

5.13.19 - The Sin of Clothing

God did not make the first clothing; **Gen 3:7 - 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.** The idea of clothing as a way to repair the relationship with God probably came from Satan. Yes, it is possible to interpret: **Gen 3:21 - Unto Adam also and to his wife did the LORD God make coats of skins, and clothed them.** to say that God went along with the idea of clothing as a means to be right with God, but that would contradict the recorded events of acceptable nudity of the kings, prophets, apostles, etc. that we have covered elsewhere in this website. Also, the fossil record suggests that the pre flood climate was tropical, no need for clothing to keep warm. Add to that the fact that at the time Adam and Eve were the only people on earth and they did not need to hide their bodies from one another. The only need was to remind them that they were sinners in need of a savior. God did not use vegetable matter to make clothing for the same reason He accepted Abel's offering and not Cain's. **Heb 9:22 - And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.** Even making clothing to protect Adam from thorns implies that Adam would not be able to solve the problem on his own. A way to please God that is invented by man influenced by Satan is called sin.

All societies have a definition of a good person which is usually linked to their god. It is not usually written, but assumed that the rules are obvious to everyone. If you grow up in a certain society you accept the rules of that society as obvious. Let me use an illustration not related to clothing. A story that is told about Galileo, which I am not able to confirm, claims that he enjoyed pointing out a mistake in the Aristotelian view that heavy objects fall faster than light ones. Aristotle argued that since the heavier object had more force (weight) on it, it would fall faster. Galileo would hold up two objects like a grape and an apple, give the argument and

point out that it was so obvious that Aristotle was right that you did not need to test the argument. Then he would drop them and they hit the table or the floor at the same time indication they fell at the same rate. After the demonstration it is obvious that the Aristotelian view is wrong. To get the "demonstration" on clothing, you need to grow up in a different culture to see that our rules are not obvious, or travel to one which has rules that seem ridiculous or visit a naturist resort where clothing rules are removed and none of the presumed bad behavior is occurring. The following verse seems to apply: **Rom 10:3 - For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.**

No one wants to be at the bottom of a group. When I was in grade school, we had spelling teams. The teacher picked two captains who took turns picking team members from the class. The teams lined up along the side walls facing each other. When the class was divided the teacher gave the words to spell and the members took turns spelling the words. When someone misspelled a word, he went back to his seat. I was the last one chosen and usually got to return to my seat on the first word I was asked to spell. It never seemed to build my esteem. (I am so glad someone invented a spell checker.) Clothing is something like the spelling competition except not as organized. There is a standard for good which most members of the society conform to, but no one wants to be average either. Someone finds a way to be better at meeting the standard. Now he is better than all the members who are only doing good at meeting the standard. Members find a way to copy the "better" standard and if the first members want to hold their position, they need to find a way to meet the standard that is even better leaving the member who has trouble meeting the "good" standard last to be chosen and first to be rejected. He is also judged rebellious for not meeting the standard without any checking for a reason.

That is part of life you say...we are all going to be good in some area and poor in another. You are correct, but the "good in some area" seems to get lost in the clothing contest. All textile societies judge people by their clothing. Here is an example from the New Testament: **Jas 2:2,3 - For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment; 3 - And ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool.** Here is an example from Wikipedia:

In ancient Rome, for example, only senators could wear garments dyed with Tyrian purple. In traditional Hawaiian In some societies, clothing may be used to indicate rank or society, only high-ranking chiefs could wear feather cloaks and palaoa, or carved whale teeth. In China, before establishment of the republic, only the emperor could wear yellow. History provides many examples of elaborate sumptuary laws that regulated what people could wear. In societies without such laws, which includes most modern societies, social status is instead signaled by the purchase of rare or luxury items that are limited by cost to those with wealth or status.

Some of this clothing is needed; we need to know a person is a policeman or high-ranking government official to avoid deceit, but everyone does not need to know that you are wealthy or whatever other status you want to advertise with clothing. Pride wants everyone to know your status in life. If you need to ask the question, "Don't you know who I am?" either your actions do not agree with your clothing or you are suffering from pride, especially if the person does not need to know who you are. Both judging people only by their clothing and using clothing to advertise your status suggest your clothing is sinful.

Clothing is used for security. Just like it was painful to be chosen last for a spelling team, so it is painful to have the strange looking body. We are all unique, so we all see ourselves as the strange one. If we have something to hide behind, we will be able to calm the pain of being different. We then make clothing our god to protect us from the stares

of "normal" people. In one of the books I read, the author was telling of the concern of a person at a nude beach not being able to find her friends she was to meet. Her problem; everyone looked alike. It would be easier to blend in when everyone is naked than when they are clothed. Looking strange is more likely to happen with clothing on. Clothing does not protect us from the pain of being different. It moves the pain to another area. There are very few times when we can please God and man at the same time. To displease God in order to please man is a sin.

If you are using clothing for a more secure position with God, it will not help. God can see through clothing like you were naked. He supervised the forming of your body, so even without being able to see through your clothing He knows all the details of your body better than you do. If you think God will not see your sins like Adam was hoping with his fig leaves, you are wrong again. God is also all knowing. He knows all the sins you committed since you were born and all the sins you will commit till you leave this earth. The only covering for sin is the Righteousness of Jesus. To appear before God without this covering, will get you a VERY uncomfortable eternity. If you are not sure you have this Righteousness, please visit www.PreciousSeed.com.

Clothing is used to prevent lust, which seems to be the least logical reason. Lust comes from the heart of the observer, but the person being observed is expected to control it with clothing. It is like trying to not offend someone who is trying to be offended. The person who lusts, does not admit that the problem is his and deal with it because he believes it is the observed person's fault. The observed person is trying to not be a source of lust, but there is nothing he or she can do when the problem is not caused by what he or she wears or does. Clothing causes two sins in this case: The observer does not repent of his heart condition and get divine help with the heart problem and the observed person is asked to hide his or her God given beauty for a goal that cannot be obtained.

Satan is very happy when he can get God's people to promote his agenda and believe they are helping God's cause. God wants His image displayed as much as possible and Satan wants it displayed as little as possible. **1Ti 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;** Modest apparel in this verse has come to mean covering what ever causes lust. The verse is not addressing lust, but gaudy attire. God does not tell us what part of the body causes lust, because it is from the heart of the person viewing the body. The parts that cause lust vary from one culture to another and from one age to another within the culture. If the culture says that men lust when they see a woman's feet, then men learn to be lustful when they see a woman's foot and the woman needs to keep her feet covered. Someone also learns how to get lots of money into Satan's programs by selling pictures of women's partially covered or naked feet.

From another culture, the "Christian modesty" rules are just as ridicules. We learn what is expected and respond accordingly. We not only allow men to lust if the woman has too much skin showing, but the rule tells men they should lust if they see too much skin on a woman. As soon as Satan has this working for him with "Christian" support, he sells a way to violate his standard for a fee. Without the "Christian modesty" rules, pornography would die. For additional information on this refer to www.mychainsaregone.org or our page on children and nudity on this site.

Western secular society is accepting more and more uncovered skin. The one-piece swimsuit has been largely replaced by the bikini and many European beaches are topless or clothing optional. When they discover that lust does not increase, but is brought out in the open and dealt with, Christians will look foolish and loose creditability.

Many of the ideas in this article come from Aaron Frost's book listed in the resource section. He gives a very complete coverage of the clothing issue, both from the Bible and secular sources. We highly recommend reading his book.

In conclusion...we are in no way making the point that wearing clothes is in and of itself sinful...in fact we firmly believe that clothing is certainly allowed by God and designed from its beginning to provide protection and warmth as well as a reminder for the price for sin, however we are making the point that anyone who is seeing themselves as somehow superior to someone who is living as God intended from the beginning is certainly in sin...the sin of pride. Prov 6: ¹⁶These six things doth the LORD hate: yea, seven are an abomination unto him: ¹⁷ A proud look...

Seems more than coincidental that these verses state that the look of pride is one of the things the Bible says that God hates. Someone who is proud of the way they look...as well as someone's facial expression showing that they think more highly of themselves than they ought to think? Clothing has its place in our society just as living as God intended does. The idea is that neither view should have with it, the feeling of superiority over the other...all of the ground at the foot of the cross is level!