

2.17.20 - The Closed Mind

The closed mind has been a problem in the Christian church from the time Jesus founded it until today. It is like Satan deceives the person and then closes their mind so the truth cannot erase the deceit. It seems to be the default response to any new idea. We will not spend much time on why it seems to be that way, but just show examples to help recognize what you might be dealing with when discussing the topic of Biblical naturism. This may seem like an article restating what has already been covered in previous articles, but as you probably already know...repetition aids learning so we feel that this will be a way to solidify some ideas in your head with a slight twist on how it's presented. It may be just enough of a change in approach to clear up what we are trying to get across.

A closed mind is not restricted to what the Bible says about going without clothing. Job's comforters had closed minds. The ruling Jews in New Testament times had closed minds on most of the teachings of Jesus and the disciples. Pharaoh had a closed mind about God's power compared to his gods. You will find it in the church today with hair length, use of wine, driving motor vehicles, how to get material wealth from God, use of TV and the internet just to mention a few areas.

We are going to use a dialog between “**Closed**” our friend with a closed mind and “**Open**” a biblical naturist with an open mind. **Open** is not going to debate **Closed**, but rather he is going to ask a lot of questions. To avoid making it look like **Closed** is in the right we will give the counter arguments under the heading **Problems**.

1.

Open: Did you notice that Adam and Eve were naked and not ashamed in the garden of Eden?

Closed: They were not completely naked...they had a righteous glow about them that covered them.

Problems: There is nothing in the KJV or the Hebrew words to suggest any such covering. The Hebrew word used in **Gen 2:25** is used 16 times in the texts the KJV was translated from. It was always translated "naked". Two of those times it refers to naked as the condition of a newborn baby. Of course, newborn babies would not have a righteous glow even though they are innocent, because they are born to sinful parents.

2.

Open: The fossils we find of tropical plants and wildlife scattered over the whole earth suggests that the climate was tropical before Noah's flood making clothing a burden instead of a blessing. Adam and Eve were married to each other and would be allowed to see each other naked even in your belief system. Do you see any need for clothing?

Closed: They needed to replace the righteous glow they lost when they sinned. After they ate the forbidden fruit, they knew that they were naked so they made aprons to cover their shame.

Problems: The word "shame" does not appear in the KJV until Exo 32. Moses did not write or edit Genesis till 2500-3000 years latter in a completely different climate and culture. Even with divine inspiration, he had to use a word that would have meaning to the people of his time. The KJV translators had to use a word that had meaning to the people in 1611. We just do not know what the fig leaf clothing looked like or for that matter what God's clothing looked like. Adam does not say he hid because he was ashamed. **Gen 3:10** **And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself.** Notice the word Adam used in this verse. It was fear that motivated Adam to make clothing and he was not sure it was enough to protect him, so he hid in the trees. Based on God's question to Adam "who told thee" we believe the case can be made that it was Satan that motivated Adam and Eve to try to cover themselves...that it was not

God that motivated this. So, if Satan motivated the covering of God's image in their bodies, then wouldn't it make sense that God was not pleased by them hiding His image?

3.

Open: Surely you allow husband and wife to see each other naked. There was no one else on the planet so no one else to see them. Since clothing would be uncomfortable and unnecessary, why would they as husband and wife need it?

Closed: God made them coats while there were only the two of them so He expected them to wear something more than aprons.

Problems: As stated above we do not know what those "coats" looked like. Considering the tropical climate and their weakness about following God's instruction, the "coats" God made were probably only a token garment like a scarf or necktie. God does not make burdensome rules unnecessarily. This reasoning still does not address the husband and wife being the only people on the planet issue. If the issue was that clothing was now a necessity what do you do with all of the other examples in scripture where nakedness was commonplace, at God's command or at the Holy Spirit's prompting?

4.

Open: Do you believe that they had to wear these coats all the time?

Closed: Yes, they had to cover their sin.

Problems: Pro 28:13 He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy. This proverb suggests that covering sin with clothing is not God's way to handle the problem. No allowance for the tropical climate. Still no allowance for husband and wife to be naked. Might be a little too personal to ask if he

ever saw his wife naked. Again, the answer does not account for all of the other examples is scripture.

5.

Open: Where are the instructions from God on when clothing must be worn and how much must be covered?

Closed: As I mentioned before they needed to replace their righteous glow and God made coats to replace the aprons. They needed to cover at least from the knees to the neck like a full-length coat.

Problems: There is no consideration of the translation problem. The glow has no scripture to support it. The climate would make the coats of fur unhealthy to wear at the least and could cause heat stroke. There is very little real fur used in clothing today. If God replaced the fig leaves from plants, we Christians should need to use fur as well from that same line of logic. He added to the scripture about coats when they needed to be worn based on the righteous glow that was also added. There is no scripture to back up the knee to neck requirement. So far, the whole discussion from the textile position is very similar to the Pharisees who made extra rules up as a means of controlling the people's behavior.

6.

Open: If nakedness is always a sin, how could God order Isaiah to be naked for over three years in Isaiah 20? It would seem that God is ordering Isaiah into sin according to your reasoning.

Closed: Isaiah was not completely naked he still had his under clothing on.

Problems: This is about as scriptural as the righteous glow and certainly can be considered adding to Scripture. The Hebrew word used in these verses for naked is the same one mentioned above for **Gen 2:25**

and the same one that describes the condition of a newborn baby...it is about as likely that Isaiah had on undergarments as it is that a baby could be born with clothing on. The Bible even goes one step further just to make sure that you know that Isaiah was truly naked when it describes Isaiah as naked and barefoot. Now if Isaiah was going to be allowed to wear undergarments, logic dictates that he'd also be allowed to wear some sort of shoe/sandal.

7.

Open: In **Exo 29:4** **And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash them with water.** God is instructing Moses on how to sanctify the priestly garments and install Aaron and his sons into the priesthood. Did God cause Aaron and his sons to sin before all the people?

Closed: It seems like they would be naked before the whole congregation. I would need to check the more modern translations to be sure it is translated right. If it serves His purposes, He can order someone into sin. God can do anything He wants to do.

Problems: Looking for a translation that agrees with you is not an open-minded approach to the scriptures. God said in **Jas 1:13, 14** **Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.** This verse is saying that God does not even test man with sin. He would certainly not order someone into sin. If you continue reading James 1 you will notice that Satan uses our lusts to tempt us and Job 1:12 suggests that God gives Satan permission to test us...either way, according to His Word, God is not going to order someone into sin. Conclusion, the ceremonial washing of the priests could not be sin even though the priests were naked in front of the whole congregation.

8.

Open: If being naked is a sin, why did Jesus not reprimand Peter for fishing naked?

Closed: He wasn't naked, he had his undergarments on.

Problems: Simple logic explains that this is certainly not the case. Why did he take his garments off in the first place? Because he was fishing, a dirty and stinky job. If he had left his undergarments on, then they would get dirty and stinky from the fishing. When he then puts the outer garments back on, will they not immediately become dirty and stinky? If he is naked as the Bible records, then washing a little with water from the lake would get most of the dirt and stink off of his naked body before he puts his garments back on. Now, is that so difficult to understand? It's not if you have an open heart for the truth, rather than your agenda.

9.

Open: During the sermon on the mount, Jesus made this statement: **Mat 5:40 And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also.** If you like Luke better: **Luke 6:29 And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloke forbid not to take thy coat also.** Since there are two different garments mentioned, it seems logical to assume one is an outer garment and the other an under garment. Is Jesus saying to humble yourself to the point of nakedness which you claim is sin?

Closed: I am not sure what He is saying, but I know that it is a sin to be naked.

Problems: This position is often taken earlier in a real conversation, but that would make for a short article and leave out many of the “closed-minded” arguments. This response is extremely close to "I don't care

what the Bible says, I know how I feel." Now I know that response is one that Christians are not allowed to use, but they often display this response in action even if not in words. Keep in mind that this response makes your feelings your god instead of the God of the Bible.

In conclusion, there are certainly a lot of hypothetical responses one could have to the truth of God's Word. Unfortunately, most of them are predicated on a belief that is already established in the mind and the individual doesn't want you confusing them with the facts. The best example of this that I can think of as it relates to nakedness that I have personally heard was, "well God was clothed in Isaiah 6:1 and so that is good enough for me." Basically, ignoring the entire rest of scripture so that I don't need to deal with the inconsistency of my position when compared to the Bible.

What we really should be asking from the beginning is what does the Bible say. If we start with a faulty premise we are destined to end up with a faulty conclusion. Once we study the Bible with an open-heart and open-mind we seek for the truth instead of verification of our agenda. Then once we learn the truth, the proper response to the Word of God is that if God is for it then I am for it and if God is against it then I am against it.

It is a sad state of the church when rules reminiscent of the Pharisees are more common place then actual scriptural doctrine...when Christians are the ones actively promoting Satan's second agenda rather than God's original design.