

Dear Friends,

I was recently searching for health information and came across an article that was very surprising to me. It was written as a complete article by Ellen G. White in the year 1900. The title of the article is Disease and It's Causes.

My husband (Dr. John Clark, M.D.) has researched issues of dress from a health perspective and has been able to find that our limbs, and in particular our ankles and feet drastically affect circulation of blood in the body when there is a discrepancy of temperature between the extremities and the trunk. This has a definite and profound impact on the health of the human body. Today, this information is almost unknown by most people.

What surprised me about this article is that it was written long after the issues and debates about the "reform dress" amongst Seventh-day Adventists. For those that are Seventh-day Adventists, dress reform is often thought of as something that was once discussed in the late 1800's mostly due to the fashions of that day and therefore the issue of dress reform is no longer applicable to us in our day. Here is a short quote from a letter written in 1897 by E.G.White that is often thought of in reference to such thought.

[Letter 19, 1897. (To J. H. Haughey, July 4, 1897.) {5MR 405.3}

"The burden of advocating the reform dress was removed because that which was given as a blessing was turned into a curse."

Further on in the letter : "The Lord has not moved upon any of our sisters to adopt the reform dress. The difficulties that we once had to meet are not to be brought in again. There was so much resistance among our own people that it was removed from them. It would then have proved a blessing. But there must be no branching out now into singular forms of dress."

But notice this article that was written three years later by the same author.

February 6, 1900 Disease and Its Causes.
Mrs. E. G. White.

"Women should clothe their limbs with regard to health and comfort. They need to have their limbs and feet clad as warmly as do men. The length of the fashionable dress is objectionable for several reasons:--

1. It is extravagant and unnecessary to have the dress of such a length that it will sweep the sidewalks and streets.

2. A dress thus long gathers dew from the grass, and mud from the streets, which makes it uncleanly.

3. In its bedrabbled condition it comes in contact with the sensitive ankles, which are not sufficiently protected, quickly chilling them, and is one of the greatest causes of catarrh and of scrofulous swellings, and endangers health and life.

4. The unnecessary length is an additional weight upon the hips and bowels.

5. It hinders the walking, and is also often in other people's way.

There is still another style of dress that will be adopted by a class of so-called dress reformers. They will imitate the opposite sex as nearly as possible. They will wear the cap, pants, vest, coat, and boots, the last of which is the most sensible part of the costume. Those who adopt and advocate this style of dress, are carrying the so-called dress reform to very objectionable lengths. Confusion will be the result. Some who adopt this costume may be correct in their views in general upon the health question, but they could be instrumental in accomplishing vastly more good if they did not carry the matter of dress to such extremes.

In this style of dress God's order has been reversed, and his special direction disregarded. "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." Deuteronomy 22:5. This style of dress God would not have his people adopt. It is not modest apparel, and is not at all fitting for modest, humble females who profess to be Christ's followers. God's prohibitions are lightly regarded by all who would advocate the doing away of the distinction of dress between males and females. The extreme positions taken by some dress reformers upon this subject cripple their influence.

God designed there should be a plain distinction between male and female dress, and has considered the matter of sufficient importance to give explicit directions in regard to it; for the same dress worn by both sexes would cause confusion, and great increase of crime. The apostle Paul would utter a rebuke, were he alive, should he behold females professing godliness with this style of dress. "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; but (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works." The mass of professed Christians utterly disregard the teachings of the apostles, and wear gold, pearls, and costly array.

God's loyal people are the light of the world and the salt of the earth; and they should ever remember that their influence is of value. Were they to exchange the extreme long, for the extreme short, dress, they would, to a great extent, destroy their influence. Unbelievers, whom it is their duty to benefit, and seek to bring to the Lamb of God, would be disgusted. Many improvements can be made in the dress of women in reference to health, without making so great a change as to disgust the beholder.

The female form should not be compressed in the least with corsets and whalebones. The dress should be perfectly easy, that the lungs and heart may have healthy action. The dress should reach somewhat below the top of the boot, but should be short enough to clear the filth of the sidewalk and street, without being raised by the hand. A still shorter dress than this would be proper, convenient,

and healthful for women when doing their housework, and especially for those women who are obliged to perform more or less outdoor labor. With this style of dress, one light skirt, or at most two, is all that is necessary, and that should be buttoned to a waist, or suspended with straps. The hips were not formed to bear heavy weights. The heavy skirts worn by females, their weight dragging down upon the hips, have been the cause of various diseases, which are not easily cured, because the sufferers seem to be ignorant of the cause that produced them, and continue to violate the laws of their being by girding the waist and wearing heavy skirts, until they are made life-long invalids.

Many will immediately exclaim, "Why, such a style of dress will be old-fashioned!" What if it is? I wish we could be old-fashioned in many respects. If we could have the old-fashioned strength that characterized the old-fashioned women of past generations, it would be very desirable. I do not speak unadvisedly when I say that the way in which women clothe themselves, together with their indulgence of appetite, is the greatest cause of their present feeble, diseased condition. There is but one woman in a thousand who clothes her limbs as she should. Whatever may be the length of the dress, women should clothe their limbs as thoroughly as do men. If the limbs and feet are kept comfortable with warm clothing, the circulation will be equalized, and the blood will remain healthy and pure, because it is not chilled nor hindered in its natural passage through the system." {RH Feb 6, 1900}

Notice that in this article above, Deuteronomy 22:5 is quoted and immediately following 1 Timothy 2:9 is also quoted.

I decided to do some research about the term "modest apparel" in that verse from 1 Timothy 2:9 and this is what I found. This word apparel does not just mean "clothing". It is a completely different word than the word "clothing" as it appears in other scriptures. It is the Greek word *Katastole*. It is a compound word. The root word "kata" (Strong's Concordance #G2597) means "to fall or let down-to flow down". The word "stole" (Strong's Concordance #G4749) means a "stole" or long gown, (as a mark of dignity):-long clothing (garment), (long) robe, or to wrap around.

Moses Mikheyev, senior editor of the Snyder Bible writes that the word *Katastole* means a "long, loose, flowing garment. The word *katastole* is a combination of two Greek words; *kata*, which means "down" and *stole*, which basically means a "long, loose garment reaching the feet." Basically a woman is to wear a long and loose dress."

I spent much time on the internet and repeatedly found that quite a few other biblical scholars of various faiths and denominations have researched this also and came to the same conclusion.

Many say that it is historical fact that both men and women both wore long robe-like outer garments and therefore there was no distinction between men and women. While it is true that both wore robes or dress like garments, there

was a clear distinction made between men and women: men wore breeches underneath their robes and when a man worked or went to battle, he would lay aside his robes and it was perfectly acceptable for the man to wear his breeches. It was not acceptable at all for a woman to have her legs uncovered at anytime. Also men's robes were much shorter than women's and exposed their legs in a way that women did not. And given the fact that Moses wrote in Deuteronomy 22:5 that men and women should not wear the same clothing, there were clearly distinctions in dress that distinguished the difference between the two.

This issue of dress reform is one of great importance, especially in light of the problems we see now in the world with homosexuality. Gender distinction and modesty has been a question of mine for years. My personal convictions is that I should wear a long skirt or dress to make the distinction of my gender clear but also to be modest and not expose myself thereby offending and/or tempting others.

Psychological studies have been done that show that both men and women look at the female form of the crotch, buttocks and thighs when pants are worn. It's an automatic and unconscious response. But this is not the case when a woman wears a dress or skirt that does not define the crotch, thighs and buttocks. Instead the visual focus goes upward to the face. The same is true for shirts that are designed in such a way as to show a large area of the chest below the neck. If any flesh is revealed near the breasts, our eyes automatically look there. For a man, both of these scenarios are very difficult. Men become physically aroused upon the sight of a woman's form when the form or flesh of woman's body is revealed by either tight clothing, low cut shirts or dresses and pants or trousers. It is a response for many men that is not an automatic conscious choice and it is something they battle with constantly. Women may wear very loose trousers or pants but as soon as they bend over or squat, all the looseness that was once there upon standing disappears. Not only that, the separation of the legs up to the crotch is always problematic. The same is true in reverse and men can and do wear clothing that is too tight, but most psychological studies reveal that women are not sexually aroused by visual stimuli, but rather emotional stimuli. Regardless, since we lost our covering of light in the Garden of Eden, men and women have had to be clothed ever since. It was the Lord speaking to Israel through Moses to warn of grave dangers of cross dressing in Deuteronomy 22.

Women have told me that dresses and skirts are not modest because they can blow up, or a woman can accidentally position herself to reveal too much. While it is very clear that women should wear pants or coverings on their legs, ankles and feet UNDERNEATH their dresses or skirts for the sake of health, it is also apparent that by doing this, it would ensure accidental exposure. However, in summer when it is extremely hot, a woman will have to take great care to be watchful of her modesty when

outdoors or doing activities that would compromise her being covered.

Another aspect of the clothing issue is the fact that generally people are quite shocked and affected when they



Mary E. Tillotson, charter member National Dress Reform Association; c. 1866-1870

see a man wearing a dress or skirt. But what hardly anyone now is aware of is that one hundred (100) years ago it was utterly shocking and even illegal in many countries for a woman to wear only trousers or pants and no skirt or dress, thereby dressing as a man.



Dr. Mary Walker

Now we see in the world, men dressing like women, with skirts and dresses and this is not limited to Hollywood or television in the entertainment field. All the current fashion shows are now heavily promoting trans-gender and “androgynous” clothing and it is becoming acceptable.



Bruce Jenner now Caitlyn Jenner



Jaden Smith



High school boys in France

The other day in a very small rural town (population 2498) near where I reside in Australia I saw a group of young school children being led by a teacher and other adults to an open field in a public park. One of the boys, around age ten was wearing a pink ballet tutu (skirt) over his school uniform shorts. I was amazed and watched to see if he was doing it temporarily as a joke. The boy did not gaze down at all to what he was wearing and continued walking and talking to another boy beside him.

The boy continued to wear the ballerina tutu (skirt) all afternoon. The teachers did not seem to pay any attention; neither did the other adult chaperones. Nor did this boys peers seem to refer to his attire either. I was amazed and thought to myself, if only I had a camera. I have looked on the internet and boys wearing skirts is now becoming a trend. It has been on the fashion parades and catwalks for

a number of years but it is now being seen worn by boys in public schools around the world.

Eighteen months ago I went to the Department of Motor Vehicles to registered a vehicle. The woman who attended me and processed my registration was a man with long hair, dressed as a woman. I knew immediately, but my son who was with me did not know.

Within current media and news, there is a trend in fashion for men to wear feminine clothing, including dresses and skirts, colors and patterns that generally have historically been assigned to women only. Not only that, men now commonly wear their hair very long. The Bible states that men should wear their hair short. (1 Corinthians 11:14) It wasn't until the 4th century A.D. that artists began portraying Christ with long hair and angels with wings.

Here are some questions to consider:

1) Should God's people be concerned if all people, including members of the church, interchange clothing so that there is no distinction between what men and women wear?

2) Do you think the church should accept dresses and skirts on men, like they have accepted pants and trousers for women? If not, why is the double standard acceptable, as it is certainly not equitable.

3) Since God has said clearly within the Bible that there is dress distinction between men and women, is the church in danger of blurring this distinction now with current fashion?

4) Because it is the sin of adultery for a man to look upon a woman with lust, wouldn't it be logical to advise women to dress modestly with long dresses and skirt (that are not too tight) to help men avoid this sin?

With all the issues facing the church, the issue of gender distinction is also something we all should be seriously considering for the Lord calls cross-dressing an abomination. This is a serious rebuke.

For more information regarding this topic, I highly recommend the following websites:

www.SistersInSkirts.com

This website documents historical information including extensive photographs, and illustrations regarding dress that most of us have ever seen before. The presentations are downloadable powerpoints. This is a must see website with amazing documentation.

www.TheAndrogynyDeception.com

Find out the subtle underpinnings of a multi-faceted movement designed to derail the remnant. You will be amazed as you discover what's at the bottom of the gender bending strategies of fashion and philosophy. A devious deception is taking the unwary by storm! Don't be caught off guard! Educate yourself today, so you can be armed with the Truth!

www.RemnantRaiment.com

God bless,

Julie Clark
Tweed Heads, Australia