

This is some correspondence we received from a pastor regarding the subject of the Bible and non-sexual nudity. We have changed the names to protect the identity of the pastor writing, but have not changed any of the content of his letter. His letter has been preserved whole and intact without any changes whatsoever. We have also included our response. We did not respond directly to him based on the Bible's admonition to not cast pearls before swine knowing that he is not open to the Bible only his prejudiced bias based on nothing but his peer's beliefs. We hope that sharing his letter and our responses will help you understand what you may be up against when dealing with other Christians, many who claim a Bible standard, but when actually confronted with the Bible find that they have no leg to stand on. We are going to provide his letter as a whole then we are going to answer below.

Initial correspondence to the pastor:

Pastor Jones,

I am sending you a booklet about a big blind spot (from the sermon about blind Bartimaeus) that someone (Satan?) has pulled over on us. I believe if we could remove this blind spot, porn would fade away. If you have proof from the Bible that the ideas are wrong, let me know. I was not able to find any. I would like to believe that what I grew up believing is Bible based. Removing the blind spot will not be easy. The spot is so accepted that you will be called a heretic if you try to point it out, but you may be able to stop promoting it and maybe cast some doubt on it.

This is his response:

Dear Bill,

It was nice to get a letter from you back in the end of April. To get to the point, my heart was broke as read through the material that you gave to me. I have taken my time to get back with you because I respected you and your raising of Godly children. I have been praying for you and am not sure where to begin addressing the pamphlet you sent to me.

*There is so much that the Bible teaches about sin. If a person believes that nakedness is how to take care of pron I believe they are missing what the Bible teaches about sin. Porn is just one sin of many that we can be tempted by, but I believe a love for God will keep us away from sin. Just because people may accept less clothes or no clothes does not take care of the sin problem. (And yes I believe the Bible teaches nakedness is a sin.) **Genesis 9:23** And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid it upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their father, and their faces were backward, and they saw not their father's nakedness. A very well know fact is that men are stimulated by sight. So, Jesus set up boundaries a man should have with a woman. Jesus delt with this in Mathew 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.***

*By no means is family nakedness ever right. The only place nakedness is ever right is what God had created for a man and a woman in the bounds of marriage. **I Corinthians 7:1-5**. I believe a person is out of bounds to say that medical care and taking care of young children is the same. As a society moves closer to the Word of God we find that they begin to cloth themselves. Adam and Eve's covering was not good enough.*

Genesis 3:7 And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons. It was God that gave them better clothing after the fall. **Genesis 3:21** Unto Adam also and to his wife did the LORD God make coats of skins, and clothed them. This point alone would be enough to disprove all that was written in the book.

Bro. Bill I am truly concerned with your stance on this matter. I will be praying for you and I will be very concerned with the long term effect of this booklet you sent me.

Pointing Souls to Christ

Pastor Jones

The pamphlet or book that is being referred to is what is now the material presented in this website www.nakedandunashamed.org. If you have not done a thorough study of the pages of this website then may I recommend that you read it first, or you may miss what I am trying to get across in my response.

A few reactions to the whole letter before I give a response to the points the pastor is making. As stated earlier, I have changed the names, so if you know a pastor by this name, this is not him. I did not change any of his spelling or grammar. I did not send any answer to him. It is clear he does not want his house of cards shaken any more than I already did.

He did not try to explain away any of the obvious non-sexual naked events mentioned in the Bible. Like Isaiah being commanded to go naked for three years, or King Saul naked with the prophets (meaning that the prophets were all naked), or Jesus not reprimanding Peter for fishing naked, or Jesus being naked to wash the feet of the disciples. I can only assume that he had no good answers for these events, so he chose to not address them.

Most of his points are not Bible based, they are merely opinion and I asked for proof from the Bible. What's worse is that his opinions are not based in Scripture even. His response suggests he was surprised. This could be the first time he was confronted with these points, but he took more than a month to answer. Seems like enough time to get over the surprise and maybe even do a little bit of a Bible study himself. I suppose it is possible that he did a Bible study and what he found contradicted his own opinions so that had to be ignored.

I will now divide his letter into parts and give a response:

It was nice to get a letter from you back in the end of April. To get to the point, my heart was broke as read through the material that you gave to me. I have taken my time to get back with you because I respected you and your raising of Godly children.

It seems that he may have missed my request for Bible proof.

What he has done instead is attempt to put a guilt trip on me for even reading something like what I sent to him.

Basically, “How dare you depart from the traditions of the elders!”
Matthew 15:1-2

I have been praying for you and am not sure where to begin addressing the pamphlet you sent to me.

Let me help you with how to address the pamphlet pastor...start with the chapter entitled “A Bible Standard” then agree or disagree with the points in that chapter. Make sure to give scripture references for your position especially if you disagree and then go to the next chapter and do the same.

There is so much that the Bible teaches about sin.

I noticed that too, in fact I can only find 2 chapters in the beginning before sin is introduced.

No one knows how far his heart will lead him into sin.
Jeremiah 17:9

If a person believes that nakedness is how to take care of pron I believe they are missing what the Bible teaches about sin.

Where in the Bible do you find that or is it your opinion?
That is the pivotal point of my request.
Where does the Bible say that nakedness is always a sin?

Porn is just one sin of many that we can be tempted by, but I believe a love for God will keep us away from sin.

Right...porn is only a part of one of the Ten Commandments.
I am afraid that love is like faith.

James 2:17-20 - Love without keeping His commandments is dead.

John 14:15 - But there is no command to be naked and there is none to be always clothed.

I think fear of offending Him who is the best friend we can ever have and making Him the most formidable enemy in this world would help also.

Just because people may accept less clothes or no clothes does not take care of the sin problem.

Right again, but we are only talking about one sin of many.
We should not try to overcome any sin our way instead of God's way.

The purpose of the pamphlet is to find God's way in this area. Even if it is not the solution to that problem we will be blessed for following God's way. That said, I do believe it may be a part of the solution. Once we have a biblical world view on something it changes our behavior. See www.mychainsaregone.org for more into on this subject.

(And yes I believe the Bible teaches nakedness is a sin.)
Genesis 9:23 *And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid it upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their father, and their faces were backward, and they saw not their father's nakedness.*

Finally, we are getting the idea...give some Scripture to back up your statement.

Here's the problem with the Scripture that you chose to provide. There are 3 Hebrew words for nakedness. Two of them are close in meaning. The third one implies some body function as part of the nakedness...usually sex.

The third one is used here in Genesis 9 and in Leviticus 18. It is obvious that Leviticus 18 is talking about sex, here it is not clear except for the meaning and definition of the specific word used. What you're doing pastor is trying to use a word with the specific meaning of sexual sin and change that meaning to simple nakedness to justify your opinion against nakedness. God clearly warns about adding to or taking away from His Word and that is clearly what you have done here. You have added meaning to His Word that He clearly never intended.

Speaking of Noah, it is hard to believe that 120 years of building the ark in a tropical climate that they did not work without clothing some of the time or even all the time. As we see in the New Testament with Peter, working without one's clothing was commonplace as the lack of a full wardrobe would have been incentive to not get one's clothes dirty. I believe God left the details out, but nakedness is not the issue or there would be instructions about nakedness somewhere in the account so that we would not bring this curse on ourselves and our families.

A very well know fact is that men are stimulated by sight.

On this we agree. I see a lot of nice tools that I would like to have. I see photos of a lot of places I would like to visit. I see a lot of vehicles that I would like to have. Some of them enough to work hard to get them. Just because we are motivated by sight does not mean that we lust after everything we see. The definition of lust is that I must have it, I must have it now and I must have it no matter the consequence. The simple act of seeing something we like does

not mean that we are lusting after it. I can see a beautiful car and not have to have it now and no matter the consequence and the same is true of a woman. I can see a beautiful woman and not have to have her now and no matter the consequence. In fact, the case can and has been made that the more common the sight of something is the less pull it has on an individual, something to think about.

*So Jesus set up boundaries a man should have with a woman. Jesus dealt with this in Mathew 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.***

Another scripture to back up the statement...thank you!
Sad, but again we have asked for a response about what the Bible says about nakedness and instead you have answered about an unrelated topic. Unless you are trying to make the case that someone must be naked for them to be lusted after. I do not believe that is the case. In fact, a case can be made that a person with some clothing on can be way more sexual than an individual who is totally naked. If you do not believe that is the case, I would ask you to explain the lingerie industry. An entire industry devoted to putting a small amount of clothing on a naked individual in order to increase their overall sexual appeal. Go to any textile beach across the country and you will see clothed beach goers in many different styles of beach wear and I contend that most of it adds to the level of sexual desire as it only enhances the imagination to what is under that thin layer of attire. Back to your Scripture reference, I do not see anything about what the woman is wearing and I'm also pretty sure that whether the individual lusts after her or not is a matter of his heart condition not her choice of attire although that can certainly be a contributing factor. Something else to consider is that the naked body does not have near the choices that a clothed body has for its enhancement. There are two basic body styles (men's and women's) with some

range in height, width, size of attachments and color...all have good feathers and all have defects. With clothing, you can change style of clothing (dresses, pants, skirts, etc). How much skin to cover or not cover. What to hide or accent. What color or pattern to use on the cloth. A man can lust as much after a modestly dressed woman as a naked one...probably more.

By no means is family nakedness ever right

Once again, opinion with no scripture to support it and a very broad statement. I believe I can give example after example where your statement is just absolutely 100% wrong.

What about in the case of a father or mother changing their baby's diaper?

What about the case of a son or daughter having to care for an aging relative...having to bath them or dress them or change bandages after an injury or surgery?

Pastor, you made the statement that "by no means is family nakedness EVER right". I have already provided you with a couple of examples and could certainly provide more where family nakedness is not only appropriate, but certainly right. My question is if these examples are appropriate examples of family nakedness being acceptable, how many more are there and then what and when are the exact scenarios that are not acceptable? I contend that the answer to the question is more about sex than about nakedness. Sex should only ever be between a husband and wife and that according to Scripture should only ever be after marriage.

The only place nakedness is ever right is what God had created for a man and a woman in the bounds of marriage. I Corinthians 7:1-5.

Pastor, I have to wonder if you're being disingenuous on purpose. We both know that this Scripture has nothing to do directly with nakedness.

I have asked you about non-sexual nakedness and the passage of Scripture that you provide deals only with the issue of sex being within the confines of a marriage and of course I agree with that. If we take a deeper look at your point though does that not mean that Adam and Eve would have been justified being naked after the fall? They were married to each other and they were the only two people on the entire planet.

Are you contending that maybe they had to be dressed unless and until they were preparing for sex?

I contend that if that were the case that God would have laid out specific instructions for attire at that point. He laid out every detail of the Old Testament law down to the smallest detail, but absolutely nothing about nakedness being a sin? Maybe that's because it's not.

I believe a person is out of bounds to say that medical care and taking care of young children is the same.

Then Pastor please tell me what the difference is?

You are not married to the doctor or nurse in most cases.

You are not married to the child that you are bathing or changing diapers and I guarantee that you have ladies in your church changing babies' diapers that aren't even related to them, so not only not married to, but not even related to.

You are not married to the elder family member in need of a bath or a change of clothes.

You are not married to the TSA agent who screens you at the airport before boarding your next flight.

Please list for me the exact and specific times that you are allowed according to Scripture to see someone you are not married to naked. Exactly who and when according to Scripture that it now does not count as sin.

As a society moves closer to the Word of God we find that they begin to cloth themselves.

Pastor, I am disappointed that you didn't use the demonic man among the tombs to support this statement.

If we agree with your statement, then Moslem women are closer to God than anyone here on earth.

So, Jesus was not close to the Word of God when He disrobed to wash the Apostles feet?

Isaiah was not close to the Word of God when he prophesied 3 years naked and barefeet at the Lord's command?

The prophets were not close to the Word of God when they prophesied naked regularly?

David was not close to the Word of God when he danced naked before the Lord at the Ark of the Covenants return?

I could go on, but I think you got the point...

I believe what you really meant to say was that as a society moves closer to religion and especially the Muslim religion we find that they begin to cloth themselves. Based on that, I'd like to ask you do you think that society is better today than they have been when nakedness in society was commonplace?

Jesus said of Adam and Eve that He made them in His own image and that He made them naked and unashamed to display His image. Are you saying that you believe Jesus is happier to have his image hidden and treated with shame?

***Genesis 3:7** And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons. It was God that gave them better clothing after the fall. **Genesis 3:21** Unto Adam also and to his wife did the LORD God make coats of skins, and clothed them. This point alone would be enough to disprove all that was written in the book.*

Much is written about this passage. Their eyes could have been opened to the error they made by eating the forbidden fruit. Satan may have suggested a solution to them that pleased him. He may have wanted man made in his image not God's image. Satan suggested covering God's image since it was too late to remake man in his image. So, Adam tried to get right with God by sewing leaves together. God gave the acceptable way to plea for forgiveness.

Consider this...there was no reason for fur coats in a tropical climate because of the temperature.

If Adam and Eve took of the forbidden fruit when they had plenty to eat and lots of variety, they were not likely to suffer with the heat just to keep the coats on.

If clothing was a big deal with God there would have been instruction on when it needed to be worn and what needed to be covered. The entire account of the animals being slain and placing the coats on Adam and Eve had absolutely nothing to do with nakedness and everything to do with the price for sin. Which I noticed that you conveniently didn't address from the information I provided to you in the pamphlet. So, you either didn't read it or chose to not answer the point with Scripture as you have no Scriptural reply.

Remember that Adam and Eve were alone on planet earth and that God had performed their marriage ceremony so even according to your own rules they had no reason to be clothed. Meaning this passage has absolutely nothing to do with simple nakedness and everything to do with the price for sin.

Pastor, it is not wise to make a doctrine out of a single passage of Scripture especially if it disagrees with other passages. God is not the author of confusion. Before you "proved the book wrong" with your single passage taken out of context, you need to explain why God commanded Isaiah to go into sin, why the prophets were

regularly naked, why Jesus was naked to wash the feet of the disciples, and why Jesus did not say anything about Peter fishing naked and the many other examples of acceptable nakedness.

Bro. Bill I am truly concerned with your stance on this matter. I will be praying for you and I will be very concerned with the long term effect of this booklet you sent me.

Another guilt trip, but still no Scriptural command or principle or example against simple nakedness.

Your response pastor is an example of why Christianity has the problems it has today. Christians who have rules for people that have no Bible basis. I believe it's what the Pharisees of Jesus' day were doing and why Jesus was harder on them than any other group of His day. It's why He called them names and undermined their authority at every step. You pastor, are no better than they!