Infant Guilt and Salvation

Dual identity at birth There is an interesting passage in Hebrews in Romans I think chapter 9 that talks about Saw and Jacob and before they were born and before they knew good and evil, and then it continues on, and that statement was pretty powerful to me because if a baby is born. It does not make the baby Guilty sin because the baby is not born in wickedness as summer religion. Jesus himself says to enter the king of heaven you need to be like one of these ones talking about the children who have no knowledge of right established opinion on this, but what Paul says is I was alive until desire. Gave birth to send and send killed me. Adam was in Wright standing until he ate from the knowledge of good And then he was separated when he did this act of rebellion with that watch makes a very good point because in everything they're extremes and there's bounce, and the Bible definitely says that we are all underneath the curse therefore, there are none that are righteous when for example, an infant is born end of the world. They truly have I think now in my current opinion as of today, listening to watch They are more under Adam. They are the watchman knee says that he speaks English, but that does not make him an English. He is in fact from China he is by nationality Chinese. He cannot be born in China. He was born in China. He can say he was born somewhere else, but that would be a lie. He was born in China. he is in fact Chinese when I was born I was born in because my father Was also born and his father and his father and in the genealogy of Matthew. It takes you all the way back to Adam Jesus is unique in Joseph was not his father. The Holy Spirit came upon Mary, which made him unique indifferent like the first he was made in thereby he was able to be possession of our Messiah through the work of God because he was not born under Adam When we are bored under Adam we are born predisposed to send but we are not born in. we are born separated as disposed to the way that watchman pauses it is we are a sinner wanna be very delicate and very careful how we articulate this because there is the idea that if you send you are a sinner or you were born a sinner and therefore you send both statements or somewhat true, which is why I wanna be delicate Prior to sin, you are predisposed to sin, but when you sin, you are a sinner, and therefore there's a legal claim against you for the sin you've committed however you are born, separated in unredeemed when you were born before you send this is my opinion that you have two statuses you are born predisposed to send in Adam But you are not a sinner. You are an image error. You are an image bearer as one nationality and predisposed to as a second nationality, however when you send you are still an image bearer, just like watch the knee is still the Chinese man, but when my knee is in America speaking English, he may have a new passport and new nationality and therefore he has been introduced to America and has become an American, but he's still Chinese when you become a center you are traduced to being a sinner who is born predisposed to sin, but you never lose the status of image. You were born in image error before you knew right from wrong.

Thought for 4 seconds

You're circling something the Bible really does hold in tension: **(1) every human is an image-bearer** and **(2) every human is born into Adam's damaged realm**, a realm where sin and death reign. The trick is keeping the categories clean so we don't accidentally say more than the text says.

1) Jacob/Esau "before they were born" isn't mainly about infant guilt

The passage you're reaching for is **Romans 9:10–13** (Jacob/Esau; "though they were not yet born and had done nothing either good or bad…"). Paul's point there is **God's elective purpose** (how God advances His promise line), not a detailed statement about *how infants are judged*.

So: Romans 9 is strong evidence for **God's purpose prior to human action**, but it's not the best "infant accountability" proof-text.

2) The Bible clearly affirms: children are truly "innocent" in an important sense

Jesus: "to such belongs the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 19:14; cf. 18:1–6).
Also: Deuteronomy 1:39 talks about the little ones "who today have no knowledge of good or evil."
Jonah 4:11 references those who "do not know their right hand from their left."

That's real: **there is a moral-knowledge/agency threshold** the Bible recognizes.

3) But the Bible also says: we are born into Adam's realm, and it's not morally neutral

Key texts that create the pressure:

- **Romans 5:12–19**: sin and death entered through Adam; death spreads to all; Adam functions as a "head" whose act impacts the many.
- **Ephesians 2:3**: "by nature children of wrath" (whatever nuance we give that phrase, it's not "blank slate").
- **Psalm 51:5** is often cited ("in sin did my mother conceive me")—but interpreters differ on whether this is **poetic hyperbole about pervasive sinfulness** or a literal biological claim.

So the Bible gives you a second category: **a congenital condition / realm / solidarity** that is bigger than personal "I chose this specific act."

4) Your "dual status" framing is close—just sharpen the vocabulary

What you're calling "two statuses" maps well to two biblical layers:

A) Ontological identity: Image-bearer (never lost)

Genesis 1:26–27; Genesis 9:6; James 3:9 assume humans remain image-bearers even post-Fall.
So your statement "you never lose the status of image" is solid.

B) Covenantal/realm identity: In Adam (until transferred into Christ)

Paul's dominant binary is **"in Adam" vs "in Christ"** (1 Corinthians 15:22; Romans 5).
That's the deeper "passport" language you're reaching for—**a realm transfer**.

So your "traduce" idea (transfer/conveyance) actually fits Paul's transfer language well: **domain shift** (cf. Colossians 1:13).

5) The crucial distinction: *corruption* vs *guilt*

This is where Christian traditions diverge, and where your carefulness is warranted.

- **Corruption / predisposition / mortality**: the bent, weakness, and death-bound condition inherited from Adam. Many traditions agree this is universal.
- **Personal guilt for chosen acts**: accountable transgression requires agency/knowledge/will.
- **Adamic guilt / imputation**: some traditions say Adam's guilt is counted to all at birth (strong federal headship). Others resist that and say what's inherited is corruption + death, and guilt attaches with personal sin.

Your current position sounds like:

- **Yes**: inherited corruption / predisposition ("in Adam" realm)
- **No**: personal guilt before moral agency
  That is a coherent biblical synthesis, even though not every tradition will label it the same way.

6) “I was alive once…” (Romans 7) — handle with care

Romans 7:7–11 (“I was once alive apart from the law, but when the commandment came… sin came alive and I died.”)

There are several legitimate readings:

1. Paul narrates **Israel’s story** under Torah (corporate).
2. Paul narrates **Adam’s story** (commandment, deception, death).
3. Paul narrates **his own awakening** to moral accountability.

Your use of it as an “accountability ignition” text is plausible **as a theological pattern**, but it’s not universally agreed that Romans 7 is literally Paul describing infancy → childhood. Still, the *pattern* (“commandment encountered → sin activated → death experienced”) matches what you’re talking about.

7) A tighter “peg-and-rope” set of pegs

Here’s a clean set of pegs you can reuse without over-claiming:

- **PEG 1 — Image:** Every human is God’s image (Genesis 1; James 3).
- **PEG 2 — Realm:** Every human is born “in Adam” (Romans 5; 1 Cor 15).
- **PEG 3 — Agency:** God recognizes “not knowing good/evil” (Deut 1:39; Jonah 4:11; Jesus with children).
- **PEG 4 — Death/Corruption:** Adamic fallout is universal (Romans 5).
- **PEG 5 — Transfer:** Salvation is a domain/identity transfer into Christ (Romans 5; Col 1:13).

With those pegs, your “dual identity at birth” becomes:
Image-bearer by creation + in-Adam by realm solidarity, while **personal guilt attaches with knowingly chosen transgression** (however exactly one defines that threshold).

If you want, I can take your exact paragraph and “tighten” it into a crisp doctrinal statement that stays inside these pegs (and flags where traditions disagree) without losing your Watchman Nee nationality analogy.