

4.8.19 – God, Satan and Clothing

God created Adam and Eve naked and then He declared their nakedness good!

In the creation account and the events leading up to the first sin we have three parties involved. This event led to the discussion we have today about whether we are required to clothe or not. The three parties involved in this clothing problem are God, Satan and the sinners. God created everything, so He is superior to everything He created, including Satan. Satan has a BIG pride problem or he would not have challenged God's power and authority, thereby losing his place in heaven. We are assuming that Satan knew that he was created by God and therefore inferior to God. Adam and Eve were in the garden long enough to see that they were naked and it was not a concern to them. **Gen 2:25 - And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.** They would have needed someone to make it a problem.

It is safe to assume that Satan wanted humans made in his image since he had a pride problem. At the very least we can assume that he did not want them made in God's image. Imagine, everywhere Satan went he would see images of God, his only rival, enjoying life and having a good time. We are assuming he wanted to do something about the situation. Since starting over with another "man" was likely to have the same image of God, Satan was hoping to at least cover up the images with clothing.

After the first sin was committed, God directed these two questions to Adam and Eve **Gen 3:11 - And he said, Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?** We will skip the second question and deal only with the first question. If I may rephrase the question for clarity's sake and then explain why I believe this is a more accurate question. I believe the question is more accurately represented in today's

modern English language as “who told you that nudity was bad?” You see, they weren’t stupid, they were the smartest people on the planet...a perfect creation of God’s, had the best DNA of all time. Adam named all of the animals, they walked with God and talked with God. They were not the cavemen that the Geico commercials portray. So, to believe that they didn’t know that their reproductive parts were able to be seen is a stretch at a minimum. Every creation of God’s had visible reproductive parts...dogs, cats, monkeys, horses, etc. and humans, everything God had created was naked and unashamed. Isn’t it odd that we still think it’s ok for every other of God’s creation on the entire planet to be naked, but not His best creation, the very ones made in His image. So, we go back to why. Again, if we ask the question “who told you nudity was bad?” then it begins to make a lot more sense. I am going to make an easy assumption that it wasn’t God that told them nakedness was bad since they were made naked and in His image. I’m guessing it wasn’t Adam or Eve that figured that their nakedness was bad since they were made in God’s image and likeness and since everywhere they looked there was a naked animal. Since we know that someone told them that their nakedness was bad, the only one left by my calculations is Satan. We know that Satan, according to Jesus’ very own words is the Father of Lies. So, if Satan is a liar and we know that he is...and he’s the one to tell them that nudity is bad and it sure makes sense that he’s the one that did, then why is it that we still believe Satan’s lie today?

I imagine that Satan was probably in the bushes laughing at their fig leaf aprons, thrilled that he had been able to convince them to cover God’s image. Note also, that clothing was made before God came to the scene. Since God had not arrived yet to ask the questions, you can only say that covering themselves was man's or Satan's idea, but not God's idea. Since it is unlikely that it was their own idea, again the logical conclusion is that it was Satan’s. But, God made them coats you say. We covered this at length in a previous article, but the short answer is that God made them coats of the very animals that they cared for in the garden as a reminder that

there is a price for sin and that “without the shedding of blood there is no remission.” This was all representative of the ultimate sacrifice for sin that would be paid some 4,000 years later when Jesus himself would be the sacrifice for our sin. He then made them wear that animal’s skin as a symbolic covering for their sin as we are now covered by the blood of Jesus and His righteousness and as a reminder of the price paid...call it incentive to avoid sinning again. God also wanted them to know that covering their bodies for protection would not be sin since they had spent their entire lives naked and unashamed to this point. What would those coats have looked like, was it what we think of today when we say coat? In all likelihood, the coats were not what the word means today. They would have been a symbol of God's grace that the animal died instead of them for their sin. Maybe something like a cross to symbolize the price for our sins?

Another bit of evidence that Satan is for clothing is seen in the dress codes for some of the non-Christian religions. The Muslims take it to the maximum, only enough uncovered to allow the person to see where she is going. It does not take much study to conclude that Allah is not the God of the Christian Bible. The only choice left is that he represents Satan and the Muslim clothing fits with what was suggested above...Satan wants God's image covered.

The textile Christian is looking for an excuse to make nakedness a sin. If God did not originate clothing then He is not opposed to nakedness. If Satan wants to cover us from head to foot with clothing, clothing is a sin as we are following Satan's will not God's will. If it is man's idea to make himself look righteous, it is also sin because it is not God's way to be righteous. To solve this problem, textile Christians must first disagree with what is outlined above. When that does not work, they go to the idea that clothing is there to prevent lust. This idea is absolutely ludicrous as Adam and Eve wore clothing when they were the only two human being on the planet so they were allowed to have those thoughts about each other. As mentioned in earlier articles...if this idea that

clothing was now mandatory from this point forward that then meant that husbands and wives were no longer allowed to see each other naked either as Adam and Eve were husband and wife and the only people on Earth.

The concept that a lack of clothing creates lust basically teaches the idea then that if a man lusts it's the woman's fault. We would allow the man to then say, "I would not lust if the woman did not cause me to lust with all that skin exposed."

So, is it the woman's role to keep the man from lusting? To answer that we must look at where lust comes from. I believe I can make the case from scripture that lust comes from a wicked heart. The only one who can control that is God, but he will not place any controls on a heart without permission from the owner. God does not ask anything of us that He has not given us the power to perform. **Mat 5:28 - But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.** Did you notice that there was no mention of what clothing she must be wearing in order for him not to lust? So lusting is to be controllable by the man regardless of attire, whether lots, some, little or none. Besides which, we contend that a woman with little clothing on is way more enticing than a woman completely naked in a naturist setting. We have been to textile beaches and we have been to naturist beaches and the textile beaches with the scantily clad women are way more sexual than the naturist beaches. The wives agree 100%. All of that aside, clothing or lack thereof does not create lust...an evil heart condition does.

Does covering the woman prevent lust? I should not answer a question with a question, but I will. Assuming rape is lust out of control, do rapists only attack naked women or scantily clad women? Most of the accounts indicate that the rapists were far more interested in an easy victim and not how or what she wore. There are no laws at all preventing nudity in Denmark and nudity in public is quite commonplace there, but the rape

percentage is one quarter what it is here in the United States. So, we know of a certainty that nudity does not lead to a higher percentage of lust, in fact you could properly conclude that the higher the percentage of nudity the lower the sexual impropriety in society. We have visited many family friendly naturist resorts across the country and there has never been a single instance of sexual impropriety at any of them. At these resorts you are in an environment where there is no clothing on anyone to prevent lust and yet there aren't even visible signs of arousal anywhere. There aren't any studies that we are aware of on the effect of naturism and lust, but there are a lot of claims that it took the lusting away for individuals going to the resorts. Check out <http://mychainsaregone.org> for more information on that subject.

Pornography is a form of lusting after a woman. Even where it is illegal to visit porn sites such as in Muslim countries where the women are covered from head to toe, there are a large number of hits on porn sites. We know that they are not all accidental site visits either because of the time spent on the site. In addition, venereal diseases are a big problem in some of the strict brethren religious groups with only head, arms, and legs about half way to the knees visible on women.

Here you are presented with two extremes...one society where nakedness is commonplace and with all body parts in plain view and the other one where women are covered from head to toe with barely an eye slit. If clothing is to prevent lust then the Muslim world should see no sexual impropriety at all. If clothing is to prevent lust then the parts that cause lust should be covered. This makes the woman more responsible for her own rape then it does the man who raped her.

Covering God's image seems to be what the contest is all about. There is a need for clothing, but it is not to stop lust or to look righteous. Clothing is needed to keep warm in cold weather or safe in extreme environments, but neither of those dictate that clothing must be worn at all times with all people. Maybe a body is just a body and we can and should get used

to seeing it so that it becomes common place and not the enticement sexually that it has become. Maybe Satan intended the unintended consequence of an extremely sexualized society through the textilization of God's creation.

God intended us to be naked and unashamed and Satan intended us to cover God's image. Which one will you choose to follow?