

ANTI-SOCIAL SLUR: ORIGINAL SIN SLANDERS OUR FIRST PARENTS (ASSUMING WE HAD ONES!) AND OUR VULNERABLE INNOCENT BABIES AND THE WHOLE HUMAN RACE!!!

Original sin is the idea that we all come into existence as sinners and estranged from God and that Adam the first human being was to blame for that. Some say original sin is like a rage virus except it is a spiritual infection. That is a good description for it is about war against real goodness and thus God. A result of original sin is that we always tend to sin. Barack Obama said, "No one is born hating another person because of the color of his skin or his background or his religion." If we have original sin then how true is that? What if it programs some to hate on racist grounds? Ignoring how we don't care about most other people, Nelson Mandela lies and says "love comes more naturally to the human heart than its opposite." If original sin is inside each of us then one of its features is certainly denial as exemplified by those two do-gooders!!!

There are three understandings of what original sin is. That it is your own first sin - that somehow a baby that knows nothing can personally sin. That you are blamed with Adam for his sin so you are guilty too - the orthodox Christian view. That you are not blamed for it but you are born like you have been.

Original sin is the sin that Adam and Eve committed at the beginning of the human race according to the Bible and Christian theology. Adam represented the human race and so when he sinned the entire human race was sinful at the first moment of their existence in the womb for he sinned for the whole race. He made the decision that we would all be born in original sin and so it happened. This sin is original sin both because it is the first or original sin ever committed by a man and also because we have it when we begin to exist. Roman Catholicism teaches that baptism is necessary for forgiveness for original sin. If the sin is not forgiven, God will not let the person into Heaven.

Adam and Eve need to be put on trial before being accused of all that! So much for Christianity's belief in innocent until proven guilty.

Church teaching is that the sin is personal in Adam but natural in me. In other words, Adam was being spiteful and selfish while as for me I am made in that state which is why the sin is grave in him and in me it is grave but not as grave. Adam was being personal and I am not. This is saying I come in being sinful in nature. I am as bad as him except I didn't take the forbidden fruit. He did.

Does this original sin mean we are born thieves, blasphemers, murderers, sexual profligates and liars? It is said we are afflicted by sin, we have a problem that makes us want to be independent of God and enjoy good on our terms not his. So we are supposed to have the problem of sin. Believers say that the type of sins is a different issue so we are not born thieves or whatever. We are born sinners but it is up to us what kind of sins we will commit. It is up to us to become thieves etc. But don't be charmed by that. If pride and the wish to be free from God are what comprise sin then whatever thieving or murdering we get up to or not, the problem is our attitude not what we actually do with it. So the person who would not kill is as bad as the person who does kill. Original sin insults the entire human race and is another denial of innocent until PROVEN guilty. Atheists sometimes wonder that when Christianity says that we come into existence with defects that make us bad why they cannot say we get defects that tend to make us religious and condone evil when done and permitted by a supposed God! Religion likes to be good but good in a way that it becomes an enemy of the best. Religion does exhibit detachment from reality and distorts respect for others - you would almost think the most obvious symptom of original sin is religion itself!

Christians use the behaviour of monsters like Stalin as evidence of original sin. It is evil to use human suffering as evidence for a religious doctrine especially a monstrous and absurd one such as original sin. The religious person means more by original sin than the human inclination to evil. That is where the problem is. And if Stalin is evidence for original sin, it means that all of us are accused of having original sin and thus being as potentially dangerous as he was.

The reason Christians remark that we are all so drawn to sin and sin so much is that they have made up half of the sins. We are a lot better than they say so there is no evidence that we prefer bad to good. Even if most people do bad things now that does not prove that they are deliberately evil. They may just be as unintelligent and not know how to become better people.

A religion teaching original sin is bad in principle regardless of how much good in practice it does. If murdering a person every year somehow seemed to lower the crime rate that would not make this good worth it. In fact it would only be an apparent good not a real one!

To sum up,

We are accused of not coming into this world innocent or neutral but hostile to God. For a baby, the baby would hate and curse God if he or she could. No innocent until proven guilty here and this is an extreme violation.

The cruel deeds of monsters such as Hitler are used as proof that it is true. It is exploiting actions that hurt others as weapons to convince people a doctrine is true. It is an abuse of the suffering.

There is no test to compare how original sin affects x who has it removed by baptism and y who still has it. To all intents and purposes y will not be any better than x or vice versa. People are accused simply to help the Church so it can baptise babies to "cure" original sin and get recruits and influence.

Remember that original sin is seen as something very very serious. It is no big deal accusing somebody falsely of murder if you can say they are corrupted by original sin.