

2.10.20 – Illogical

Since God is not the author of confusion, we need to look for Satan's deceptions in anything that is illogical. We typically do not change our behavior suddenly. We take a small step in the new direction and study the feedback from that step. If we like the results, we take a bigger step. A trained eye will see these steps, but they are usually seen after the new behavior is obvious to everyone. There are evidences that someone is not what he pretends to be. The boss is too familiar with the attractive young lady employee before he leaves his wife and runs off with the young lady. We often do not see what is coming, but when it happens, we remember the times when things did not seem right. If the evidence leading up to the "fall" is missing, a false accusation is more logical.

Doctrine has similar problems, when a doctrine needs a lot of exceptions...we should suspect that it is wrong. Job was a big exception to the doctrine that God always blesses good people and punishes bad people and his comforters were not willing to change their doctrine, therefore they incorrectly assumed that Job must be a bad person. If you read the book of Job, it is no longer logical to assume that a tragedy in an acquaintance's life means that he is a bad person who is finally getting punished. This behavior is repeated whenever people holding a doctrinal position have a closed mind when their position is challenged.

The disciples of Jesus believed that once dead always dead even though Jesus had brought 3 people back from the dead, therefore the women who saw Jesus alive were not believed, but were thought to have been tricked somehow. The only one who could say "always" and "never" when talking about God was Jesus. All humans should use "usually" or "seldom" because we do not know God well enough to give definite statements. The apostle Paul writes a lot in his letters to show that the ceremonial law was set aside. Our problem is that ceremonial law is still being worked into the Christian doctrine, but it is called tradition or some other name so we can't recognize what Paul was writing about is

the same thing we are dealing with today. We will start on a familiar doctrine, clothing.

Textile people tell us that the body needs covered at all times. This leads to a lot of questions about how to do certain tasks and why is clothing needed.

We will start with the "how" questions first.

How can someone be clothed all the time and change clothing?

Exception one, you may be naked in a room by yourself to change clothing.

Would I be allowed to change clothing in a locker room with the members of my gym class?

Exception two, you may change clothing with a gym class in the locker room.

How can we have a Doctor examine us if we keep our clothing on?

Exception three, you may be seen without clothing by a medical person.

How do I take a bath or a shower with clothing on?

Exception four, you may take off your clothing to shower.

Does the same rule apply to gang showers?

Exception five, Gang showers are allowed in a school or gym setting if restricted to the same sex.

Is a mother allowed to remove the clothing from her child to give it a bath?

Exception six, A mother is allowed to care for her child without clothing until they can care for themselves.

If your child becomes too sick to bath himself after he is old enough to care for himself, can a mother see him naked to give him a bath?

Exception seven, A parent may see their child naked after he can care for himself, if he is too sick to care for himself.

If your parents are unable to care for themselves, are you allowed to remove their clothing, bath them and redress them?

Exception eight, A child is allowed to see his parents naked if they are unable to care for themselves.

Are married couples allowed to see each other naked?

Exception nine, Married couples are allowed to see each other naked when no one else can see them.

How can I travel on an airplane and go through the TSA security scanner if I am not allowed to be seen naked? Must I stop all airline travel now that the scanner operator can see me naked?

Exception ten, the scanner operator is allowed to see me naked, because at least I don't see him see me naked.

You can start to see how ridiculous the exceptions become and none of them have a Bible basis for the exception. The exceptions end up being

based on our own authority, not the absolute authority of the Word of God. Mainly because the rule didn't come from the Bible in the first place.

I believe that we have established enough exceptions to look for a better doctrine concerning clothing. Consider how much simpler the doctrine would be if clothing were only needed to protect the body and comply with the civil law.

Now we will go to the "why" questions as related to the cartoon below.



We will consider the statements against nakedness one at a time.

"You can't have that out!"

Well it is clear that he does already have it out. Maybe "can't" means "not allowed to", but with no information about the setting, we do not know what is allowed.

There are settings, obviously, where he is permitted to "have that out." Like in the restroom, when showering, in his bedroom with his wife, among like minded friends in a non-sexual activity, at a naturist resort, just to mention a few places.

"It's obscene!"

According to Webster's Dictionary 1828 on line, a definition of obscene is *Offensive to chastity and delicacy; impure; expressing or presenting to the mind or view something which delicacy, purity and decency forbid; to be exposed; as obscene language; obscene pictures.* These are all dependent on what is accepted by the society we are living in.

In the context we are working with, "chastity" applies to being proper about sex. Let's consider sex, penis and chastity for a while. If the penis is uncovered, does it have to be used for sex? No, it is uncovered to shower, to change clothing, to vent the bladder and maybe to sleep, all non-sexual. Is there anything sexual about a limp penis? Maybe, if your mind is programmed wrong, but not otherwise. Is a limp penis any threat to proper behavior concerning chastity? For Christians, chaste behavior is no sex before marriage and only with the person you married, after marriage. I see no threat.

Is the penis the only part of the body used for sexual pleasure? Can hands be used for creating sexual pleasure? Yes, then why do the hands not have the same rule as the penis? Can a mouth be used for sexual pleasure? Yes, then why does the mouth not have the same rule as the penis? Why is the penis singled out as obscene and therefore in need of covering?

I can think of no logical reason.

If the rule is in place because the penis can be used for sex therefore it must be covered, then that same rule should apply to hands, feet, mouths, etc. If the rule is that if it can be used for sex that it must be covered then the truth is that Satan and the Muslims have it right and the entire body should be covered from the top of the head to the tip of the toes...for guys and for girls.

For this belief to hold any credibility whatsoever, then sex would have to be considered evil. Sex is not evil...sex was created by God, is sanctioned and ordained by God, procreation was commanded by God, therefore we can correctly conclude that sex is good. So, if we can correctly conclude that sex is good, how can we call a specific part of the body obscene because it may be related to sexual pleasure at some point? The correct answer is that we cannot!

The next logical question then is does God wants us to enjoy sex? Yes, He does within the confines of marriage! This question comes from a person who thinks, if it is enjoyable then it must be sin. What a perverted view of God!!! Why would God allow His Son to suffer so much humiliation and death here on earth so that we could be restored to fellowship with Him and escape hell? Certainly not so we can avoid all enjoyable activities. God will not attract many people to his side if His people never enjoy life. The rules in the Bible are not given to take the joy out of life, but to avoid losing a lot of enjoyment. Extra marital sex can gain a person a disease that will not only destroy his sexual enjoyment, but could destroy most other enjoyments and the body as well. God did not allow Jesus to die to remove your enjoyment, He said that he came to bring life and life more abundant not less!

If mankind, represented by Adam, could not refrain from eating the forbidden fruit when living in abundance of other good things to

eat, including lots of fruit, what is the chance he would be fruitful and multiply if it was unpleasant to do so and a lot of work and responsibility when he is fruitful? Look at all the effort made to have the enjoyment without being fruitful. Without the enjoyment, the fruitful part would not often get done i.e. no overpopulation problem. If getting the enjoyment without the fruitful part fails, then society has proven its willingness to murder the child that our enjoyment produced. God did not plan to have children grow up with only a mother. He used sexual enjoyment as a tool to keep the couple together and intended for it to be a mutually enjoyable activity. God intended for sex to be enjoyable and so to remove any doubt He had Solomon write a book of the Old Testament about the enjoyment of sexual relations. The writer of Hebrews described the marriage bed as “undefiled” which means that God allows any activity that the married couple both agree would be enjoyable. The Song of Solomon has a passage where God instructs the lovers to “drink deeply” i.e. enjoy the experience fully. God wants us to have an abundant life. Sexual enjoyment is designed to help smooth the conflicts that happen when two people live together. It is also a picture of our relationship with Him.

Think about it this way, if God is for sex, who might be against it? Ding, ding ding...you guess right, Satan! Those who proclaim that the genitals were covered in the garden of Eden so we must cover the genitals as well might want to consider God’s question of “who told thee.” Since Satan was just successful in getting them to partake of the fruit that they had been commanded to not eat, then what else might the master of deceit been successful at? God wanted His creation to expand their numbers, Satan wants to shrink our numbers. God wants to display His creation Satan wants it hid in shame. God is for children being born Satan is for abortion. God is for a marriage of a man and a woman Satan is for homosexuality. Are we seeing a pattern here? The real question is whose side are you on? Which doctrine are you a proponent of

whether knowingly or unknowingly? Are you promoting God's way or Satan's way?

The naked guy in the cartoon makes a good point that the penis is part of his body. God declared the body to be very good along with the rest of His creation in Gen 1:31 while Adam and Eve were naked. There is nothing in the Bible that indicated that the body was changed by eating the forbidden fruit. The "obscene penis" the textile guy is pointing out is part of a body that God declared "very good". Dose not seem like a very logical thing to tell an all-powerful and all-knowing God that He made an obscene part. There is something that the textile guy missed or does not understand, if he is saying God's perfect creation has obscene parts. This seems very illogical to me.

"It's private!!!"

Here again it is hard to see how the statement applies only to the penis. If we define "private" as *belonging to or concerning an individual only*, then the rest of the body is also private. If we say "private" is the opposite of public then again, the whole body is not public.

My car is not public, so it is private, but I do not keep it covered. I don't even have a cover for it if I wanted to cover it. My house is private, but I do not put clothing on it and that is legal to have it uncovered. Just because something is private does not mean it requires covering. Again, no logical reason to apply the statement to the penis or the body.

"It's dirty!!!"

This is a figurative way of saying obscene or something like that which we covered above. I enjoy doing what the naked guy does in the cartoon, he took it literal and gave the answer that would go with a literal statement. If the textile guy meant it literal, that still

is not a reason to cover it, but a reason to wash it. I do not cover my hands when they are dirty. It would get the inside of the glove dirty. Either way we take it, it is not a logical reason to cover the penis.

"AAAhhhh!!!!"

The textile guy is not reacting well to the doubt cast on his beliefs. He has a closed mind in that area. He has no doubt that his doctrine is right. His frustration is why the naked guy can not see the obvious. This is an all too common response to facing the illogical aspects of the textile position. Judging from the illogical arguments for clothing and the illogical reactions from otherwise logical Christians, keeping the body covered has to be Satan's number two goal. His number one goal is to keep people from getting saved.

With no logical reason to cover just the penis, we are left with the option of either covering the whole body because all the parts of the body can be involved in sexual pleasure or admitting that there is no reason to cover any particular part.

If we change the cartoon to women, one clothed and one naked, then we could just replace penis with vagina or breasts and the lack of logic is almost identical.

It seems that the belief of what needs covered is being arbitrarily set by the society we live in. Aaron Frost illustrated this point in his book, [Christian Body: Modesty and the Bible](#), by pointing out societies that covered different parts of the body for similarly illogical reasons.

How about we as Christians decide to have a Bible standard for our doctrine and live as God intended from the beginning...naked and not ashamed?