

12.7.20 - Suggestions on Bible Study Part 2

Now we will look at some excerpts from the correspondence with the pastor who wanted some information on naturism. We sent him to the N&U website.

Here are some of his responses (in italics) and our take on them:

Thanks for sending the link. I have read some of the articles. It never ceases to amaze me how many ideas and "doctrines" have been concocted by men. It might surprise you who concocted the ideas you believe. No chance you found these ideas and "doctrines" in the Bible.

I have one question, and that is, What good does this doctrine do? He is giving away that he didn't actually read the information on the website or he would know that his question is answered there. The second article is an open letter to a pastor who took the position he took in his response. We could say he was not being intellectually honest with us or himself. To answer his question briefly, how about living as God intended, how about honoring God by displaying His highest creation as He wanted from the beginning, how about porn proofing our children by desexualizing the naked body, how about helping to conquer porn addiction in our adults the same way, how about conquering low self esteem and poor body image by showing that all bodies are beautiful as they were formed in His image and that the Hollywood image that Satan promotes is a big lie. That's just a few of the good things this doctrine does, and we haven't even scratched the surface with that list.

He goes on: *Since I understand that this is a doctrine that you are fully immersed in, I will endeavor to explain below ... why it is a dangerous and wrong doctrine.* If you have ever tried to explain naturism to someone who is fully immersed in the textile doctrine, you don't do it again because you find it completely futile. But here he is trying the reverse on someone who has written nearly 100 articles on the subject and he's doing so without reading even one of my articles. He is either really dumb or really arrogant.

His proof: 1. *From the beginning, as soon as Adam sinned, he "knew that he was naked, Why did God ask, "Who told you..." and sowed fig leaves together."* This was an immediate realization on his part that came about after he sinned. Adam knew that he was naked from the beginning by looking at the animals. It was not a problem until Satan convinced him it was. It does not say why he sowed the fig

leaves together, but we can surmise that Satan told them to do it as a means of getting right with God. We do not need to stretch the passage anymore then our pastor is to say that maybe they tried to camouflage themselves so that God did not find them. The verse does say they were afraid, it does not say that they were ashamed.

Therefore, the only way you can convince me that nakedness or “naturism” should be practice as in the garden of Eden would be if there were only sinless human beings present. Now we know why he did not read the articles, he felt it was a waste of time since we are all sinners, so nakedness is a sin. I don't get the connection, but it was enough for him. The sin was disobedience not nakedness. As they say in the naturist world...the sin was not in their skin! It was in their heart.

Let's take a look at the passage...

Genesis 3:6-11 KJV

[6] And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. [7] And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons. [8] And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden. [9] And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou? [10] And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself. [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?

You see how immediately, without being told, after they sinned, they knew they were naked. Are we supposed to believe that Satan disappeared immediately as soon as Eve took a bite of the forbidden fruit, that Adam came up with everything after that with no outside suggestions? When God asked Adam and Eve who told thee, isn't it obvious that God was referring to Satan. We believe Satan had just succeeded with his first lie “thou shalt not surely die” so he went straight to his second lie (why not, the first one worked so well) and tried to convince Adam and Eve to cover up and hide the very image that God so lovingly bestowed upon them...His own image! After all, who is happier about hiding God's image...God

or Satan? Besides that, knowing that you're naked does not make it a sin. There are times I know that I am hungry or cold or thirsty, but that does not make it a sin.

That is an innate property of every human being now, and is given so that we may know we are naked and must be covered. How do you explain clothes-less societies? How could you have God call nakedness sin for the person who makes the choice to eat and go without clothing? I think you will find it is a tradition of the elders.

God even asked the question, "Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?" Doesn't the question imply Satan might be involved? I doubt it was an ancestor of Balaam's donkey (sarcasm intended).

God knew that if anyone would eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil then they would realize that they were naked. My Bible says if they ate of the tree that they would die, my Bible says nothing about nakedness. I think you're adding to scripture...someone is messing with your KJV.

Now their sin must be covered, and thus their bodies. I find nothing in scripture that matches your assertion. Their sin definitely needed covering, thus the shedding of blood of the innocent animal. Again, this was dealt with quite clearly in the website itself. He is once again proving that he didn't actually read the information on the site even though he clearly claimed he did. I wonder if lying is considered a sin in his book. I am wondering if he is trying to say that the naked bodies that God had just called very good were now somehow different, that those same people who were made in God's image were now no longer made in God's image. That they were somehow disgusting to God and that God no longer considered His image in them a good thing, but that now His image in us is bad and needs hidden and covered. It sounds to me like something that Satan would promote not God. Sounds like a lie that Satan would tell, just can't see God wanting His image covered after just saying that it was good...very good in fact.

God himself even helped them by covering their bodies. That would be a lot of help during the heat of the day. Before the fall according to a verse above, God walked and talked with them in the cool of the day while they were naked. Maybe, God had them wear the skins of the innocent animals slain that day as a reminder of the cost for sin, maybe God was providing for them as thorns would now begin to grow and protection would need to be worn from time to time. Again, covered in the site that he supposedly read. The fact that he never mentions the info in the

site gives very clear indication that he didn't read it. Why would you try to teach someone without ever getting all of the facts? It really makes him look foolish and arrogant, both at the same time.

Verse 21:

"Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them."

Yes, this was partly a symbol that sin must be covered by the shedding of blood, which was done by God's slaughter of an animal to clothe, but it is just as much the simple truth that they must now be clothed, as the Bible clearly states. The Bible does not state anywhere in this passage that they must now be clothed.

Look, I am sure that this pastor would agree that husbands and wives can see each other naked. Well, the fact of the matter is that at this time Adam and Eve were the only humans on Earth. If, as he stated, that the Bible clearly states that they must now be clothed, then the truth is that husbands and wives cannot see each other naked. Now, does anyone in their right mind actually believe that? Just because God made them some skins for protection from the elements that would be soon changing does not mean that Adam and Eve were now required to wear clothing from that moment on. In fact, in the website we make the point that this would have been a perfect time for God to say this if it were so. This and when the Bible mentions Peter fishing naked were two perfect situations where if it were a sin that God could have clearly said so and all ambiguity would have been cleared up. But He didn't say so at either occasion and that leaves us with only one assumption and that is that simple nonsexual nakedness is not a sin. Why are there no instructions about the use of these coats of skins, why are there no specifics as to when to wear them and when to take them off? With as much exact detail to other of the Old Testament laws as there is, if nakedness is such an obvious sin then wouldn't God have laid out the details?

They were only "naked and unashamed" before sin.

At the end of chapter 2, verse 25:

"And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed."

This was before the sin of chapter 3. Inherent in the statement, "they were not ashamed," is the truth that now we are ashamed of nakedness. This is such a false statement that it is hard to believe he's ever read his Bible. Let's see, do we have a record in the Bible of anyone being naked after the original sin and not being ashamed? Did he not read the website...we give an entire list of people in the Bible that were naked and not ashamed after sin entered the picture? Job, King David, King Saul, the prophets, Isaiah, Jesus, Peter, Blind Bartimaeus, the servant in the field, the crowd at the triumphal entry on Palm Sunday, etc.

*And by the way, nakedness is not a sin in the marriage bed (no way to check obedience) because the man and woman become one flesh (see 2:24). That verse has nothing to do with nakedness for sex. **Heb 13:4 Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge*** This verse says that you may do whatever the two of you agree on in marriage and that God does not like any sex outside of marriage.

If others can become one flesh with one another, than nakedness seen in those relationships is okay. Logic is missing in this statement for as far as we know this is an impossible situation.

We cannot just “go back to the way we were created, unashamed of our nakedness.”

This is another “fact” of his that has no basis in reality. There are literally thousands of naturists who know that statement to be utterly incorrect. In fact, most naturists only put clothes on for the emotional comfort of their textile friends and associates, not for any motivation stemming from shame. You will also not find any support for his statement in the Bible. I invite you to visit a local family friendly naturist resort, so you can see and experience firsthand that there is no shame in nonsexual family friendly nudity. In fact, you might just find like the rest of us have why God wanted us this way in the first place. There is nothing more natural and more appropriate than living life the way we were meant to. No shame, no guilt, just honoring God with our entire being...mind, body and soul!

We are all sinners now, and that truth cannot be changed.

Yes, ideally...we would be sinless, and live in perfect fellowship with God, and have no need of clothing. My Bible tells me that Christ Jesus came to earth for that very purpose...to make us sinless and restore us to perfect fellowship with Him. In fact, Jesus Himself declared that "It is finished." That the work was completed, the Apostle Paul then went on to declare that we are already new creatures, that we've been born again, that old things were already passed away and that all things have become new. Pastor, you're living in the Old Covenant while trying to preach the New Covenant. You're doing what so many others are...you are trying to make the law relevant in the age of grace. By doing so you are creating a hybrid covenant...grace plus some of the law because we need rules you know, to keep us safe. Jesus Himself warned against this when He said not to put new wine in an old skin and not to sew a new fabric into an old cloth.

But since that perfect fellowship has been broken, and we are sinners, we are no more “naked and unashamed”, nor will we ever return to that state on this earth. You need to study the writings of the Apostle Paul on our standing with God. You are once again, ignoring the many examples in the Bible of the commonplace of nonsexual public nudity during Bible times. Your statement that we will never return to that state is not reflected in scripture...it was before the fall and it was after the fall and it still is in a lot of places not just here in the US, but all over the world. It seems that the main place that naked and not ashamed isn't accepted is by the very people that it should be...the Christian community. The very people who should be confidently displaying the image and likeness of our creator in honor and reverence to Him are the very one's proclaiming that the image of their God should be hidden in shame and guilt. Guilt that they should not be bearing anymore as Jesus bore our guilt and carried our shame to the cross. Our guilt and shame should stay buried in that borrowed tomb of His, because He certainly doesn't want us carrying around the guilt and shame that he died to eradicate.

2. There are multiple references and commandments throughout the Bible against any nakedness whatsoever. See the following:

Leviticus 18:6: None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness: I am the Lord.

See also verses 7-17

[7] The nakedness of thy father, or the nakedness of thy mother, shalt thou not uncover: she is thy mother; thou shalt not uncover her nakedness. [8] The nakedness of thy father's wife shalt thou not uncover: it is thy father's nakedness. [9] The nakedness of thy sister, the daughter of thy father, or daughter of thy mother, whether she be born at home, or born abroad, even their nakedness thou shalt not uncover. [10] The nakedness of thy son's daughter, or of thy daughter's daughter, even their nakedness thou shalt not uncover: for theirs is thine own nakedness. [11] The nakedness of thy father's wife's daughter, begotten of thy father, she is thy sister, thou shalt not uncover her nakedness. [12] Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's sister: she is thy father's near kinswoman. [13] Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister: for she is thy mother's near kinswoman. [14] Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's brother, thou shalt not approach to his wife: she is thine aunt. [15] Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy daughter in law: she is thy son's wife; thou shalt not uncover her nakedness. [16] Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife: it is thy brother's nakedness. [17] Thou shalt not uncover the

nakedness of a woman and her daughter, neither shalt thou take her son's daughter, or her daughter's daughter, to uncover her nakedness; for they are her near kinswomen: it is wickedness.

And unless you would say, that is uncovering their nakedness for sexual purposes, understand that the Lord did not say only "thou shalt not uncover to lie with them," He rather says don't uncover because she is thy "near kinswoman," or "thy brother's nakedness."

Note: Understood in these verses is the fact that the only reason someone would uncover someone else's nakedness would be in the boundaries of marriage, and limited only to that.

The Lord calls it abomination. They were not to see the nakedness of their own families. It is the rule of being clothed.

If they weren't clothed to begin with, the Lord wouldn't have to tell them not to "uncover."

Assumed in the commandment not to uncover is the presumption that they were already covered at all times in daily life.

I hope this is clear. God Word is not confusion, but clear enough for us to understand. Let us not twist and wrest the Scriptures to our own destruction. We spend a whole section dealing with this passage in the website content...the one you supposedly read. Oh well...anyway, we know that this passage is the one most people go straight to trying to proclaim the textile position, the problem is that it has absolutely nothing to do with nonsexual nudity. And admittedly he did notice that the chapter is about sex, which is not part of naturism, then at the same time tried to make it about simple nudity anyway. The Hebrew word used here and the context of the chapter itself indicates that this is about not having sex with a very long list of people. A paraphrase would be, "don't uncover the nakedness of so and so for sex." The point about wresting the scriptures to our own destruction is one that he should heed as he is the one altering the meaning of the teaching to fit his own agenda rather than looking at the teaching at face value.

3. Nakedness is always referred to as a negative thing. I guess once again that we are going to ignore the fact that the Holy Spirit influenced King Saul's and the prophet's nakedness. That God commanded Isaiah's nakedness, and it appears to me that God seemed to be pretty proud of Adam and Eve when they were naked. I do not believe that you can accurately make the point with scripture that nakedness is always a negative. Think about this, when someone became a follower of God in the Old Testament, what identifying trait did God use to set them apart? Did God not call upon His chosen people to circumcise the foreskin of their penis to identify that they were His? Well, let me ask you this...how was someone to know

that you had done that? I am asserting that a lot of nakedness was common in order for this Old Testament symbol to be effective. Do you know which of your male friends are circumcised today? No, well they all did back then! So, if as you say, nakedness is always referred to as a bad thing, how is that God's OT symbol of circumcision would have required a lot of nakedness along with the many examples in the Old and New Testaments of the commonplace of nonsexual nudity. I'd say that your statement is incorrect at a minimum.

2 Corinthians 5:2-4 is a spiritual example, where he says that we don't desire to be unclothed but clothed upon.

Why would he put it this way, if, as human beings, we actually desired to be unclothed?

No, we desire to be clothed physically, just like we desire to be clothed spiritually with "our house which is from heaven." We desire to be "clothed upon" with immortality. I think it's safe to say that you are misapplying the analogy. When the Apostle Paul wrote this, people went to the Roman bath houses to bathe with no suggestion to avoid them. The athletes competed naked and Paul used them as examples in his writings. Dirty job, like fishing or field work, were done naked. They did desire clothing to avoid the stigma of poverty, but that is not a sin. A lot is written about this on the site as well...

[2] For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: [3] If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. [4] For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life.

This is a example of the tenor of the subject biblically. Paul spoke about the unfortunate condition of nakedness that he found himself in persecution. Is it a sin to have your clothing taken from you? We are not referring to forced nakedness due to poverty or captivity or slavery. Certainly, we do not want nakedness forced upon us with no protection from the elements. We are talking of voluntary nakedness to show God's handiwork, to feel the warmth of the sun on our bodies, to be free of the restrictions of clothing.

The Laodicean church was advised spiritually to buy "white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear." How could God's Word be any clearer on the subject? Does it need to be clearer? God was trying to tell them they depended too much on their clothing. They were showing off how well dressed they were, and God said they were naked! The meaning here being "exposed." Maybe the nakedness issue is a distraction from a more

important issue that Satan does not want handled. It's the same in 1st Timothy where the Apostle Paul was teaching on modest dress...he was not teaching the neck to knee approach that the modern church has taken. He was teaching the women to dress humbly (modestly) so as to not make the poor women in the church feel bad for not having anything to wear. Now we teach folks to wear our "Sunday Best." Wow, we have gotten things a bit upside down!

Who was naked in the New Testament?

1. The demoniac whose "legion" of devils were cast out into the herd of swine by Jesus.

Then, when he was healed, he was found sitting at Jesus' feet, "clothed, and in his right mind." See Luke 8:26-35

Those that are in their right mind will naturally desire to be clothed. There were one or two people at most who were naked, and demon possessed. Should we conclude that if you are naked you are or will become demon possessed? Or is nakedness a sign that you are demon possessed because two demon possessed people in the New Testament were naked? Is it possible that they were naked while possessed due to the elements and the fact that demons set out to hurt people? They were also cut and bruised by these demons, maybe their nakedness was that the demons were using the elements as a weapon against these folks? It's a really bad idea to make a doctrine based on the limited information about two demon possessed people mentioned in scripture when it stands in stark contract to the Bible as a whole as it relates to nonsexual social nudity.

2. Peter, who when he saw Jesus cast himself into the sea, threw his coat on. Jesus was His Maker. Why was he ashamed before Him? Because he was a sinner. See John 21:7 This is a huge assumption and an inaccurate one as well. The Bible never tells us that he was ashamed before Jesus, you just added to scripture again. In fact, Jesus had just disrobed in front of Peter just a little while before this event to wash Peter's feet at the last supper. Peter then asked Christ if He'd wash his whole body, which would require Peter to join Jesus in the nude, I don't see any shame in any of this. Think of this event this way, if your clothing was as valuable as your car, would you leave it on a rented boat? It was getting late in the day and going to get cool at evening, Peter would want his clothing for protection against the cold. The Greek word suggests that he put it around his neck until he got to shore. The textile believers want us to believe that Peter put his clothes on to jump into the water and walk to shore, but if he was fishing naked in order to keep it clean then where is the logic in putting it on to get into the dirty water to go to shore. Peter would want a clean and dry robe for the coming cool evening.

There are other biblical examples, but these will suffice to show that nakedness was not and is never accepted as “commonplace.” Your logic is that since that is the case today, it must have always been that way. There is no instruction on what needs to be covered or allowed exposed because nakedness was so common, and God was happy with it that way. Satan appears to be the only one happy about covering the image and likeness of God in us.

It is not the way God intends it to be, and a true Bible believer, I believe, will discern that. Now, he’s questioning my salvation if I do not agree with his unbiblical opinion. I am glad he gave me a choice...I’m either not saved or I severely lack discernment...nice guy! How about, maybe you didn’t really give the study a serious look?

At this point, I am not asking you to leave the church. Instead, I am asking you to see the error of these ideas and reject the ideas of naturism as false doctrine. If you cannot do that, then we will determine what the next step will be.

Please keep in mind that out of respect for his office I didn’t answer him with near the amount of information or fervor that I have included here. I felt he was not really open to learning the truth from God’s Word, so I didn’t waste time casting pearls. I can only hope that the seed that was planted will encourage him to come back to this site and the other sites and books that are listed here as additional resources and that he will truly research the Word of God for the truth.

Instead I fear what will happen to our country because of pastors like this. I am reminded of a quote that is commonly attributed to the French commentator Alexis de Tocqueville: *“I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers—and it was not there. . . . in her fertile fields and boundless forests—and it was not there. . . . in her rich mines and her vast world commerce—and it was not there. . . . in her democratic Congress and her matchless Constitution—and it was not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because she is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, she will cease to be great.”*

Most pastors are like the one above and will not take the time to do a thorough study of the scriptures, not just for this topic, but for many topics. Because of this, I am fearful that America will not remain a great nation for long, let alone a free one. Freedom seems like a foreign concept in our churches today, it has instead been replaced with some very strict and very extrabiblical rules. God said that His

Truth would make us free, but our pastors seem intent on keeping us enslaved. We will keep praying and keep working on educating the willing and we hope that you will keep working right here alongside us.