

### 6.3.19 - The Textile Position

We thought we'd write a short article about the textile position...what Bible arguments might they use to try to dissuade someone from becoming or staying a naturist. The truth is that when we began writing this article we felt kind of queasy because we knew we'd have to take verses completely out of context and distort them before having any chance of even making a Bible argument, but we know that some of you will come up against a textile Christian at some point and it might be nice if you had the truth about the Bible and the textile argument. Consider this article as what the pastor in the Pastor's Letter article should have said, even if it would still be incorrect.

Here is a partial list of some of the items that they might use to make their point:

1. In the beginning Adam and Eve had a righteous glow about them which covered their nakedness that they lost when they sinned.
2. After Adam & Eve sinned God clothed them.
3. Canaan was cursed because Ham saw Noah naked when he was drunk indicating we need to be covered at all times so that others are not cursed.
4. God was ready to destroy the Israelites because they were naked before the golden calf.
5. If you try to mention either King Saul or Isaiah, they will claim that they both still had their undergarments on when they were "naked".
6. The demon possessed man was naked indicating that nakedness is a sign of demon possession.
7. The Apostle Paul indicated that women should be modest.
8. Jesus said that men should not lust after women so women need to dress to be modest so as to prevent lust.

We will be taking a look at each of these briefly and comparing each to what the Bible actually says rather than what the textiles want the Bible to say.

Like the theory of evolution, these arguments can sound reasonable until you hear the correct position. Let's be good Bereans and see if the textile position lines up with the Bible position.

Let's start at the beginning and take them one at a time...

1. The righteous glow is one of these details ADDED to the creation story to keep Adam and Eve "covered" in **Gen 2:25 And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.** You will not find this "righteous glow" anywhere in Scripture. The Hebrew word used here in Genesis for naked is also used to describe Job when he was born. It's also the same Hebrew word that Solomon used to describe a person's condition when they are born. Hosea used it to describe Gomer on her first birthday. The righteous glow argument is only needed to force the textile position on the Bible account of creation. This is a sure case of adding to Scripture and God specifically warned us about that including a statement that He would add the plagues in Scripture to those who added to His Word...not a position I'd want to find myself in.
2. It is true that God made coats according to the KJV to replace the aprons or loin cloths that they had made for themselves out of plant material. We actually deal with this argument really well in the website itself under The Worldly View tab of the site. I'd recommend to go back and read that section again if there is still a question here, but suffice it to say that the covering was a reminder of the price that was paid for their sin. God himself slew an innocent animal because they sinned. The Bible says that without the shedding of blood there is no remission for sin. This sacrifice that was made for their sin, now being worn was a constant reminder of the price for sin, but please take particular note that there are no instructions given in Scripture to Adam and Eve on when it needed to be worn or what needed to be covered. If nakedness was such a huge issue in the site of God then surely, He would have given instructions on when and

how much needed to be covered. Another point to consider here is that if you are going to use this passage to require clothing then doesn't it stand to reason that you'd have to outlaw plant material-based clothing as God did not accept Adam and Eve's plant-based clothing. Wouldn't you have to at this point require only animal skin-based clothing? Last, but not least since Adam and Eve were the only two human beings on planet earth, then wouldn't the conclusion be that even husbands and wives would not be allowed to see each other naked?

Another question that must be asked if you are going to require clothing because God clothed Adam and Eve is, "What change took place that suddenly required clothing?" Were Adam and Eve suddenly changed into Satan's image and God wanted that covered? If they were still in the image of God, then why cover it simply because they disobeyed? If they were still in the image of God, was God now shameful and needed covered? If it is sin that God could not look upon, doesn't the Bible say that we are still naked before the Lord even if we have clothes on, so the clothing makes no difference to God. If you have been reading our articles, you know that the textile people have no answers for these questions and that they resort to non-biblical behaviors like name calling or anger out of frustration at their inability to answer these questions.

3. The account of Noah's drunkenness leaves a lot of the details of exactly what happened out, however the definition of the Hebrew word used here for nakedness is defined as some sort of sexual act exactly the same as it is used in Leviticus chapter 18. Thankfully, God did not think we needed the gory details. Sex outside of marriage is considered wrong throughout the Bible and not a single account of simple nudity is listed as wrong anywhere so we can safely assume from the Hebrew definition and from the consistency of Scripture that this case is specifically referring to sex outside of marriage of some sort. Based on what I know about drunkenness, it is not likely that Noah would have remembered the event if all that happened

was that Ham peeped into the tent while he was drunk so we can safely deduce that his infraction had to be much more than seeing Noah's naked body. Besides, based on history and Jesus' teaching on the scarcity of clothing we can safely assume that most of Noah's family was regularly naked while building the ark due to not wanting to soil what was mostly likely their only piece of clothing. Examples of this are found throughout the Bible, from the Old Testament lending law where if you took someone's clothing for security on a loan you had to give it back at night so they had warmth for sleeping to the New Testament accounts of workers in the field and Peter's fishing naked. If as history and Scripture would indicate that they saw each other naked regularly then simply seeing Noah naked while drunk doesn't fit well with the account if you're trying to say that simple nudity is now wrong.

4. The golden calf passage involved idol worship, which was forbidden by one of the commandments given less than two months before by the God that had just miraculously brought them out of Egypt and supplied them with food and water daily in an uninhabited desert. There were and are no commands against nakedness so it is safe to assume that God was not upset with their nakedness, but rather with their giving His glory to an idol...this is a sure way to anger Him. It is also possible their nakedness in this event was a neglect of security for the camp. As in the case of Noah it may have also involved sexual sin as that was commonly associated with idol worship, hence the practice of sacrificing the children born after such actions to the idol they were worshipping. In any event there was enough for God to be angry about here that their simple nudity wasn't really the issue.
5. The Hebrew word used for naked in the passages for King Saul's and Isaiah's nakedness is the same word used for Adam and Eve before the fall before any clothing was even made. The word is also used to describe the

condition of a child at birth. Trying to say that they were wearing undergarments is another case of adding to Scripture in order to force the Bible to agree with your viewpoint, it's also a glaring example of an incomplete Bible study as in Isaiah's case the Bible says clearly that he was naked and barefoot. I believe that God added the barefoot part in there just to make sure that you knew that he was totally naked due to the fact that he wasn't even wearing shoes.

6. The naked demon possessed man is a good exercise in logic. I've actually heard preachers state that because the demon possessed man was naked that all nakedness is associated with demon possession. So, I have a few questions for you...first question, were all demon possessed people in the Bible naked? No! Since this is the only passage where it is stated that the man was naked, it is safe to assume some of them were clothed. As we have covered in previous articles clothing was very time consuming to make and so therefore was very expensive. The man in the tombs would not have any means of earning that kind of money for clothing. His nakedness could simply be a statement of how poor he had become because of the demons. Second question, were all naked people in the Bible demon possessed? That answer is also clearly no. Peter was fishing naked. Jesus and the thief on the cross were naked. In Acts 19:14 the sons of Sceva ended up naked at the hands of a demon possessed man when trying to cast out the demon. It's not likely that they were demon possessed. The logical conclusion is that there is no connection between nakedness and demon possession and anyone who is trying to tell you otherwise is adding to Scripture and doesn't know their Bible well.
  
7. In I Tim 2:9 (In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array;), when Paul is talking about modesty, he is not talking about what needs to be covered on a woman's body. He is talking

about flaunting wealth as can be seen by the examples included in the verse. He is specifically talking about humility. It is likely that they had poor people in their churches who did not have any garments. In the Pharisee's day wealth was inappropriately and incorrectly used as a measure of how much God loved a person. A poor person would see the wealthy apparel as a put down and a cause for insecurity and a feeling of unworthiness. The proper definition for Paul's admonishment for modesty is that they should be trying on purpose to not flaunt their wealth, that they should be trying to be humble (modest) in their appearance...that being the case, if you were to take Paul's teaching to the extreme the best application of his teaching would be for us all to be naked as that would be the most modest/humble.

8. Preventing lust with clothing is the least logical of all the arguments in the textile position. Lust is a heart condition and only the person with the lustful heart can control it and even then, only with Holy Spirit's assistance. Of course, no one should dress to say, "I am available for sex", but clothing is not going to prevent lust. If clothing were able to prevent lust than the Muslim society would be completely devoid of all lust. Based on the rape and abuse of women in the Muslim society I would accurately conclude that clothing even from the tip of the head to the tip of the toe with only an eye slit does not prevent lust. Maybe, just maybe God has it right when He created us to be naked and unashamed...maybe the best way to conquer the problem is to be exposed to family friendly non sexual nakedness on a regular basis and destroy the naked equals sex mindset. God just might have known what He was doing when He created us naked and declared it good!

At this point it should be clear that the textile position does not agree with the Bible on any of the statements given at the beginning of this article. As in science

it is time for a new position. Maybe God has no trouble with nakedness, maybe just the modern-day religious Pharisee's do.