

# Dressing for the Lord



David Cloud

*Dressing for the Lord*  
Copyright 2007 by David W. Cloud  
This edition May 2017  
ISBN 978-1-58318-106-5



Published by Way of Life Literature  
P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061  
866-295-4143 (toll free) • fbns@wayoflife.org  
<http://www.wayoflife.org>

Canada: Bethel Baptist Church,  
4212 Campbell St. N., London, Ont. N6P 1A6  
519-652-2619

Printed in Canada by  
Bethel Baptist Print Ministry

# Contents

Introduction.....	5
The Importance of Reproof.....	9
The Origin of Clothing.....	11
Clothing Is a Language.....	13
The Captains of the Fashion Industry.....	18
Isn't This Basically the Man's Problem?.....	24
Bible Guidelines for Clothing.....	28
A Study on Biblical Modesty.....	46
Worldliness and the Christian's Dress.....	73
Pants and the Christian Woman.....	91
A Summary of the Bible's Teaching on the Christian's Dress.....	102
Pushing the Edge on Dress Standards: Borderline Modesty vs. True Modesty.....	105
Plain Clothing.....	112
Questions Answered on the Issue of Christian Dress.....	119
Testimonies From Christian Women on the Issue of Modest Dress.....	168
Survey of Men on the Subject of Women's Dress.....	190
Bibliography.....	215

## **Dedication**

I dedicate this book to the wife of my youth. We were married in August 1976, and not on even one occasion has she failed to demonstrate that modest femininity that comes only from a Christ-centered heart. She is a true Proverbs 31 woman. “Who can find a virtuous woman? for her price is far above rubies. ... Favour is deceitful, and beauty is vain: but a woman that feareth the LORD, she shall be praised” (Proverbs 31:10, 30).

# Introduction

There was a time, just a few years ago, when a message like the one contained in this book was heard from fundamentalist and independent Baptist pulpits across the world, but that is no longer the case. All too often, any kind of preaching about clothing has become an oddity, an embarrassment, or a type of “legalism.” The resistance of the rock & roll culture to such preaching is so pervasive that many pastors have decided to ignore the matter of dress, thus the battle is lost simply because the ground is abandoned.

Yet if ever there ever were a time when preachers need to warn their people about clothing issues, it is today. Modern society is drenched with indecency. A Vogue fashion show would make ancient Corinth blush. Standards of morality are not to be left to the pew. Surely it is the obligation of the preacher to set forth these things. Has God not spoken on this issue? We know that holiness is a matter of the heart, but is it not a matter of the body, as well? What man has ever lusted after a woman’s heart? How, then, can we ignore these parts of Scripture and refuse to preach them boldly and uncompromisingly? That is what the New Evangelical does. There are some things he will not preach, and separation is one of them. But the Bible speaks as much about moral separation as it does about ecclesiastical separation. The faithful Bible-believing preacher cannot ignore either.

Those who are crying “legalism” today are hypocritical in this matter. They decry the old-time preacher for the lines he draws, but they, too, draw lines for clothing. Will they allow a woman to teach a Sunday School class in a bikini or a man to sing a special in lipstick, a dress, and high heels? No, and there are other types of attire they do not allow. They draw lines; they have standards. And if it is right to draw a line in clothing, it is wise to draw the line after the Bible’s principles rather than the world’s.

Let's make a clear difference between ourselves and the world. Let's not be afraid of being a "peculiar people, zealous of good works." Let's stand in the old paths. Those who are giving up high, plain standards of holiness in dress and moving closer and closer to the fashions of the world should remember that the world is moving farther and farther from God's Word.

### **A Church's Modesty Standard Must Go beyond Mere Written Rules**

I want to make it as clear as possible that when I talk about "dressing for the Lord" I am not talking about merely putting a bunch of rules on Christian women. I believe specific dress standards are necessary in churches, but a church's standards must go beyond any specific written standard. The church must teach both men and women the why of modesty and the biblical principles thereof, and the church must find a way to reach the hearts of the females so that they are not merely obeying specific rules of dress but they love Jesus Christ so much that they want to measure everything in their lives by what pleases Him.

This is the approach we take in this book. To lay a solid Bible foundation for modesty, we are going to give a careful exegesis of about 25 key Bible passages from Genesis to 1 John. We are going to develop Bible principles that can be applied to any nation or culture. As foreign missionaries we are concerned about teaching Christian women that the Bible's principles for modesty can work anywhere. Furthermore, we strongly believe in dealing with the heart of this matter and not the mere externals.

**Please don't judge me or this book by something you might have witnessed somewhere else.**

I realize that in some independent Baptist circles "dress standards" are not much more than a part of a package of what is considered to be proper church life and perhaps a

badge of honor to impress others, and in this context modesty often doesn't reach beyond a few written rules.

One man wrote to say: "I am not against strong Bible preaching, but I go into countless churches that have an immature, uneducated flock because no one ever takes the time to teach them the Word. It's much easier to preach on a topic than to actually study and prepare then teach the Scripture. I think we as Independent Fundamental Baptist are for the most part impatient."

This man has a point. Topical preaching is certainly not wrong; in fact, it is necessary; but preachers and teachers need to stand back and make sure that the church is a serious Bible-training institution that produces biblically-educated people who are truly prepared to serve Jesus Christ. And there is indeed a great need for preachers and teachers to be patient, looking for that spiritual fruit that can only come through the Holy Spirit. We cannot change the heart, but we can teach and pray and fast and yearn and wait on God.

### **The Woman Has an Obligation**

Many women protest that the men should just watch their eyes, and we agree wholeheartedly that a Christian man is responsible to guard his eyes, but that is only one side of the coin. The woman also has a responsibility. Since the woman's figure is a powerful attraction to the man, the Christian woman is responsible to dress so that she does not draw his attention in a sensual manner.

There are far too many women in fundamental Baptist churches who are sensual and stubborn and who resist the teaching of Scripture and the preaching of God's men and the pleas of the tempted. This is probably the greatest reason why so many preachers simply ignore this issue in their preaching. There are just too many stubborn females in the congregation who cause trouble anytime someone mentions modest apparel. The preacher should be brave enough to

buck them, but it is not an easy matter and many do not think it is worth the trouble.

If you are a female reading this book, I trust that I have not described you in the previous paragraph, because as long as you are stubborn and sensual there is no way that I or any other preacher can help you to be modest. We can show you what the Bible says about modesty and we can show you what men say about how that sensual dress affects them, but we cannot change your heart. The foundation of a modest Christian life is a heart surrendered to Christ.

SAMPLE

# The Importance of Reproof

The Bible teaches us that even after we are saved we still have the “flesh” and the “old man,” which is the sin nature that we inherited from Adam.

“For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not” (Romans 7:18).

“This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would” (Galatians 5:16-17).

“If so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus: That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” (Ephesians 4:21-24).

Since the believer has an indwelling propensity to sin, an enemy that lives within, he cannot trust his own understanding and his own heart. Note the following important exhortations:

“Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and LEAN NOT UNTO THINE OWN UNDERSTANDING. In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths” (Proverbs 3:5-6).

“THE HEART IS DECEITFUL ABOVE ALL THINGS, and desperately wicked: who can know it?” (Jeremiah 17:9).

“HE THAT TRUSTETH IN HIS OWN HEART IS A FOOL: but whoso walketh wisely, he shall be delivered” (Proverbs 28:26).

It is for this reason that the Bible instructs the believer to receive reproof and correction. This is one of the themes of the book of Proverbs, which is a book that teaches practical godly living. This book tells us that our attitude toward reproof is a measure of the condition of the heart.

“For the commandment is a lamp; and the law is light; and reproofs of instruction are the way of life” (Proverbs 6:23).

“He is in the way of life that keepeth instruction: but he that refuseth reproof erreth” (Proverbs 10:17).

“The way of a fool is right in his own eyes: but he that hearkeneth unto counsel is wise” (Proverbs 12:15).

“Only by pride cometh contention: but with the well advised is wisdom” (Proverbs 13:10).

“The ear that heareth the reproof of life abideth among the wise. He that refuseth instruction despiseth his own soul: but he that heareth reproof getteth understanding” (Proverbs 15:31-32).

When I am reproved by God’s Word, what is my attitude? Do I think that I already know everything and don’t need reproof? Do I have a proud attitude? Am I contentious?

I need to understand that godly, biblical reproof is for my own good. The Bible says, “For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth” (Hebrews 12:6). God does not correct us because He hates us but because He loves us, and righteousness is always the best for us. “In the way of righteousness is life; and in the pathway thereof there is no death” (Proverbs 12:28).

Having a right heart attitude toward biblical reproof is a major part of the battle in knowing God’s will.

My prayer should be, “Lord, keep my heart right with Thee; help me be wise in receiving reproof; help me not be puffed up and foolish and carnal.”

# The Origin of Clothing

“And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed” (Genesis 2:25).

“And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. 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” (Genesis 3:6-7).

“Unto Adam also and to his wife did the LORD God make coats of skins, and clothed them” (Genesis 3:21).

Nakedness only became a problem because of man's fall. Before this the man and woman were naked and there was nothing wrong with their nakedness. The problem came when man sinned and his heart became darkened and he began to think sinful thoughts. His heart became “deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked” (Jer. 17:9). It began to spew forth “evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies” (Mat. 15:19). Prior to this, man's thoughts were only pure and holy and right.

Both the nudist and the fashion designer say, “We have bodies; why not enjoy them?” but they are willfully ignorant of the Fall and its grave consequences.

Since the Fall, nakedness must be covered properly according to God's standards. When Adam and Eve became aware of their nakedness they instinctively tried to cover it themselves, but their covering was not right before God. The fig leaf aprons were not acceptable. It left their chests and thighs and legs exposed. From then until now the issue of modesty is not something that God has left to men to decide.

There is a heavenly standard for earthly modesty, and that is what we are going to examine in this book.

As a starting point, we can learn a lot just by considering what a modest covering was according to God's standard at the very beginning of man's history.

The main lesson here is that the clothing covered the individual's nakedness. The Bible says God made them "coats," but that does not refer to a mere jacket. The Hebrew word translated "coats" in Genesis 3:21 is translated "robe" in Isaiah 22:21 and in 2 Samuel 13:18 it describes Tamar's robe of many colors. As opposed to Adam and Eve's aprons, God provided robes that covered them. This teaches us that clothing should cover the chest entirely and properly. In Proverbs 5:19 the Bible says to the married man, "... let her breasts satisfy thee at all times." That is restricted to the marriage bed. Other than this, the woman needs to take special care to cover herself properly and not draw attention to this part of her body. The robes doubtless also covered their legs and thighs. In Isaiah 47:2-3, where God pronounces judgment upon Babylon, we find that the uncovering of the leg and thigh is nakedness by God's standard. "Take the millstones, and grind meal: uncover thy locks, make bare the leg, uncover the thigh, pass over the rivers. Thy nakedness shall be uncovered, yea, thy shame shall be seen: I will take vengeance, and I will not meet thee as a man."

We will see that there are other principles of modesty in Scripture, but proper covering of one's nakedness is a starting point and that is what we see at the very dawn of man's history.

# Clothing Is a Language

It is important to understand that clothing is a language. It is a “social message,” a fashion “statement.”

*Wikipedia* defines fashion as “a prevailing mode of expression.” It acknowledges that “every article of clothing carries a cultural and social meaning” and observes that “humans must know the code in order to recognize the message transmitted.”

The knowledge of this is the engine that drives the fashion industry, and the child of God needs to understand it, as well.

I need to ask myself what message is my clothing broadcasting?

American fashion designer Rachel Zoe said, “Style is a way to say who you are without having to speak” (goodreads.com).

“Clothes change our view of the world, and the world’s view of us” (Feminist writer Virginia Woolf, *Orlando*, chapter 4).

“Choose your clothes for your way of life” (American actress Joan Crawford, azquotes.com).

“Style is a simple way of saying complicated things” (Jean Cocteau, French designer, playwright, filmmaker, goodreads.com).

“Every day I’m thinking about change” (Miuccia Prada, Italian fashion designer, brainyquote.com)

“Basically I’m trying to make men more sensitive and women stronger” (Miuccia Prada, Italian fashion designer, brainyquote.com).

“What you wear is how you present yourself to the world, especially today, when human contacts are so quick. Fashion is instant language” (Miuccia Prada, Italian fashion designer, “Interview: ‘Fashion Is How You Present Yourself,’” *Wall Street Journal*, Jan. 18, 2007).

“I’ve realized that fashion is a very powerful instrument that ... allows you to transmit ideas and shape opinion” (Miuccia Prada, Italian fashion designer, “Interview: ‘Fashion Is How You Present Yourself,’” *Wall Street Journal*, Jan. 18, 2007).

“... there are sociological interests that matter to me, things that are theoretical, political, intellectual and also concerned with vanity and beauty that we all think about but that I try to mix up and translate into fashion” (Miuccia Prada, Italian fashion designer, brainyquote.com).

George Harrison of the Beatles, who rebelled against the way his father wanted him to act and dress, testified: “*Going in for flash clothes, or at least trying to be a bit different ... was part of the rebelling. I never cared for authority*” (Hunter Davies, *The Beatles*, p. 39).

Note that Harrison’s flash clothing and non-conformity was intimately associated with his rebellion.

Mary Quant, the fashion designer generally credited with inventing the mini-skirt in the mid-1960s, admitted that her aim was to entice men and promote licentiousness. She wanted something “daring” and “controversial,” which refers to pushing moral boundaries, something sexually immodest. It was regarded as a “symbol of liberation.” Some European countries banned the mini-skirt, saying it was an invitation to rape (Mary Quant, interview with Alison Adburgham, *The Guardian*, October 10, 1967). Quant also promoted a short hair style for women. Her fashions were statements and her clothing was a language.

Vivienne Westwood, who helped create the rock punk look, said, “I think fashion is the strongest form of communication there is. ... It’s only interesting to me if it’s subversive: that’s the only reason I’m in fashion, to destroy the word ‘conformity’” (Jon Savage, *Time Travel: Pop, Media and Sexuality 1976-96*, p. 119).

David Kidd once posed the following question to a young college girl who was inquiring about his family's conservative dress: "If you are shopping and see a girl in a long, loose fitting dress, what is your first impression of her?" Without any hesitation, she answered "that she is probably religious." He concluded, "It behooves us to recognize that our manner of dress is a statement that either reflects or contradicts our Christian purpose" (*The Fall and Rise of Christian Standards*, p. 154).

Hair styles are also statements. Long hair on men and short hair on women are not merely harmless fashions, a mere sign of the times, but are statements of rebellion against God's created order (1 Corinthians 11:14-15).

The androgynous unisex image is not innocent. It was created by rock musicians who intended to overthrow tradition. One of the rock songs of the 1960s called upon young men to grow their hair long and "let your freak flag show." David Lee Roth of Van Halen testified: "[My long hair] is a flag. It's Tarzan. I'll always be anti-establishment" (cited by John Makujina, *Measuring the Music*, p. 73).

Dennis Wilson of the Beach Boys sported long hair and popularized the "surfer cut" in the early 1960s. Commenting on the significance of this hair length, Wilson's biographer observes: "The 'surfer cut,' as it came to be known, was a radical thing to behold in 1962. Few parents would permit their sons to sport the look" (Jon Stebbins, *Dennis Wilson: The Real Beach Boy*, p. 24). Dennis Wilson was a rebel and his appearance was merely a reflection of this. Observe, too, that the "surfer cut" was not that long compared to the long hair that came afterwards, but it was just long enough to be a bold statement of non-conformity. Small fashion changes can have large consequences.

Paul McCartney of the Beatles flippantly acknowledged their role in overthrowing sexual distinctions: "There they were in America, all getting house-trained for adulthood with

their indisputable principle of life: short hair equals men; long hair equals women. Well, we got rid of that small convention for them. And a few others, too” (Barbara Ehrenreich, “Beatlemania: Girls Just Wanted to Have Fun,” cited by Lisa Lewis, *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media*, p. 102).

Where did the “small convention” of “short hair equals men; long hair equals women” come from? Why was this an “indisputable principle of life” in America prior to the onslaught of Beatles’ style rock & roll in the 1960s? The answer is that America, because of its vast number of churches, had been influenced by the Bible in these things. It was Bible principles that the Beatles ridiculed and sought to overthrow.

Abercrombie & Fitch, the clothing company that markets “edgy” clothing featuring loose sexuality, is “best known for its REBELLIOUS ATTITUDE” (“Flip-Flops, Torn Jeans, and Control,” *Business Week*, May 30, 2005). Thus even the world recognizes the message of Abercrombie & Fitch clothing. They don’t merely sell clothing; they sell an attitude via a certain style of clothing.

In “The World according to Abercrombie and Fitch,” David Seel observed: “SUCCESSFUL BRANDS IN AMERICA DON’T SELL PRODUCTS. THEY SELL LIFESTYLES” (*Critique*, 2000).

The upscale unisex Pusch brand was developed by two brothers who realized as teenagers that “music had its own subculture, complete with a lifestyle and a style of dress” (“Groovin’ to the Right Tune: A Lifestyle Brand of Clothes Inspired by Calgary’s Music Scene Rocks the Competition,” *Alberta Venture*, October 2007, p. 12). The Pusch brand is a reflection of the rock & roll dance scene.

Even the small details of clothing are significant as a language. Referring to the denim jean market in the 21st century, the web site fashionera.com observes that this market “is status ridden and has CODED TRIBAL SIGNS

AND SIGNALS with it's not so subtle stitching, logos, tabs, decorative pockets, shading and distressing.”

Therefore, clothing styles are not innocent. Each style preaches a message. Fashion designers are change agents.

Pantsuits preach the feminist's message of equality of the sexes.

Tight fitting, low cut, short and skimpy styles preach the world's message of loose sexuality.

Ripped jeans preach the message of a cheap affectation of poverty, of “I don't care” and thus slovenliness, and of moral casualness.

Slit skirts preach the message of sexual flirtation.

God's people must beware of sending the wrong message with their clothing. We must understand that the clothing industry is not in submission to God and cares nothing about submitting to His Word.

It doesn't do to say, “Well, my tight, ripped jeans don't preach that message TO ME.” The important point is not what message the clothing preaches to any particular individual who wears it, but what message it preaches in the context of its history and in the context of society at large and to those who are forced to look at it.

The child of God should ask, “Who invented this type of dress, this particular fashion, and what was his or her objective?”

“Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord *is*” (Eph. 5:17).

“Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God. Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God: Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved” (1 Cor. 10:31-33).

# The Captains of the Fashion Industry

What type of men and women control the fashion industry that produces the clothing styles desired by teenage girls and women? Who are the captains of this industry?

The first fact we should understand is that the fashion industry is shot through and through with homosexuality. Speaking at a panel discussion of Generation X Fashion in New York City in 2005, Tara Subkoff stated that fashion “is a gay man’s profession” (“A Gay Day for Fashion,” *New York Times*, Dec. 15, 2005). Melanie McDonagh, fashion reporter, said: “I asked a couple of fashionista friends of mine to name a single major heterosexual male designer, and they were stumped” (“Designers Parody Women at Paris Fashion Show,” *Daily Mail*, July 20, 2004).

Consider the following admission from an encyclopedia of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Culture under the section on “Fashion”:

“Historians of the modern gay experience have documented the large proportion of gay men who have worked in creative fields (such as fashion and the theater) and service industries (such as restaurants and catering). Ross Higgins, in his study of gay men’s involvement in fashion in Montreal, has shown that gay men were involved at all levels of the fashion industry there. The same is undoubtedly true throughout North America and Western Europe. THROUGHOUT THE TWENTIETH CENTURY MANY OF THE TOP COUTURE FASHION DESIGNERS WERE GAY, EVEN THOUGH SOCIAL PRESSURE CALLED FOR THEM TO KEEP THEIR SEXUALITY QUIET IF NOT SECRET. Indeed, many of the greatest names in twentieth-century fashion were gay or bisexual, including such figures as Christian Dior, Cristóbal Balenciaga, Yves Saint Laurent, Norman Hartnell, Halston, Rudi Gernreich (who was one of the founding members of the first American homophile

organization, the Mattachine society), Giorgio Armani, Calvin Klein, and Gianni Versace.”

The following are a few examples of the moral debauchery and anti-Bible attitude that permeates this industry.

### **Christian Dior (1905-57)**

Known as “the man who made the world look new,” the Frenchman Christian Dior launched the “house of Dior” in 1947. His designs revolutionized women’s dress. In his male fashions he went after the “manly and depraved look” (“Christian Dior: The Man Who Made the World Look New,” [fashionwindows.com](http://fashionwindows.com)). For the female his fashions emphasized the woman’s figure, making her appear more curvaceous (“Christian Dior,” Wikipedia). He did this by form clinging dresses and “bustier-style bodices, hip padding, wasp-waisted corsets and petticoats that made his dresses flare out from the waist.” He named one suit the “Jean-Paul Sartre” in honor of the morally debauched philosopher. Dior was a homosexual. At age 14 a fortune teller predicted that women would make him famous. He religiously carried a string of lucky charms.

### **Calvin Klein (b. 1942)**

Klein is a bi-sexual fashion designer who has brazenly promoted sexuality in clothing and helped popularize sexy styles down to the level of “tweens.” Klein has promoted highly indecent public advertisements for sexy underwear, both for men and women. His super tight jeans sold 200,000 pairs in one week when they appeared in 1978. A biography of Klein on [AskMen.com](http://AskMen.com) observes: “Klein has become notorious for the nudity, blatant sexuality, and use of underage, prepubescent models in his ads ... While he has been married, his days as a bachelor hanging out at the famed Studio 54 could be considered questionable, as can his sexuality.”

### **Gianni Versace (1946-1997)**

Versace was an influential homosexual Italian fashion designer who was “influenced by Andy Warhol and modern abstract art” (Wikipedia). “He liked to create sexy clothes for his women, skin-tight with low cuts and high slits on the skirts. Versace was among the first to revive the cat suit, to bring back the mini skirt, to show tights worn as trousers, to bring the bustier out at night and bead it. In 1982 his dresses made with fine metal mesh first appeared and were a hit. ... Versace has been referred to as the rock-and-roll designer and clients include Phil Collins, Bruce Springsteen, George Michael, Eric Clapton, Elton John, and Michael Jackson.” Versace was shot to death in front of his mansion in July 1997 by a homosexual man.

### **Yves Saint Laurent**

Yves Saint Laurent (1936-2008) was one of the most influential fashion designers of the 20th century. It was said: “There is virtually nothing about the way we dress or the way we shop now that was not a result of his 44-year career” (“Yves Saint Laurent Changed How We Dress,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 5, 2008). He was a homosexual, spent time in psychiatric institutions, and was addicted to drugs. His long-time homosexual partner, Pierre Berge, said that Saint Laurent “played a part” in the liberation of women. In fact, he helped to enslave them to fashion and tempt them into rejecting their God-given femininity. He invented the pantsuit in 1966, as part of the rebellious rock & roll culture. Linda Grant observes that the pantsuit “put women on an equal sartorial footing with men and “is what fashion gave to feminism” (“Feminism Was Built on the Trouser Suit,” *The Guardian*, June 3, 2008).

### **John Galliano**

Galliano, who was British Designer of the year in 1988 and knighted in 2001, is a homosexual.

### **Paul Smith**

Smith is a British fashion designer renowned for his multicolored pinstripes. He is infamous for his “naked lady” designs hidden inside cuffs or wallets. He has a collection of masculine attire for women.

### **Vivienne Westwood**

Westwood created the punk fashion. Her second marriage was to Malcolm McLaren, the manager for the vile punk rock band The Sex Pistols. In 1971 they opened the SEX/Seditionaries fashion store in London. The punk look featured such things as leather bondage gear, safety pins, chains, spiked dog collars, outrageous makeup and hair. Wikipedia observes that Westwood revolutionized fashion and “the impact is still felt today.” Her fashions were so influential that they have been shown at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London and the National Gallery in Australia. She stated that the only reason she is in fashion is to be subversive and to destroy the word ‘conformity’” (Jon Savage, *Time Travel: Pop, Media and Sexuality 1976-96*, p. 119).

### **Giorgio Armani**

The Italian Armani’s designs for women “are inspired by men’s wear” (Giorgio Armani, Infomat.com). He is a homosexual.

### **Tommy Hilfiger**

Hilfiger said, “I knew exactly what I wanted to do: I wanted to build a brand of clothing around my own attitude and my own lifestyle.” It is described as clothing “for the people.” Thus it is all about self, a fulfillment of the prophecy in 2 Timothy 3:1-2 -- “This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves...” It is rock & roll clothing. Hilfiger sponsored the vile Rolling Stones’ 1999 “No Security” tour.

## Mike Jeffries

Jeffries is the head of Abercrombie & Fitch, an influential trend-setting clothing company worth \$2.6 billion. When Jeffries came to the company his “big idea was to make the new A&F sizzle with sex.” In the article “Flip-flops, Torn Jeans, and Control,” he is described as follows:

“Jeffries is a man with many obsessions: youth, fashion, himself, his lucky shoes. ... A bonfire burns daily amid the tin-roofed buildings, where dance music blares nonstop. ... No matter the weather, he trots around the place in flip-flops, torn jeans, or shorts. Most mornings he lifts weights barefoot in the company gym. At home, a photo of a toned naked male torso shot by Herb Ritts hangs over the fireplace in his bedroom. ... A former colleague, Neil Dinerman, [says]: ‘He would like to be a guy with a young body in California.’ ... Jeffries leaves his black Porsche -- doors unlocked, with the keys between the seats -- at the same odd angle at the edge of the parking lot. Everyone knows why: Jeffries is superstitious about success. That’s why he always goes through revolving doors twice. Associates have learned not to pass him in stairwells; he returns the courtesy. Then there are Jeffries’ lucky shoes, a worn pair of Italian loafers that a secretary keeps in her desk. ‘I put them on every single morning when I look at the numbers,’ he says” (*Business Week*, May 30, 2005).

These are only a very few examples of the weirdness and moral perversion that can found among the captains of the fashion industry.

It should also be understood that these men and women have an influence that extends throughout the industry. Though their personal dress creations can cost as much as \$15,000 and are beyond the reach of the average person, their philosophy and designs trickle down to the lowest level of the industry, to the Sears, Penney’s, Wal-Marts, Coles (Australia), Marks & Spencers and Hennes & Mauritzs (Europe), and Tesco (England) of the world.

“Of all the cultural wolves that prey upon Christian principles, none has been more merciless toward virtuous, modest womanhood than modern fashion. ... From short shirts to tight tops, high-rise hem lines to low-rise jeans, each new craze dares women to cast aside their inhibitions and reveal themselves in a new and bolder way. Tragically, many Christian women have sacrificed the precious virtues of modesty, decency, and discretion to the ruthless determination of the cultural wolf whose appetite for them is never satisfied” (David Kidd, *The Fall and Rise of Christian Standards*, pp. 87, 88).

SAMPLE

# Isn't This Basically the Man's Problem?

Many women seem to think that the issue of modesty is basically the man's problem and that if he would keep his eyes to himself that would be the end of the matter.

The answer to this is that both the man and the woman have a grave responsibility.

Christian men most definitely should keep their eyes in check and say, with Job, "I made a covenant with mine eyes; why then should I think upon a maid?" (Job 31:1), and with David, "I will set no wicked thing before mine eyes..." (Psalm 101:3).

This is not to say, though, that Christian women can dress as they please because they have no responsibility in the matter. *If she knows that men are seriously tempted in the matter of sexual lust and if she knows that certain types of dress can cause more problems for men than others, why would a godly girl or woman not want to do everything she can not to cause a potential for stumbling?*

David was a man after God's own heart, the sweet Psalmist of Israel, a man who had determined not to set any wicked thing before his eyes; yet look at what happened to him after seeing a woman innocently (apparently) bathing on her roof.

Most women don't properly understand how powerful the visual element is to the man in the realm of sex and sensuality.

One man wrote to say: "I do believe most women just do not know how men think. Period. I BELIEVE THAT THERE IS A WHOLE SEGMENT, GROUP, CLASS OF WOMEN, WHO, IF THEY REALLY UNDERSTOOD MEN, WOULD CHANGE THEIR DRESS CODE, BECAUSE THEY DO WANT TO PLEASE GOD. ... *They just need to understand it's not just a list of do's and don'ts set forth to force them in to 'frumpiness,' but a desire of godly men to gain their*

*cooperation in helping them NOT lust, and to not be stumbling blocks, because they just want to please God.”*

Another man wrote: “I am a 24-year-old, unmarried man. I am very glad that you are asking us men about this issue, because it has been my experience that women truly do not understand the things that can run through a man’s head when he sees an immodestly-dressed woman. ... Some women have told me that it is a man’s fault for having such a dirty mind or for letting it get to a point where lust becomes a problem, but the fact is that men seem specifically prone to these types of thoughts.”

The book *For Women Only: What You Need to Know about the Inner Lives of Men* by Shaunti Feldhan describes the powerful visual aspect of man’s sexuality. Note the following statements:

“[A] woman who is dressed to show off a great body is an ‘eye magnet’ that is incredibly difficult to avoid, and even if a man forces himself not to look, he is acutely aware of her presence. ... [When a group of men were asked what their reaction would be if they were sitting alone in a train station and a woman with a great body walked in and stood in a nearby line,] a whopping 98 percent put their response in ‘can’t *not* be attracted’ categories (only 2 percent were unaffected). Interestingly, the results were essentially the same for men who described themselves as happily married believers. ...

“One faithful husband whom I highly trust confessed, ‘If I see a woman with a great body walk into Home Depot and I close my eyes or turn away until she passes, for the next half hour I’m keenly aware that she’s in there somewhere. I’m ashamed to say that, more than once, I’ve gone looking down the aisles, hoping to catch a glimpse.’

“I’d love to think that this man was an aberration--except that all the men I shared his quote with said, ‘That’s exactly right!’ ...

“In addition, the man’s initial temptation is often not only unintentional, but automatic. If the stimulus is there (a great figure in a right outfit), so is the response. As one man put it, ‘It doesn’t even register that I thought *great body* until two seconds later!’ A man cannot prevent those *initial* thoughts or images from intruding.

“Don’t believe me? Let me illustrate.

“Don’t read this.

“No really, don’t read it. Just look at the letters.

“Impossible, isn’t it? There is no way to just notice the letters without reading the word. That’s what it’s like for a guy. His brain reads ‘good body’ without his even realizing it.

“One man provided this analogy. ‘If you are nearsighted, everything is fuzzy without glasses. With your glasses, everything is in sharp focus. If a babe walks into Starbucks, other women sort of see fuzzy--all they see is that a woman is there. But all the men in the room suddenly have their ‘glasses’ on--that woman is in sharp focus, and it’s really hard not to stare at her.’

“This distinction actually debunks the assumption that all the trouble starts because ‘men have roving eyes.’ A better understanding is that there are roving, under-dressed women--and men can’t not notice their existence. ... The choice is the critical distinction between temptation and sin. Once an image intrudes in a man’s head, he can either linger on it and possibly even start a mental parade, or tear it down immediately and [‘bringing into captivity every thought’] as the Bible puts it. ... So although few men can stop an involuntary image from popping up in their heads, and few men can stop themselves from wanting to look, they can (and do) exercise the discipline to stop themselves from actually doing so” (Shaunti Feldhahn, *For Women Only: What You Need to Know about the Inner Lives of Men*, pp. 111-113, 120-123).

A knowledge of the man's make up as a fallen creature and the powerful temptation that the immodestly dressed female can be to him should help the Christian woman understand how imperative it is for her to dress properly.

The section on "Survey of Men on the Subject of Women's Dress" describes exactly what attracts men and what a problem immodest clothing is for them.

SAMPLE

# Bible Guidelines for Clothing

*By Bruce Lackey*

Introductory note by Brother Cloud: The following is by the late Bruce Lackey (1930-1988). He was a great blessing in my life. As a young man he played honky-tonk piano in bars. After his conversion he became serious about God's will and was a zealous student of Scripture. He read his Greek New Testament every day and taught and preached from the King James Bible, being convinced that it was expertly translated from the correct Hebrew and Greek manuscripts and believing that it needed no correction. He was the Dean of the Bible School at Tennessee Temple when I was a student there in the 1970s and he was the best Bible teacher I have ever had the privilege of sitting under. He was also a conscientious soul-winner and a master of sacred music styles on the piano. He taught his students that it was not right to use a bar-room style of music in the service of a holy God. In August 1976 he performed our wedding in a ceremony at his church in Tennessee. In the 1980s he traveled as a Bible conference preacher, and he died in 1988 of complications with medicine he was taking for an illness.

---

The thing I want to talk to you about tonight is Christian clothing. What do we mean when we say "Christian clothing"? Is that some particular article? No, we can't hang a particular suit or a particular dress up here tonight and say this is Christian. Rather, there are five questions that you need to ask yourself to answer the question, "What kind of clothing should I wear?" There are five questions, and I am going to support these by God's Word.

I hope you will get these down, because you are going to face this all your life. Fashions are going to change and new things are going to be brought out all the time. There is no

use in me making up a list of what is good and what is not, because that would change next year. So these five principles from God's Word will help you to decide every single item, whether it be right or wrong to wear, male or female, adult or child.

### **Is it worn by the opposite sex?**

The first question is this: Is it worn by the opposite sex? Turn back to Deuteronomy 22:5 for our beginning. Here is our first principle. When I am trying to decide whether or not I should wear a certain thing, my first question is "Is that item worn by the opposite sex?" In other words, I as a man should not wear anything that a woman would wear. And a woman should not wear anything that a man would wear.

"The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God."

I am well aware of the fact that people resent using this verse because it is in the Old Testament. And many times people say we can't use that verse unless we are going to use the whole chapter. For instance, we wouldn't want to use verse nine. A lot of people violate that verse by planting two or three different kinds of seeds in the same plot of ground. Similarly, we've all violated verse eleven about wearing garments with different kinds of cloth. Nearly everything we have on is made out of a weave of different things. So how can we take verse five and not take verse nine or verse eleven?

The answer is that any principle found in the Old Testament which is repeated in the New Testament is for us today.

Let me prove that to you. Keep your place at Deuteronomy and go over to 1 Corinthians 10. In 1 Corinthians 10 we have a book written by a grace preacher. Nobody can deny that the Apostle Paul was a grace preacher. He preached that we're not under the law but under grace, and he wrote about that time and time again. Without a doubt he is a New Testament

preacher. But I want you to notice that in this entire chapter of 1 Corinthians 10 he constantly uses the Old Testament Scripture to prove something. Look at verses one and two: “Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.” That was taken from Exodus 13 and 14, in which passage we read about the cloud, and about the Red Sea parting, and how they walked across on dry land, which was similar to being baptized. They were covered with the water, even though not a drop of it touched them. Paul is referring to the Old Testament. Look at verse three: “And did all eat the same spiritual meat.” That refers to Exodus 16, when God gave the manna from Heaven. That was called spiritual food. Verse four: “And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.” That refers to Exodus 17, when Moses took his rod and struck the rock, and God gave gushing water out of that flinty rock.

Notice that he is referring to several Old Testament incidents. Verse five: “But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness.” That is referring to Numbers 13 and 14. They refused to go into the land of Israel and inherit it, and they said, “We can’t take it,” and so God overthrew them in the wilderness. Many of them died.

Now look at verse six. “Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted.” You see. It’s not wrong to use the Old Testament to teach New Testament Christians to do something right. Paul did it.

Let’s keep on going. Verse seven: “Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.” Here he refers to Exodus 22:6. The Apostle says, “Don’t you be like that.” Verse eight: “Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them