If the holy pair should be obedient, the race would, after a time, be made equal to the angels. As Adam and Eve failed to bear this test, Christ proposed to become a voluntary offering for man.” {2Red 15.2}

Here we see clearly that Adam began with a mind/will perfectly in harmony with the will of His maker. Notice also Adam was placed on probation. If you interpret the YI statement to mean Christ began where the first Adam began; *“All his faculties were harmonious. In all his emotions, words, and actions, there was a perfect conformity to the will of his Maker”*, how do we then answer these following inspired statements?

“As God He could not be tempted, but as a man He could be tempted, and that strongly, and could yield to the temptations. His human nature must pass through the same test and trial Adam and Eve passed through. His human nature was

created; it did not even possess the angelic powers. It was human, identical with our own. He was passing over the ground where Adam fell. He was now where, if He endured the test and trial in behalf of the fallen race, He would redeem Adam's disgraceful failure and fall, in our own humanity." {CTr 213.4}

"A human body and a human mind were His. He was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. . . ." {CTr 213.5}

"A human body, a human mind, with all the peculiar properties, He was bone, brain, and muscle. A man of our flesh, He was compassed with the weakness of humanity. The circumstances of His life were of that character that He was exposed to all the inconveniences that belong to men, not in wealth, not in ease, but in poverty and want and humiliation. He breathed the very air man must breathe. He trod our earth as man. He had reason, conscience, memory, will, and affections of the human soul which was united with His divine nature."—16MR 181, 182. {TA 157.1}

Inspiration is telling us that Christ had *"A human body and a human mind were His"*, *"with all the peculiar properties"*, *"reason, conscience, memory, will, and affections of the human soul"*; these affections of the human soul with all its peculiar properties are fallen.

But we saw that Adam began with *"All his faculties were harmonious. In all his emotions, words, and actions, there was a perfect conformity to the will of his Maker"*, therefore

how can one interpret the YI statement to mean Jesus began where Adam did, according to His mind and affections?

We are fallen, meaning we are born subject to the law of sin, which means our faculties (mind, will etc.) are fallen. In simple terms this means the human will is not inclined to *perfect conformity to the will of God*, self is always seeking to prevail. Before he fell, Adam's will and all his faculties "*were harmonious*" and "*there was a perfect conformity to the will of his Maker.*" We have seen this was not the case with Christ, so how can anyone teach He began where Adam began?

Adam's will was perfectly conformed to the will of his Maker. Jesus had a human will like us, which He had to keep surrendered. His human will like ours sought to put self first and not God's will.

Notice the following statement;

"The one absorbing aim of the life of Christ was to do the will of his heavenly Father. He did not become offended with God; for he lived not to please himself. The human will of Christ would not have led him to the wilderness of temptation, to fast, and to be tempted of the devil. It would not have led him to endure humiliation, scorn, reproach, suffering, and death. His human nature shrank from all these things as decidedly as ours shrinks from them." {ST, October 29, 1894 par. 9}

"His human nature shrank from all these things as decidedly as ours shrinks from them" Clearly Jesus did not begin where Adam began, as far as Adam's mind will and faculties were concerned. Adam's will was perfectly conformed to the

will of God; Jesus' human will, like ours, had to be kept always in subjection.

In the YI statement, Sister White does not define clearly the comparison between the two Adam's. 2 points where Christ certainly began where Adam began;

1. Both the two Adams began as the heads of the human race. The YI statement is not comparing their nature.
2. Jesus did begin where Adam began as far as His standing before God. Both Adam's came into the world on probation;

Adam was created in the image of God and placed upon probation.

*“For a period of time Christ was on probation. He took humanity on Himself, to stand the test and trial **which the first Adam failed to endure.**”(ST May 10, 1899). {5BC 1082.6}*

The Brethren in error continually insist they do not believe in Original sin. Yet they teach the Immaculate Conception, only much more subtly and deadly. For example we have clearly seen Jesus began His human life with the same fallen attributes we have, and we have harmonised the YI statement. On the other hand the Brethren's interpretation of the YI statement cuts Christ off from every other human being by implying that Jesus began where unfallen Adam began. This is “Immaculate Conception” teaching.

For further evidence about Christ's human nature, see Bill Pinto's talk entitled; The “Human Nature of Christ.”

Chapter 6

- *What Is Sin?*

“Now, we want to understand what sin is--that it is the transgression of God's law. This is the only definition given in the Scriptures.” {FW 56.1}

“Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.” This is the only definition of sin given in the Holy Scriptures, and we should seek to understand what sin is, lest any of us be found in opposition to the God of heaven.” {RH, July 15, 1890 par. 2}

“Sin is the transgression of the law.” This is the only definition of sin. Without the law there can be no transgression. “By the law is the knowledge of sin.”(MS 27, 1899). {7BC 951.3}

And what is sin? “The only definition for sin that we have in the Bible is that it is the transgression of the law...it condemns every sin”. ST 3 March 1890 par 3

- **Objection -“I am carnal sold under sin”**

For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.” (Romans 7:14-17)

The Brethren teach the carnal nature is sin and they quote Rom 7. But we are still carnal now, the converted Christian still has a carnal mind, but it is kept subdued by his constant surrender to the Spirit. If the carnal mind is sin then the converted Christian is still a sinner. The carnal aspect of our nature is only removed at the 2nd coming when the saints are glorified. Also notice this inspired statement; Sister White quotes Rom 7:7-14 verse 14 is saying; *“But I am carnal sold under sin”*, the Brethren take great delight in this verse, and with it try to teach our nature is sin. But notice what the SOP says after quoting these verses;

“What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came [home to the conscience], sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which [if obeyed] was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is [a yoke of bondage, against me, and something to be trampled underfoot because it points out my sins?--No.] holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful. For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin.” {ST, October 1, 1894 par. 3}

But though we are carnal, we are to reckon ourselves "dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. . . ." {ST, October 1, 1894 par. 4}

Notice how the prophet correctly interprets Rom 7:14, she says **"we are carnal"**; you see your carnal nature doesn't change, it is kept dead by constant surrender; *"we are to reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin"*. When she says *"we"* she includes herself and every Christian, we are still carnal, but through Christ we are not sinning.

Also keep in mind Lucifer, Adam and Eve all sinned while possessing a sinless/unfallen nature, therefore nature is not sin; sin is the transgression of the law. They sinned by choosing to disobey God while in an unfallen nature. While it is true that the carnal nature is at enmity with God, this is not all that comprises the nature of man. In Romans 2:14-15 we see that the Gentiles (those who have never heard of God's law) *"do by nature the things contained in the law"*.

Question -If your nature is only carnal and against God, how is it then that these people keep the law of God by their nature, which you say is carnal?

This is how they keep the law; man's nature, though fallen and carnal, also comprises of moral powers, which enables man to make moral choices. Notice the following statement;

"He who does not obey the commandments of God is a sinner in the sight of God." {ST June 20 1895 p 5}

So who is a sinner in the sight of God? The new born baby?
NO!

“He who does not obey the commandments of God is a sinner in the sight of God.” {ST June 20 1895 p5}

- **Objection- Romans 3:23 says; “all have sinned”**

Inspiration declares a foreknowledge of people’s sins before they are born, (Isaiah 53:6). As in Romans 3:23 do you think God knows which sins, and how many sins, one will commit tomorrow and the next day and even during the whole course of his/her life? Of course He knows, and He declares so; the same way He inspired Isaiah to write, *“He hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all”*. Isaiah 53:6; the same way God was able to place all our sins upon His Son on the cross, even though we weren’t even born yet! Also the context in Romans 3 is to tell all people, Jews and Gentiles, that they have all sinned and fallen short of God’s glory and their only hope is to trust in the Righteousness of Christ - see Vs 20-24. These statements and texts are not difficult to understand, but we must not read into them something they don’t say and end up with contradictions.

If you interpret Rom 3:23 to teach all are sinners from birth, you have to conclude that all humanity sinned in Adam - this is Original Sin teaching. It means those who are born tomorrow or next year etc., are already sinners, even before they are born! This is full blown Catholic O.S teaching. Adam’s sin passed down to all his posterity, which necessarily involves an Immaculate Conception Doctrine to protect Christ from sin, (see Born Sinners Teaching Examined). Remember Rom 5:18; the human race was freed from the condemnation of Adam and given a second

probation. We are not sinners because we are born, but because we transgress the law of God.

In all the examined verses we have not seen one text that teaches we are born sinners. This second antichrist teaching is just like the trinity; it has not one verse for its support and brings in dozens of contradictions. Because you cannot teach “Righteousness by Faith” with this teaching, those promoting this error must change the nature of Christ, and by so doing they destroy the completeness of His humanity in overcoming sin.

How can we look to Him in faith to overcome, when our minds are telling us He overcame in a different nature to us? And how can you overcome sin if it is something more than the transgression of the law, if it is part of your very being?

Original Sin teaching can only lead to sinning till Jesus comes, because original sin means your nature itself is sin and our nature does not change at conversion, therefore a converted man is still a sinner.

This teaching destroys the whole Sanctuary message and the High Priestly Ministry of Christ. Most of all it destroys Christ as our example.

The Brethren even boast that He was different to us and that he took the nature of only “sanctified Brethren”

Please read the following statement carefully;

“Christ's overcoming and obedience is that of a true human being. In our conclusions, we make many mistakes because of our erroneous views of the human nature of our Lord. When we give to His human nature a power that it is not possible for

man to have in his conflicts with Satan, we destroy the completeness of His humanity.” {OHC 48.2}

Chapter 7 - What does God hate?

- *God hates sin not the Sinner;*

*“Satan’s work is to allure to works of evil. How adroitly Satan worked with his bewitching power to fascinate the mind to choose sin rather than righteousness. The influence of one person on another had become dangerous because of Satan’s leading and controlling the mind and pressing this influence of one over another in his own service.” CTr 164 **God hates sin.***

“The world loves sin, and hates righteousness, and this was the cause of its hostility to Jesus. All who refuse His infinite love will find Christianity a disturbing element. The light of Christ sweeps away the darkness that covers their sins, and the need of reform is made manifest. While those who yield to the influence of the Holy Spirit begin war with themselves, those who cling to sin war against the truth and its representatives.” {DA 306.1}

“But although He represented in His spotless character the character of His Father, yet the world hated and refused Him. The human heart loves sin and hates righteousness, and this was the cause of the hostility of the world to Jesus. The atmosphere that surrounded His soul was so pure, so elevated, that it placed the hypocritical rabbis, priests, and rulers in their true position, and revealed them in their real character as claiming sanctity, while misrepresenting God and His truth. If Christ had given license to men to exercise their evil

passions, they would have hailed this great miracle-worker with shouts of applause; but when He reproved sin, made open war upon selfishness, oppression, hypocrisy, pride, covetousness, and lust, they hunted Him down as a malefactor. He endured the contradiction of sinners against Himself until at last they cried out, Away with this fellow, and give us Barabbas.”{BEcho, April 9, 1894 par. 3}

Christ hated one thing only, and that was sin.

“Will you not hate sin, and pray most earnestly that you may have a sense of its exceeding sinfulness? Will you not hate that which caused the death of the Majesty of heaven, the Son of God? Always bear in mind the fact that there is one thing which God hates with a perfect hatred, and that is sin. It will prove the ruin of thousands, yea, millions of souls, because they choose to sin, and in sinning make themselves characters after Satan's likeness; and such, unless they repent, forsake sin, and believe in Jesus Christ, will never find a place in heaven.”{14MR 73.2}

When you look at the above statements one thing comes across very clearly; Both God and Jesus Hate sin.

Now I ask myself the question -**if sin is not what I do but what I am** - what does God hate? Does he hate what I do or does he hate what I am?

IF the above is true then God not only hates what I do but he also hates me! There can be no other conclusion, if we hold to the notion that sin is what I am because I was born. But what does SOP tell us?

*“Work as Paul worked. Wherever he was, whether before scowling Pharisee or Roman authority, rich or poor, learned or ignorant, the cripple at Lystra or the convicted sinners in the Macedonian dungeon, **he lifted up Christ as the One who hates sin and loves the sinner**, the One who bore our sins that He might impart to us His righteousness.” {CEv 27.1}*

*“It is not Christ's follower that, with averted eyes, turns from the erring, leaving them unhindered to pursue their downward course. Those who are forward in accusing others, and zealous in bringing them to justice, are often in their own lives more guilty than they. Men hate the sinner, while they love the sin. **Christ hates the sin, but loves the sinner**. This will be the spirit of all who follow Him. Christian love is slow to censure, quick to discern penitence, ready to forgive, to encourage, to set the wanderer in the path of holiness, and to stay his feet therein.” {DA 462.4}*

“All who enter the City of God will enter through the strait gate—by agonizing effort; for “there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth.” Revelation 21:27. But none who have fallen need give up to despair. Aged men, once honored of God, may have defiled their souls, sacrificing virtue on the altar of lust; but if they repent, forsake sin, and turn to God, there is still hope for them. He who declares, “Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life,” also gives the invitation, “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.” Revelation 2:10; Isaiah 55:7.

God hates sin, but He loves the sinner. "I will heal their backsliding," He declares; "I will love them freely." Hosea 14:4. *Prophets and Kings, 83, 84*

Chapter 8 - Psalm 51:5

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

The word "shapen" means to be born. David is simply stating he was born in sin, not born a sinner. To be born in sin is the lot of every human being, including Jesus. It simply means to be born fallen or sinful. Notice how Sister White uses the term born in sin;

*"Seth was a worthy character, and was to take the place of Abel in right doing. Yet he was a son of Adam like sinful Cain, and inherited from the nature of Adam no more natural goodness than did Cain. **He was born in sin**, but by the grace of God, in receiving the faithful instructions of his father Adam, he honoured God in doing his will. He separated himself from the corrupt descendants of Cain, and laboured, as Abel would have done had he lived, to turn the minds of sinful men to revere and obey God." 1SP 60.2*

Sister White, in writing of Seth, declares he was "born in sin". Now notice this parallel passage where she writes of the same event.

“While Adam was created sinless, in the likeness of God, Seth, like Cain, inherited the fallen nature of his parents. But he received also the knowledge of the Redeemer and instruction in righteousness. By divine grace he served and honoured God, and he laboured, as Abel would have done, had he lived, to turn the minds of sinful men to revere and obey their Creator.” Patriarchs and Prophets 80.1

To Sister White, being **born in sin**, simply meant being born with a **“fallen nature”** (as stated above).

Notice the following statement from SN Haskell, equating “born in sin” with the nature of Christ.

*The Bible is the only reliable history of his ancestors. In the Gospel by Matthew four women before Mary, the mother of Jesus, are mentioned by name: Tamar (Matt. 1:3), who acted the part of a harlot with, her father-in-law (see Genesis 38); the harlot Rahab (see verse 5; also Joshua 2); Ruth, a Moabitess, a descendant of the daughter of Lot by her own father (see Gen. 19 : 30-38); and Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah the Hittite. Bathsheba's course with David has been a reproach in the mouth of scoffers for thousands of years. This is not the way that men would naturally write a history of the ancestors of Christ; They would select the good women and the men of influence, whose birth and lives were exemplary. But it is God's way, and it presents hope to the fallen. Even if we have inherited tendencies and appetites of the worst kind, there is hope. **It was Christ through David who said: “Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.” This states plainly the nature of the humanity in which***

Christ was conceived. The same prophet, in Ps. 22:9, says: "*But thou art he that took me out of the womb: thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mother's breasts. I was cast upon thee from the womb: thou art my God from my mother's belly.*" ***This illustrates how it was with Christ*** and how it is with every believer in Christ who has the righteousness of Christ. S. N. Haskell.

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

This is simply stating as above, to be "born in sin" means to be born with a sinful nature. "*What about the innocent child in the cradle? Is it actually a born sinner?*" Of course not! Because, if so, Jesus would be a born sinner as well. Notice the contradiction you face if you want to use this verse to teach David was born a sinner. He says, "*in sin did my mother conceive me*", did not Jesus also have an earthly mother? If you teach David inherited sin from his mother, therefore born a sinner, you must be consistent and acknowledge that Jesus also inherited sin from His mother, which of course is incorrect. But when you understand David inherited the sinful nature of his mother, you can also acknowledge the same for Jesus, because sinful nature is not sin. Sin is the transgression of the law; it is not being born.

Also if you insist Ps 51:5 teaches we are born sinners, you have no choice but to change Christ's nature from His inheritance through His mother.

Chapter 9 - Scriptural Objections

- *Romans 5:12-21;*

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:*

¹³ *(For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law.*

¹⁴ *Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.*

¹⁵ *But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.*

¹⁶ *And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.*

¹⁷ *For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)*

¹⁸ *Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.*

¹⁹ *For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.*

²⁰ *Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:*

²¹ *That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.*

In summary; Paul is contrasting the effect the 2 Adam's have had on the whole human race.

Verse 18 is the key. Christ undid the condemnation Adam brought upon his posterity, so we are not, as some brethren are teaching, *"hopeless lost and condemned"*, *"even from birth"*. We are born acquitted, justified and reconciled to God. See our study on Rom 5:18 in OS part 1.

Notice how EJ Waggoner comments on this text;

*"Adam a Figure.-"Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of Him that was to come." How is Adam a figure of Him that was to come, namely, Christ? Just as the following verses indicate, that is, Adam was a figure of Christ in that his action involved many besides himself. It is evident that Adam could not give his descendants any higher nature than he had himself, so Adam's sin made it inevitable that all his descendants should be born with sinful natures. Sentence of death, however, does not pass on them for that, **but because they have sinned.**" {October 18, 1894 EJW, PTUK 658.7}*

This is what Rom 5:12 is teaching, we receive the effects of Adam's sin, i.e. sinful nature. And Elder Waggoner states; "Sentence of death, however, does not pass on them for that, **but because they have sinned.**" Clearly Elder Waggoner

understood nature is not sin and he believed and taught Christ partook of our sinful nature, this was at the heart of the 1888 message. Notice the following statement;

*“But death came by sin, and as Satan is the author of sin, so he has the power of death. Since we are partakers of flesh and blood, **born in sin, Christ also Himself took part of the same;**”{1900 EJW, EVCO 117.2}*

Waggoner is teaching Jesus was born in sin, which simply means, as the SOP states, He inherited the fallen nature of humanity. Born in sin does not mean you're born a sinner, it simply means you're born with a sinful nature and Jesus partook of the same flesh, (sarx, sinful nature), as every child of Adam -Heb 2:14. This is what Rom 5:12 teaches, we inherit the consequences of Adam's sin, a sinful nature which brings sin and death. If you teach we are born sinners from Rom 5:12, you have to conclude we actually sinned in Adam 6000 years ago. This is exactly what many do (using the marginal reading), which is OS teaching and contradicts the Bible and cuts Christ off from the rest of humanity. First of all you have to redefine sin to be more than the transgression of the law, because you're teaching people sinned before they were even born. You contradict numerous Bible verses like;

Rom 4:15 “where no law is, there is no transgression.”

Rom 5:14 “Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.”

John 9:41 “Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth.”

John 15:22 “If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloke for their sin.”

They cannot accept Christ truly partook of our nature, because they believe your nature is sin, therefore they contradict many passages like Rom 1:3, Rom 8:3, Heb2:14, 17. To teach we sinned in Adam is a Catholic teaching, and it was because of this teaching that they baptise infants and invented the Immaculate Conception Doctrine, to cut Christ off from His human inheritance because they say that “nature itself is sin.”

The marginal reading for Rom 5:12 “in whom all have sinned” is not stating we sinned in Adam, which not only contradicts the Bible but is also illogical. It simply means, as Adam’s posterity, we were in him genetically and we all receive the effects of his sin.

- ***Romans 3:9-10***

Rom 3:9 “What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin;”

Rom 3:10 “As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one:”

Rom 3:11 “There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God.”

Rom 3:12 “They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.”

Of whom is the Apostle speaking when he says *“there is none righteous, no, not one”*? Is he referring to new born infants? Of course not! They are not even mentioned in the passage; notice verse 11; *“There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God.”*

Can a baby “understand”, can a baby “seek” after God? No. This is speaking about God’s rebellious people. Notice verse 12; *“They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable”*. Notice it says; *“They are all gone out of the way,”* speaking about their sinful rebellious actions. It goes on to say, *“they are together become unprofitable”*. What does become unprofitable mean? It denotes actions and wrong character; the word “become” means they had to do something, it is not talking about an innocent child at birth! It is speaking about rebellious people, that’s why it says *“there is none that doeth good, no, not one”*. This passage doesn’t even mention birth or infants. Also if you parallel Ps 14:1-4 from which Paul is quoting, the statement *“there is none that doeth good, no, not one”* comes from Ps 14:3 and it is speaking about “the fool”, those who are “corrupt”; and in vs.1, those who have “done abominable works”; and in vs.4, “the workers of iniquity”. It is of these that it is spoken “there is none that doeth good, no, not one”, not new born babies. In Rom.3 Paul goes on to say;

Rom 3:13 “Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips:”

Rom 3:14 “Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness:”

Rom 3:15 “Their feet are swift to shed blood:”

Rom 3:16 “Destruction and misery are in their ways:”

Rom 3:17 “And the way of peace have they not known:”

Rom 3:18 “There is no fear of God before their eyes.”

These are those who are described as; “*there is none that doeth good, no, not one*”.

Question - if you had a room full of drunkards, could you rightly say there is none sober, no, not one? Yes; for everyone in the room is drunk, this is what Paul is saying. He is speaking about the wicked and he says there is none that doeth good, no, not one.

Now let us say we put a new born innocent baby in that room full of drunkards and then state; there is none sober, no, not one. Nobody possessed of reason would for a moment think that the baby was also drunk! But these Brethren, holding to such a dangerous error, have not one verse to teach their false doctrine. So they seek to use straight forward passages like Rom 3, which is speaking about the wicked, and seek to implicate innocent infants! Don't forget what Scripture says about the infant in the womb “*having done neither good nor evil*”, *Romans 9:11* .

- *Psalms 58:1-4*

Ps 58:1 “To the chief Musician, Altaschith, Michtam of David. Do ye indeed speak righteousness, O congregation? do ye judge uprightly, O ye sons of men?”

Ps 58:2 “Yea, in heart ye work wickedness; ye weigh the violence of your hands in the earth.”

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

Ps 58:4 “Their poison is like the poison of a serpent: they are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear;”

This passage, like many in Psalms, is using figurative language to convey a message to God’s people; it is not to be understood literally. For example; can a baby speak when it is born? Can a baby speak lies when it is born? This passage is speaking about “*the wicked*”. In vs.1 God is speaking to His people; “*O congregation*”, “*ye sons of men?*” and in vs.2 God says “*in heart ye work wickedness; ye weigh the violence of your hands in the earth*”. Then in verse 3+ 4 He says “*The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies. Their poison is like the poison of a serpent: they are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear;*

God is not speaking about new born infants, that would contradict His own word, see Ps 127:3. He is speaking about the stubborn and rebellious people that claim to be His, yet were always working wickedly with poison in their words and violence in their hands. God says “*even from the womb*”, illustrating figuratively their stubborn rebellion; from the beginning. Another similar passage is Isa 48:1-8. No one can read these verses intelligently and believe they are talking about new born infants. Do babies speak lies; have poison like a serpent and violence in their hands? Of course not! The Scripture says in *Psalm 127:3*, “*Lo, children area*

heritage of the LORD: and the fruit of the womb is his reward”.

- **Minor Objections** - *Job 4:17, Job 14:4, Job 15:14, Galatians 4:4, Job 25:4, Romans 3:23.*

Job 4:17 “Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his maker?”

This verse does not mention birth or sin; it’s simply contrasting the finite mortal state of man to the purity and infinite nature of God. If you read this verse in its context you will see that Eliphaz is speaking, rebuking Job, and verse 17 are the words Eliphaz heard when an (evil) spirit spoke to him in the night, see verse 12-17. (See “The Defender of God”)

Job 14:4 “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.”

This verse does not mention birth. If you interpret this verse to mean that we are born unclean sinners, then what do you do with the birth of Jesus? Was He also born an unclean sinner? Of course not! Once again we must understand the difference of sin and the effects of sin. The word unclean (Strong’s 2931) means impure, defile. No one is denying we are born with a nature that is defiled, meaning fallen/sinful. As we saw earlier this is not sin, Jesus was born with this nature.

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

This verse spoken by Eliphaz in rebuking Job, it was not God who inspired Eliphaz to ask this question. This is the very accusation Satan made to God; that *“he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?”* This is the very accusation Christ came to dispel! *Heb 2:14, “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;”*

Gal 4:4 *“But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law,”*

Notice Christ had to be born of a woman in a nature like ours and live a righteous life, to show that he which is born of a woman can be righteous.

Job 25:4 *“How then can man be justified with God? Or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?”* See answer above for Job 15:14

Rom 3:23 *“For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;*

What does it mean that all have sinned"? This statement is simply stating all have sinned. Not when they were born, for “sin is not imputed where there is no law” “but because they **have** sinned”. It is not saying children are born sinners.

Chapter 10 - Propensities

- *Do not set Him before the people as a man with the propensities of sin.*

Be careful, exceedingly careful as to how you dwell upon the human nature of Christ. Do not set Him before the people as a man with the propensities of sin. {13MR 18.1}

We will see that Christ clearly inherited propensities **to** sin, but never cultivated propensities **of** Sin.

Also we cannot use the SOP to contradict the SOP. Sister White clearly states dozens of times;

*“Clad in the vestments of humanity, the Son of God came down to the level of those He wished to save. In Him was no guile or sinfulness; He was ever pure and undefiled; yet He took upon Him **our sinful nature**.” {ST, July 30, 1902 par. 1}* and “our sinful nature” has propensities to sin.

*“Do not set Him before the people as a man with the propensities **of** sin.”*Please notice it says; “***of sin***”, not ***to sin***, this is important, we must read these statements carefully, Jesus certainly had propensities/inclinations **to sin**. Otherwise He could not have been our example, notice the following statements;

*“The Son of God in His humanity wrestled with the very same fierce, apparently overwhelming, temptations that assail us—temptations to **indulgence of appetite**, to **presumptuous***

venturing where God has not led them, and to the worship of the god of this world, to sacrifice an eternity of bliss for the fascinating pleasures of this life.” {CTr 195.4}

Is indulgence of appetite a propensity to sin?

Is presumptuous venturing a propensity to sin?

Is the worship of the god of this world a propensity to sin?

They certainly are, and we are told “*The Son of God in His humanity wrestled with the very same fierce, apparently overwhelming, temptations that assail us*”. But did Christ ever yield to any of these temptations? No. Although the propensities to relieve His hunger etc. were there, He never submitted to the inclination, therefore He never developed a propensity of those offenses.

Notice how the next statement clearly describes this conflict within His human nature.

“The human will of Christ would not have led him to the wilderness of temptation, to fast, and to be tempted of the devil. It would not have led him to endure humiliation, scorn, reproach, suffering, and death. His human nature shrank from all these things as decidedly as ours shrinks from them.” {ST, October 29, 1894 par. 9}

“A human body and a human mind were His.” {CTr 213.5}

“His human nature was created;It was human, identical with our own. ...He would redeem Adam’s disgraceful failure and fall, in our own humanity.” {CTr 213.4}

“He was made like unto his brethren, with the same susceptibilities, mental and physical.” {RH, February 10, 1885 par. 7}

“Christ did in reality unite the offending nature of man with his own sinless nature...” {RH, July 17, 1900 par. 8}

In summary of the above statements we see;

1. Jesus took our sinful nature
2. Took our fallen will
3. Our fallen mind and body
4. A nature identical with our own
5. Same susceptibilities (inclinations) mental and physical
6. He took the offending nature of man

Inspiration is clear; Jesus inherited the same sinful nature, with all its weaknesses and tendencies, as the rest of us.

The next statement brings this point out clearly and leaves no room for doubt; notice how Sister White contrasts the human nature of Christ with Adam’s unfallen nature.

“Adam was tempted by the enemy, and he fell. It was not indwelling sin which caused him to yield; for God made him pure and upright, in His own image. He was as faultless as the angels before the throne. There were in him no corrupt principles, no tendencies to evil. But when Christ came to meet the temptations of Satan, He bore “the likeness of sinful flesh.” {BEcho, September 3, 1900 par. 10}

Here Sister White clearly states Adam’s unfallen nature was “pure”, “upright” and “faultless” and “There were in him no

*corrupt principles, no **tendencies to evil.***” Then she contrasts Adam’s unfallen nature to that of Christ’s human nature. She states of Christ; “*He bore "the likeness of sinful flesh."* And as we have seen from the previous statements this “*sinful flesh*” Jesus bore was “*identical with our own*”. A nature, as Sister White states which had “*corrupt principles*” and with “*tendencies to evil*”.

A word of caution is necessary here. Let no one think we are saying Christ was in anyway corrupted by these principles! The truly converted Christian who lives in obedience to God still has corrupt principles in his nature. These principles are part of fallen human nature until glorification. But these corrupt principles cannot corrupt anyone until the individual exercises their will to live in subjection to them.

For example; every fallen human being has a sinful nature where self/selfishness seeks to rule. This is a corrupt principle, but it is only when one allows self to rule, that brings corruption. Jesus “*bore the likeness of sinful flesh*” He like all of us had to battle against this corrupt principle, but He never allowed it to rule, therefore He was never corrupted and always remained “*pure and undefiled*”.

Christ took our nature, fallen but not corrupted, and would not be corrupted unless He received the words of Satan in the place of the words of God. {16MR 182.3}

With this in mind, if we understand “*propensities to sin*” to mean the same as, tendencies to sin. Then as we have seen from previous statements from Sister White, Christ certainly had these propensities.

However; if Sister White is using the term “*propensities to sin*” to mean cultivated sins, then of course Jesus did not have these “propensities”. This is what we believe she is stating. For example, in the same statement where Sister White writes; “*do not set Him before the people as a man with the **propensities of sin***” just a few lines later she writes; “*not for one moment was there in Him **an evil propensity***” from the context it seems clear Sister White is using the word “*propensities*” in reference to committed sins. When we understand her meaning of the word “*propensity*” the entire statement becomes clear. Notice for example how often she used this word in reference to committed sins.

*The means which came to you from relatives was a curse to you. It only increased your **money-loving propensity**, and was an additional weight to sink you to perdition. {2T 240.1}*
"The love of money is the root of all evil."

Here we see how Sister White used the word “*propensity*” in reference to a known sin.

Notice another example;

*Therefore guard well your words; put a bridle on your tongue. If you allow yourself to become a **talebearer**, you will not be welcome in any family, because of your **propensity** to report every transaction that may occur. (Signed) Mrs. E. G. White {SpM 77.2}*

Again Sister White uses the word “*propensity*” to a known sin; in this case a talebearer.

There are dozens of examples of how Sister White uses this word in reference to committed sins.

In the following statement Sister White uses the word propensity in reference to both “*hereditary and cultivated tendencies to wrong*”.

We need not retain one sinful propensity. . . . As we partake of the divine nature, hereditary and cultivated tendencies to wrong are cut away from the character, {FLB 23.4}

We have seen Sister White uses this term propensity in reference to both “*hereditary and cultivated tendencies to wrong*”.

We have seen clearly that Jesus certainly possessed “*hereditary tendencies to wrong*”. We saw Jesus was tempted to “*indulgence of appetite, to presumptuous venturing where God has not led them, and to the worship of the god of this world, to sacrifice an eternity of bliss for the fascinating pleasures of this life.*” {CTr 195.4}

Therefore when Sister Whites states of Christ; “*Do not set Him before the people as a man with the propensities of sin.*” {13MR 18.1} She is using the word propensity in reference to known or cultivated sins. That’s why she goes on to say; “*not for one moment was there in Him an evil propensity*”

What is the difference between "propensities of sin" and "propensities to sin"?

Propensities of sin are a natural tendency to sin from the cultivated sins we have committed, these Jesus did not have.

Whereas propensities to sin are the natural tendencies to sin which we inherit from birth, (from our sinful fallen nature), these Jesus had like us. But not that we should make Jesus the same as one of us, struggling with self, as many Christians do. Most of our struggles are from having tasted sin and becoming more tempt-able to that sin, these Jesus did not have, which is addressed in the "The Human Nature of Christ" in this way; "the sinful fallen nature has a natural tendency to please or protect self. When in danger you want to protect yourself and when tempted with pleasure your natural tendency is to please yourself. Jesus had this, but through the right exercise of the will and connected to His Father He always made the right decision to please His Father and help others, not self. Remember the law of Heaven is "self-sacrificing love" which is the opposite of pleasing and protecting self. In the Human Nature of Christ DVD we illustrate the difference; for example we have 2 men, both have a fallen nature and both have an inherent weakness to put self first. Let us say the first man has never **tasted** alcohol and cigarettes in his whole life and in fact he hates those 2 bad habits.

Question - can you tempt this man with cigarettes and alcohol? NO. Does he have a propensity for cigarettes and alcohol? NO. But does he have a propensity to sin? YES. Now the second man; he smoked and drank alcohol all his life, and then becomes a Christian, and he realises he must

give up these wrongful habits. Question - can he be tempted with cigarettes and alcohol? YES. Does he have a propensity for cigarettes and alcohol? YES. His propensity came from partaking of those habits and he needs to surrender and fight to remain free from them, until he has complete victory. You see the first man represents Christ, he has a fallen nature; he has the inherent weakness of every fallen human being, meaning he is subject to the law of sin - which is self wanting to prevail. He has a propensity/inclination to sin like every other human being, but he never exercised his will to put self first, therefore never tasted sin/selfishness and never developed an evil propensity. Because he always refused cigarettes and alcohol he never developed a propensity/liking for them, in fact he has an aversion to those things, he hates them. So it is with Jesus, he always said no to any wrong inducement (Jn 8:29) and never developed a propensity for a wrong thought or action. In fact He hated, with a perfect hatred, the sins we commit, but in his nature he is no different to the second man. But did Jesus have propensities to sin? YES. There are many examples, wilderness/Gethsemane; He was often tempted to put self first; the DVD shows many examples of this.

Propensity = tendency, inclination, predisposition, susceptibility, bent, leaning, preference, vulnerability.

All these words describe a natural tendency to sin. This is what the sinful fallen nature comprises of. Do you know about the "Law of sin" in Romans chapter 7? See for further study; "The Law of Sin verses the Law of the Spirit" (on the web.)

This law is something we are born with; this law is the tendency to sin that everyone has, but this law is not sin - it is our tendency to sin; our inclination to sin; our predisposition

to sin; our bent to sin; our leaning to sin. All these descriptions are a leading to sin, but they are not sin itself. Sin is by choice, not by nature. We must choose to sin before we sin. So nature is really only the condition we come into this world with. What we do with this nature depends upon our will. Will is the power of choice; we must choose what we will do, in any given situation, before we do it.

Now this propensity can be manifested by the nature we come into this world with; i.e. the sinful fallen nature. And it can also be manifested by the conditioning of a life of sin; like the 2 men in the previous illustration. One man liked cigarettes and alcohol, but the other man didn't. The one who liked cigarettes and alcohol had a cultivated tendency to those habits which the first man did not have. They both had the law of sin in their members, but only one had the tendency of that particular sin, because of his participation of that sin. This cultivated sin is the propensity of sin. **Of-because** he committed that sin; but the propensity to sin they both had from nature. This is where Jesus was different to us; although He had propensities to sin, He never chose to sin and therefore never cultivated propensities of sin. By this understanding we can accept that Jesus was truly like us, except without sin, and we have many verses to prove this truth; Rom 8:3 is one of the best, *“For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:*

*Heb 4:15 “For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet **without sin.**”*

This is how you can explain that Jesus is truly our example and understands what we are going through. If at any point you make Jesus different to us at birth, (in His humanity); you destroy the completeness of His humanity. As soon as you do this, you do not have an example any more. If one teaches Jesus was different to me at birth in His humanity, I have an excuse for sin. And this is precisely the danger of what is being taught now among us. The majority of people do not understand what is going on with this teaching. The gravity of it caused the Apostle John to call it antichrist - this is serious.

Rome had to change Jesus' nature, not only to cut him off from His hereditary (ancestors) and make Him different to us, and to pervert the Holy Scriptures, but also to give man an excuse to keep on sinning. This is why there is no "victory over sin" taught in the Catholic Church. And although SDA's will deny that they are teaching sin and live like the Catholics; that is precisely what they are teaching their followers, without the teachers realising what they are doing. The vast majority of SDA's are still living in sin and when they hear that Jesus was different to us, it makes perfect sense to them.

"The divine nature, combined with the human, made Him capable of yielding to Satan's temptations. Here the test to Christ was far greater than that of Adam and Eve, for Christ took our nature, fallen but not corrupted, and would not be corrupted unless He received the words of Satan in the place of the words of God. To suppose He was not capable of yielding to temptation places Him where He cannot be a perfect example for man, and the force and the power of this part of Christ's humiliation, which is the most eventful, is no instruction or help to human beings." {16MR 182.3}

- *Explain “A taint of or inclination to corruption”*

The above query arises from the following statement;

“These words do not refer to any human being, except to the Son of the infinite God. Never, in any way, leave the slightest impression upon human minds that a taint of, or inclination to, corruption rested upon Christ, or that He in any way yielded to corruption. He was tempted in all points like as man is tempted, yet He is called "that holy thing." It is a mystery that is left unexplained to mortals that Christ could be tempted in all points like as we are, and yet be without sin. The incarnation of Christ has ever been, and will ever remain a mystery. That which is revealed, is for us and for our children, but let every human being be warned from the ground of making Christ altogether human, such an one as ourselves; for it cannot be. The exact time when humanity blended with divinity, it is not necessary for us to know. We are to keep our feet on the Rock Christ Jesus, as God revealed in humanity.”
 {5BC 1128.6}

A taint **of**, is the same as a propensity **of**, corruption. “**Of**” means to actually have a taste of the sin or corruption, or to be tainted with it; your own personal sin or corruption. Of course Jesus didn’t have these.

“Or that He in any way yielded to corruption”

Obviously if Jesus *“in any way yielded to corruption”* He would have sinned.

For Jesus to be *“ever pure and undefiled”*, He could not have had an evil thought, He would never have contemplated doing something wrong. His mind was just as pure and innocent as a new born baby and Jesus kept this purity all

through His life. We on the other hand have tainted ourselves with sin and corruption and evil thoughts, so we need to be born again.

"He is called "that holy thing."

This is referring to His Divinity; see Luke 1:35

*Luke 1:35 "And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also **that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.**"*

"let every human being be warned from the ground of making Christ altogether human, such an one as ourselves; for it cannot be."{5BC 1128.6}

The key to this statement is the word "altogether", Christ was not **"altogether human, such an one as ourselves"**

Christ was the Son of God, we are not. Christ was Divine, we are not. Christ was Immortal, we are not. The statement is talking about the mystery of the incarnation - notice the next few words; "*The exact time when humanity blended with divinity, it is not necessary for us to know*". {5BC 1128.6}

Jesus was fully man/human so this statement cannot be talking about the amount of human nature Jesus took on.

*Hebrews 2:14 "**Forasmuch**(G1893) then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;"*

Strong's concordance; Forasmuch= G1893 (as much as)
This means that **just as much** as we are partakers of flesh, Jesus took part of the same.

*“A human body, a human mind, with all the peculiar properties, He was bone, brain, and muscle. A man of our flesh, He was compassed with the weakness of humanity... He trod our earth as man. **He had reason, conscience, memory, will, and affections of the human soul** which was united with His divine nature.”—16MR 181, 182. {TA 157.1}*

*“As God He could not be tempted: but as a man He could be tempted, and that strongly, and could yield to the temptations... **His human nature was created**; it did not even possess the angelic powers. **It was human, identical with our own.**” {6MR 111.1}*

“The human will of Christ would not have led him to the wilderness of temptation, to fast, and to be tempted of the devil. It would not have led him to endure humiliation, scorn, reproach, suffering, and death. His human nature shrank from all these things as decidedly as ours shrinks from them.” {ST, October 29, 1894 par. 9}

So where is the difference in Jesus humanity to ours?

*Heb 4:15 For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was **in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.***

Here is a difference between Jesus and us; *“yet without sin.”* If you study the Baker Letter (MR No. 1002 - THE BAKER LETTER {13MR page 13}) you will see the many times Sister White makes a point that; Jesus never sinned, we have! This is the difference; Jesus had no sin on Him, we have! If there was something different in Christ’s humanity as far as His makeup is concerned, **He could not be our example** and this would be a valid argument to support why one cannot overcome sin. But praise God this excuse for sin is not valid.

Chapter 11-*Hebrews* 7.26

- **The Priesthood of Christ and the 1888 Message;**

Heb 7:26 "For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens;"

The whole book of Hebrews is about the contrasts between Christ's priesthood with the Levitical priesthood; the old covenant with the new; the Melchisedek priesthood with that of Aarons and why the old covenant priesthood failed. If you read from verse 23 you will see the Levitical priest could not continue "by reason of death" verse 24 then states; *"But this man,(Jesus) because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood."* Notice Paul is contrasting Christ's unchangeable priesthood with the changeable intercession of the Levitical priest. Now he says in verse 25; *"Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them"*. He now contrasts the temporary intercession of the Levitical priest with the eternal intercession of Christ. Why is Christ's priesthood unchangeable and eternal? Verses 26; *"For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens;"* This passage is referring particularly to the divine Sonship of Christ. Take note it says; ***"He was made higher than the heavens"***, that's why verses 28 says; *"For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the **Son**, who is consecrated for evermore."* This is the point of Hebrews 7. Our high priest had to be one of us in every way, Heb 5:1-2, **but**

also the Son of God in order to represent us before the Father - if Christ was separate from sinners how could He represent sinners? The Scripture says in Heb 5:2 *"Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity."* Because Christ inherited the same infirmities as the rest of us - how was He separate from sinners? Because He never sinned! Now let us read Heb 7:26-27 *"For such a high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; 27 Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself"*. Christ never had to bring a sin offering; in this way He is separate from sinners, not separate in His nature! The brethren suggesting this are not studying correctly; if you use Heb 7:26 to teach Christ had a different nature to us, or was born different to us, you totally destroy all of Heb 7 and the whole book of Hebrews. Paul devotes all of chapter 2 and part of chapter 4 and 5 to the humanity of Christ, to make it perfectly clear He could not be our high priest if He was different to us in His humanity. Heb 2:14-17, Heb 4:14-16, Heb 5:1-2, etc.

Heb 5:1 "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins:"

Heb5:2 "Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity."

When you change Christ's humanity and separate Him from us then He cannot be your High Priest and cannot represent you. This is the very foundation of the book of Hebrews. That's why we are continually admonished to follow Him; Heb 6:20, Heb 10:19-20.

Inspiration says, ***"It was necessary that Christ should take upon him our nature, in order to prove the falsity of Satan's statements. The apostate cast contempt upon the law of God, and declared that it was impossible for men to keep God's commandment, which had been preordained in the counsels of heaven. Therefore Christ became man's representative and surety, thus demonstrating to heavenly intelligences, to unfallen worlds, and to the human race, that, through cooperation with divine agencies, humanity could be pure and holy. By partaking of the divine nature they could meet the demand of a perfect and holy law. Of Christ it is written: "He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens."*** {ST, June 18, 1894 par. 5}

"Christ's overcoming and obedience is that of a true human being. In our conclusions, we make many mistakes because of our erroneous views of the human nature of our Lord. When we give to His human nature a power that it is not possible for man to have in his conflicts with Satan, we destroy the completeness of His humanity. His imputed grace and power He gives to all who receive Him by faith." {OHC 48.2}

“The obedience of Christ to His Father was the same obedience that is required of man. Man cannot overcome Satan's temptations without divine power to combine with his instrumentality. So with Jesus Christ; He could lay hold of divine power. He came not to our world to give the obedience of a lesser God to a greater, but as a man to obey God's Holy Law, and in this way He is our example. The Lord Jesus came to our world, not to reveal what a God could do, but what a man could do, through faith in God's power to help in every emergency. Man is, through faith, to be a partaker in the divine nature, and to overcome every temptation wherewith he is beset.” {OHC 48.3}

“The Lord now demands that every son and daughter of Adam, through faith in Jesus Christ, serve Him in human nature which we now have. The Lord Jesus has bridged the gulf that sin has made. He has connected earth with heaven, and finite man with the infinite God. Jesus, **the world's Redeemer**, could only keep the commandments of God in the same way that humanity can keep them.” {OHC 48.4}

“We are not to serve God as if we were not human, but we are to serve Him in the nature we have, that has been redeemed by the Son of God; through the righteousness of Christ we shall stand before God pardoned, and as though we had never sinned.” {OHC 48.5}

“The humanity of the Son of God is everything to us. It is the golden chain that binds our souls to Christ, and through Christ to God.” {OHC 48.6}

This next passage really sums it up; Christ's humanity had no power that we cannot have, ***“Christ's overcoming and obedience is that of a true human being”*** This is why He is our example; ***“He came not to our world to give the obedience of a lesser God to a greater, but as a man to obey God's Holy Law, and in this way He is our example.”*** So why didn't Christ sin like the rest of us? As we have seen it is not because of a power we cannot have or because His humanity was different to ours; it was because He always exercised His will in obedience to God, and by faith He would lay hold of Divine power, this is where we fail. ***“The Lord Jesus came to our world, not to reveal what a God could do, but what a man could do, through faith in God's power to help in every emergency”{OHC 48.3}.*** If Jesus, in His humanity, did not remain connected with God He too would have sinned, He would not have been able to overcome Satan's temptations. Notice the following statement; ***“Man cannot overcome Satan's temptations without divine power to combine with his instrumentality. So with Jesus Christ; He could lay hold of divine power”*** Even as a young child He still had to exercise His will to do all things in the light of God's law.

God's remnant will not only stand on the platform of 1844-46, but also on the message of 1888. Where the full and complete Divinity and humanity of Christ was clearly set forth, this led to the correct understanding of the atonement, sanctuary message and Righteousness by faith.

1. The Divinity of Christ is our surety in the atonement, see Heb 9:14 and ***“In all the fullness of His divinity, in***

all the glory of His spotless humanity, Christ gave Himself for us as a full and free sacrifice,”{FW 85.1}

2. ***“The humanity of the Son of God is everything to us. It is the golden chain that binds our souls to Christ, and through Christ to God.” {OHC 48.6}***

The 1888 message clearly set forth the true humanity of Christ. In order that He can rightly represent us as our high priest before the Father in the sanctuary, see Heb 5:1-2 and Heb 4:15. If you prayerfully read from Heb 4:15 to Heb 5:10 you will see that before Christ could be our high priest He had to be like us, *“compassed with infirmities”* and *“in all points tempted like as we are”* and *“learned He obedience by the things which He suffered”*, then the apostle says in verse 9 *“being made perfect He became the author of eternal salvation.”* And therefore in Verse 10 we read, *“called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedek”* (King of Righteousness). See also Isaiah 53:11. All this is based upon the full and complete humanity of the Son of God, Hebrews 5:1-2.

The 1888 message taught this clearly. We can look to Him in faith, and follow Him as He intercedes for us in the final cleansing work in the most Holy place, because we believe He is truly our example and our high priest. The teachings of many today in the Godhead movement, because of their understanding of sin, are teaching a false Righteousness by Faith message. They even freely admit “Jesus was different to us” and they teach that He was “born as sanctified Brethren”, and by doing so these Brethren destroy the sanctuary message, the 1844/1888 platforms. The very heart of the sanctuary message is not the sanctuary itself, but the

value of the Sacrifice (the Divine Son of God) and who it is that ministers the Sacrifice - namely the High Priest, *“taken from among men”*. We, like ancient Israel in the type, truly have a Brother ministering for us before the Father - ***1Ti 2:5*** *“For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the **man** Christ Jesus;”* We look to Him in faith knowing that He has overcome as we must overcome, that He was tempted in all points as we are and He learnt obedience by the things which He suffered. The cleansing of the sanctuary and the cleansing of our record of sin will take place as we partake of His victorious life - the perfect life of a fallen human being who conquered sin.

Heb 5:9 “And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him;”

That’s why Jesus became our high priest after the order of Melchisedek, (My King of Righteousness). In Hebrews 7:11, 19 it says the Levitical priesthood could not perfect the worshiper; the problem was not with the law, (The Levitical Priesthood) but the people’s failure to obey (Heb 8:8). Jesus lived under the Levitical law; He obeyed every precept, the only man who never had to bring a sin offering - Heb 7:26-27. By living a perfect life while subject to the law of sin (sinful nature), Christ conquered sin and became the King of Righteousness and our High Priest after the order of Melchisedek, taken from among men. If you teach Jesus had a different nature to us and that “sinful nature is itself sin” then you destroy Christ’s priesthood; He could not have been born subject to the law of sin, therefore He could not have conquered it, thus He could not be our high priest *“taken from among men”*. Then you go back to the original problem, the

old covenant, which could not stop men sinning! Can you see what they have done? The brethren have totally destroyed the atonement, priesthood and sanctuary message.

- *Jesus was Born-Born again?*

If Jesus was BBA He would be in His humanity born different to every other child of Adam, which is “Immaculate Conception Doctrine” and cuts Christ off from every other human being. Hebrews 2:14 specifically tells us He was born like every other child, and children are not Born-Born Again.

The reason the Brethren teach this is because they believe we are Born Sinners, so they need to change Christ’s circumstances at birth, (this is no different to the Catholic Teaching) but the born again experience is for the sinner not for the child. Born again has to do with character not nature, for the born again Christian still has a sinful nature. The new born infant has nothing to be born again from. An infant has not developed an unrighteous character therefore does not need to be born again. Jesus began like every other child; He never developed one unrighteous trait, therefore never needed to be born again. And infants that die and will be in Heaven won’t need a born again experience. Keep in mind the born again experience is for the sinner, which requires guilt, repentance, faith etc. A new born infant cannot experience guilt or repentance, nor has any understanding of right and wrong or good and evil; they are a separate class from the sinners and the saints. See Pioneer statements, also Robert Burness’ study, “There are 3 classes in the Resurrection; 1. The saints. 2. The lost. 3. The babies”. See also “Sinner or Saint” www.thewordwasmadeflesh.org

Chapter 12 - Reformers

- *Misunderstanding of Righteousness by Faith;*

Martin Luther's understanding;

Although Luther taught salvation by grace, he went too far and a lot of the problems today stem from his teaching. Luther taught grace alone, without works and he rejected the Epistle of James, calling it "an Epistle of straw". His error stemmed from a wrong understanding of sin and the nature of man. He believed man, by nature, is incapable of doing anything good, which is exactly what many brethren teach today. This teaching is called the doctrine of total depravity. Notice the following statement from Luther's Catechism;

"That which is born in us from Adam, angry, hateful, envious, unchaste, stingy, lazy, haughty, yea unbelieving, infected with all vices and having by nature nothing good in it."

It is because of this teaching that Luther taught infant baptism. He also taught that the Holy Spirit was received through baptism. Please read Acts 10:44-47 and you will see the Holy Spirit comes before baptism. See also Rom 2:14-15, which speaks about unbaptised Gentiles doing the things contained in the law.

Luther also consented to the death of the poor Anabaptist's who rightly opposed infant baptism. Scripture also says; "*he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved*" and a new born infant has no understanding of "right and wrong" Deut.1:39.

This incorrect understanding of the nature of sin/nature of man, led him to develop another error; the teaching of "bondage of the will", and this of course led to Calvin's predestination doctrine. Calvin was 8 years old when Luther

taught these heresies and later developed his predestination doctrine based on Luther's teaching. He believed man was so totally depraved, so incapable of doing anything good that he did not even have the ability to choose what is right! Therefore he concluded that God has predestined everyone's eternal destiny. Many today, are also teaching that for fallen man it is "absolutely impossible to do anything good."

Notice this statement from Martin Luther, "It is manifest that there can be no such thing as free will". Ask yourself why the Bible continually admonishes us to choose what is right, (Jos 24:15, Rom 6:16), if we do not have a free will; also inspiration says;

"What you need to understand is the true force of the will. This is the governing power in the nature of man, the power of decision, or of choice. Everything depends on the right action of the will. The power of choice God has given to men; it is theirs to exercise." {SC 47.1}

There are a multitude of inspired statements and Bible verses that teach of the higher, nobler and moral powers that exist in man, indeed inspiration says man is endowed with these Godly virtues. See "Original Sin - Are we Born Sinners? part3

Chapter 13 -Lawful prey of the enemy

"Your children, that are under your control, should be made to mind you. Your word should be their law. Will not parents wake up to their duty before it shall be too late, and take hold of the work in earnest, redeem the time, and make unsparing efforts to save their children? Children are the lawful prey of the enemy, because they are not subjects of grace, have not experienced the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus, and the evil angels have access to these children; and some parents are careless and suffer them to work with but little restraint. Parents have a great work to do in this matter, by correcting and subduing their children, and then by bringing them to God and claiming his blessing upon them. By the faithful and untiring efforts of the parents, and the blessing and grace entreated of God upon the children, the power of the evil angels will be broken, a sanctifying influence is shed upon the children, and the powers of darkness must give back. When the destroying angel was to pass through Egypt, to destroy the first-born of man and beast, Israel was commanded to gather their children and families into their houses with them, and then mark their door-posts with blood, that the destroying angel might pass by their dwellings, and if they failed to go through with this process, there was no difference made between them and the Egyptians. The destroying angel is soon to go forth again, not to destroy the first-born alone, but " to slay utterly old and young, both men, women and little children" who have not the mark. Parents, if you wish to save your children, separate them from the world, keep them from the company of wicked

children; for if you suffer them to go with wicked children, you cannot prevent them from partaking of their wickedness and being corrupted. It is your solemn duty to watch over your children, to choose the society, at all times for them. Learn your children to obey you, then can they more easily obey the commandments of God, and yield to his requirements. Don't let us neglect to pray with, and for our children. He that said, " Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not," will listen to our prayers for them, and the seal, or mark, of believing parents will cover their children, if they are trained up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. E. G. WHITE"

Nowhere in this passage does it mention birth; rather speaks about children and the responsibility of parents in raising children faithfully. For example; *"bringing them to God and claiming his blessing upon them"* and by the *"faithful and untiring efforts of the parents"*. While it is true that children (and us) are the lawful prey of the enemy, it is the unfaithfulness of parents that allow evil angels to influence the little ones. Again notice from the same passage; "some parents are careless and suffer them (evil angels) to work with but little restraint". If the parents, particularly the mother, are faithful in their duty, the enemy has no chance to control the mind of the little ones.

Notice the following statements;

"The work of the mother must commence at an early age, giving Satan no chance to control the minds and dispositions of their little ones." {CG 230.3}

It is the neglect of the parents that allows Satan to influence their little ones.

“The heavenly intelligences cannot co-operate with fathers and mothers who are neglecting to train their children, who are allowing Satan to handle that little piece of infant machinery,” {CG 232.1}

Notice the context in the passage is always referring to the parent’s responsibility in watching over the children.

*“Parents, if you wish to save your children, separate them from the world; keep them from the company of wicked children”**“It is your solemn duty to watch over your children, to choose the society, at all times for them.”**“Don't let us neglect to pray with, and for our children.”**“For if you suffer them to go with wicked children, you cannot prevent them from partaking of their wickedness and being corrupted.”* E. G. WHITE

This is speaking about their character not their nature! The faithful parent can protect their children’s character from **“being corrupted.”** In this sinful world we are all “the lawful prey of the enemy”, Adam’s disobedience gave Satan the right to harass and tempt his posterity. But this does not mean we are born sinners. Even the converted Christian is still “the lawful prey of the enemy”, yet everyone would agree the truly converted Christian is not a sinner, but still temptable, still a prey. Even Jesus who certainly wasn’t born a sinner was a “lawful prey of the enemy”, from childhood to the cross.

“The divine nature, combined with the human, made Him capable of yielding to Satan's temptations. Here the test to Christ was far greater than that of Adam and Eve, for Christ took our nature, fallen but not corrupted, and would not be corrupted unless He received the words of Satan in the place of the words of God. To suppose He was not capable of yielding to temptation places Him where He cannot be a perfect example for man, and the force and the power of this part of Christ's humiliation, which is the most eventful, is no instruction or help to human beings. {16MR 182.3}

“Children are the lawful prey of the enemy, because they are not subjects of grace, have not experienced the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus” E. G. WHITE

Are children under the guardianship of angels?

Mat 18:10 “Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.”

This statement that some try to use to teach “born sinners” actually teaches accountability. The reason the children “*are not the subjects of grace*” is because they **“have not experienced the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus”**. This experience of forgiveness and justification - **“the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus”** requires understanding of one’s condition; conviction of sin; repentance and faith; all of which a new born baby has no understanding of and is incapable of doing. That’s what is meant by the statement **“are not**

subjects of grace, have not experienced the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus". The little ones are under the guardianship of the angels and the care and training of the parents. It is because they are not accountable to God that the parent's faith covers the children. Notice how the statement ends, "the seal, or mark, of believing parents will cover their children". If the child is born a sinner, it would be condemned by the law and lost. This is exactly what some brethren are teaching. **Even from birth** they are hopeless lost and condemned.

In a special sense all humanity is under grace as we can see from the following scriptures.

Titus 2:11 "For the **grace of God** that bringeth salvation hath appeared to **all men**,"

1Timothy 4:10 "For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the **Saviour of all men**, specially of those that believe."

Romans 5:20 "Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where **sin abounded, grace did much more abound**:"

But the "**grace**" Sister White is speaking of in this statement is the "**grace**" that brings "the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus" and she says children are "**not subjects**" of this "**grace**"! Why? Because "the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus" is for the transgressor or sinner; not the innocent new born baby who is "*the inheritance of the Lord*" Ps. 127:3, who has "*no knowledge between good and evil*" Deut.1:39, "*neither having done any good or evil*" Rom 9:11.

For one to be a subject of grace, one has to first sin. We are all born justified, acquitted and reconciled before God. Rom 5:18. Therefore, you cannot escape the dilemma that if children are born sinners then you must change Jesus nature! But scripture says in **Heb. 2:14** “*Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh (sarx/sinful nature) and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same;*”

This passage destroys OS, BS teachings. It identifies Christ’s birth into mankind with every other child of Adam. Jesus was born with the same nature as all children, He too was a “**lawful prey of the enemy**” and neither was He a subject of grace, because He never sinned and did not require the cleansing power of the blood of a Saviour. He was born under the law (Gal 4:4) and began His life as we do, not as a condemned sinner, but as a probationer.

“Christ on Probation.--For a period of time Christ was on probation. He took humanity on Himself, to stand the test and trial which the first Adam failed to endure. Had He failed in His test and trial, He would have been disobedient to the voice of God, and the world would have been lost” (ST May 10, 1899). {5BC 1082.6}

Notice He began His life as a probationer, not a sinner and if “*He failed in His test and trial*” and “*would have been disobedient to the voice of God,*” then He would have been in need of “**the cleansing power**”. Of course that would have been impossible because there was no other Saviour, therefore Jesus “*and the world would have been lost*”.

Keep in mind we are not teaching that babies do not need a Saviour. The question is; what do they need to be saved from? Sin or the effects of sin? It's not a sin to be born a human being; Jesus was born a human being. It is a sin to transgress God's law, to be "disobedient to the voice of God." The Bible says; "*whosoever commiteth sin*", it doesn't say whosoever is born, rather, whosoever committeth; which means an action of the thoughts and will combined against the will of God. And children have no knowledge of good or evil, in fact their nature is endowed with moral powers and virtuous qualities;

"Love to Jesus, trust, repose, confidence, are all qualities that agree with the child's nature." {CG 486.3}

This statement from EJ Waggoner sums it up beautifully. Notice how he does not separate Christ from the rest of the children;

"Human nature is sinful, and the law of God condemns all sin. Not that men are born into the world directly condemned by the law, for in infancy they have no knowledge of right and wrong, and are incapable of doing either, but they are born with sinful tendencies, owing to the sins of their ancestors. And when Christ came into the world, He came subject to all the conditions to which other children are subject. {July 2, 1891 EJW, PTUK 217.1}

Summary:

This is just one of the many statements some Brethren desperately use to try and teach "born sinners" - a term which the SOP never uses! Just like the trinity debate. They do not have one clear statement from "The Testimony of Jesus" to teach their doctrine, but they try to twist meanings out of

statements to support their beliefs. Like this one which we have examined above, the words “birth” or “born” are never mentioned. The statement is simply referring to the responsibility of parents as faithful guardians over their children, against the devices of the enemy, and how the parent’s faith covers the little ones. Which means what?- obviously infants without understanding are not accountable nor can be condemned by a law that judges wrong/selfish motives, of which the Scripture clearly teaches a new born baby is incapable of.

Chapter 14 - Acceptance of Scripture Evidence

We should believe God's word; it is plain and there is no need for anyone to be deceived. Again we are counselled by God's prophet –

*"The truths most plainly revealed in the Bible have been involved in doubt and darkness by learned men, who, with a pretence of great wisdom, teach that the Scriptures have a mystical, a secret, spiritual meaning not apparent in the language employed. These men are false teachers. It was to such a class that Jesus declared, "Ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God." [Mark 12:24.] The language of the Bible should be explained according to its obvious meaning, unless a symbol or figure is employed. Christ has given the promise, "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." [John 7:17.] **If men would but take the Bible as it reads, if there were no false teachers to mislead and confuse their minds, a work would be accomplished that would make angels glad, and that would bring into the fold of Christ thousands upon thousands who are now wandering in error.**" {GC88 598.3}*

*"I was shown the necessity of those who believe that we are having the last message of mercy, being separate from those who are daily imbibing new errors. I saw that neither young nor old should attend their meetings; **for it is wrong to thus encourage them while they teach error that is a deadly poison to the soul** and teach for doctrines the commandments of men. The influence of such gatherings is not good. If God*

*has delivered us from such darkness and error, we should stand fast in the liberty wherewith He has set us free and rejoice in the truth. God is displeased with us when we go to listen to error, without being obliged to go; for unless He sends us to those meetings where error is forced home to the people by the power of the will, He will not keep us. **The angels cease their watchful care over us, and we are left to the buffetings of the enemy, to be darkened and weakened by him and the power of his evil angels; and the light around us becomes contaminated with the darkness.**" {EW 124.3}*

Hebrews 2:17 states; "*Wherefore in **all** things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God.*" **You need to remove this scripture if you wish to teach Jesus had a different nature than ours. It is an "absolute" scripture and warrants no argument.**

Sister White confirms this; "*In our Lord's great scene of conflict in the wilderness, apparently under the power of Satan and his angels, was He capable, in His human nature, of yielding to these temptations? {CTr 213.3} {6MR 110.3} As God He could not be tempted, but as a man He could be tempted, and that strongly, and could yield to the temptations. His human nature must pass through the same test and trial Adam and Eve passed through. His human nature was created; it did not even possess the angelic powers. It was human, identical with our own. He was passing over the ground where Adam fell. He was now where, if He endured the test and trial in behalf of the fallen race, He would redeem*

Adam's disgraceful failure and fall, in our own humanity. {CTr 213.4} {6MR 111.1} A human body and a human mind were His. He was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. . . ."
{6MR 111.2}

We are told that Jesus took on Him the seed of Abraham and David - Heb.2:16, Acts 13:22-23. **You need to remove these scriptures if you wish to teach Jesus had a different nature than ours. They are "absolute" scriptures and warrant no argument.**

Sister White confirms this; "It would have been an almost infinite humiliation for the Son of God to take man's nature, even when Adam stood in his innocence in Eden. But Jesus accepted humanity when the race had been weakened by four thousand years of sin. Like every child of Adam He accepted the results of the working of the great law of heredity. What these results were is shown in the history of His earthly ancestors. He came with such a heredity to share our sorrows and temptations, and to give us the example of a sinless life. {DA 48.5}

We are told all unrighteousness is sin - 1 John 5:17, and sin is the transgression of the law, 1 John 3:4. **You need to remove these scriptures if you wish to teach babies are born sinners and lost. They are "absolute" scriptures and warrant no argument.**

Sister White confirms this; "Sin is an intruder, for whose presence no reason can be given. It is mysterious, unaccountable; to excuse it, is to defend it. Could excuse for it be found, or cause be shown for its existence, it would cease to

be sin. **Our only definition of sin is that given in the Word of God; it is “the transgression of the law;”** it is the outworking of a principle at war with the great law of love which is the foundation of the divine government. {GC88 492.2}

Where there is no law there is no transgression - Rom.4:15.
You need to remove this scripture if you wish to teach babies are born sinners and lost. It is an "absolute" scripture and warrants no argument.

If you believe a baby is born selfish and you call this sin - then you must also believe that Jesus was born exactly that way also; and then your only option is to change the nature of Jesus, which is exactly what this false doctrine is about. God created babies unable to speak. How do they let us know of their needs? How do they tell us when they are cold, when they are hungry, when they need changing, when they are frightened? They cry! Are they being selfish - no, for they do not even know what selfishness is.

Scripture is absolutely clear - there is no room for confusion - *Ezek.18:20 – “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: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.”* **You need to remove this scripture if you wish to teach babies are born sinners and lost. It is an "absolute" scripture and warrants no argument.**

Also we are warned by God's prophet - *"In almost every case where reproof is necessary, there will be some who entirely*

overlook the fact that the Spirit of the Lord has been grieved and His cause reproached. These will pity those who deserved reproof, because personal feelings have been hurt. All this unsanctified sympathy places the sympathizers where they are sharers in the guilt of the one reproved. In nine cases out of ten if the one reproved had been left under a sense of his wrongs, he might have been helped to see them and thereby have been reformed. But meddling, unsanctified sympathizers place altogether a wrong construction upon the motives of the reprover and the nature of the reproof given, and by sympathizing with the one reproved lead him to feel that he has been really abused; and his feelings rise up in rebellion against the one who has only done his duty. Those who faithfully discharge their unpleasant duties under a sense of their accountability to God will receive His blessing." [VOL. 3, P. 359 (1875).] {5T 679.1}

Every wind of doctrine is blowing. Our only anchor is "It is written". There is no other safety for us.

Sister White again tells us - "*After a long and severe conflict, the faithful few decided to dissolve all union with the apostate church if she still refused to free herself from falsehood and idolatry. They saw that separation was an absolute necessity if they would obey the Word of God. They dared not tolerate errors fatal to their own souls, and set an example which would imperil the faith of their children and children's children. To secure peace and unity they were ready to make any concession consistent with fidelity to God; but they felt that even peace would be too dearly purchased at the sacrifice*

of principle. If unity could be secured only by the compromise of truth and righteousness, then let there be difference, and even war. {GC88 45.2}

To be standing with Jesus when He returns will cost us everything we have on this earth - and that includes our family and friends. Jesus will weep throughout eternity for all who choose their human family and friends over and above Him, and choose to listen to man instead of His word - but He also promises to wipe away all our tears. Love for the Father and Son is of much more value than to stand with friends that are in error and standing in clear defiance of God's word.

These scriptures are "air tight absolute scriptures" that cannot be refuted - and these scriptures alone should make anyone halt and look to where their steps are taking them. It is with great sadness that we see many standing with those teaching false doctrine and actively supporting them. It will take a very courageous person to acknowledge they are in error, but God warns us that "*pride goeth before destruction and a haughty spirit before a fall – Prov16:18*". Pride will keep most from returning to God.

To try and change the human nature of Jesus while sojourning on earth is nothing new. An **entire conference** did that in Sister White's day. She gives clear instruction of the error they were in then, and that same error is being taught again today. It was born back in Sister White's day, **by one man**, and look at how many followed that one man. If you don't have a copy of the Holy Flesh document, let us know and we will email it to you.