

Clean Flesh teachers define "clean flesh" as the idea that "there were no consequences to the condition of Adam's nature following his sin. It was the same as before he fell. And Jesus, too, inherited this clean flesh" (Jim Luke). In fact this a very vague and convenient (for clean flesh) definition of the clean flesh teaching. Clean flesh teachers from the beginning have denied that our physical human nature is called 'sin' in the Bible. Christadelphian teaching is that indwelling sin (Romans 7) constitutes human nature as "sin in the flesh".

Clean flesh teachers can claim

"We have been at pains to show that mortality and a proneness to sin resulted from Adam's transgression" (Jim Luke)

... and be in perfect agreement with Edward Turney, Harry Fry, A.D. Strickler, John Bell et al.

"There was no sin in the 'nature' after it had transgressed. No, what was there then? There was mortality. What does that mean? Death." (Edward Turney, *The Sacrifice of Christ*, p. 21, August 28th 1873)

"There was mortality. There was man destined to die; but sin was not a fixed principle in the man's flesh. However, inasmuch as I have said that Dr. Thomas has taught this, I cannot do better than refer you to the place. Elpis Israel Page 113, 3rd para." (Edward Turney, *The Sacrifice of Christ*, p. 21, August 28th 1873)

"Christ's own human nature did not sin; he controlled it; in every point so far as physical substance was concerned he was made like his brethren, mortal, under the dominion of death." (A.D. Strickler, *Darkness*, p. 84)

"to show the origin of the race, the introduction of sin into its experience and the consequent infliction of suffering and mortality as inherent conditions of human existence apart from a Divine deliverance." (J. J. Hadley)

By "proneness to sin" clean-fleshers mean a moral condition, whereas the truth is that our proneness to sin originates from a physical condition. To deny this is to teach substitutionary sacrifice.

