

[23 November 2014 at 03:30](#)

Rinuboy Speaks

Female Trousers - Insights from Bible, History and EGW

PRESENTED BY: IZUCHUKWU RICHES UBANI (RINUBOY)

Outline:

Insights from the Bible

Insights from History

Insights from Ellen G. White (the Prophet-ess) [for Seventh-day Adventists]

Biblical Principles against Licentious Use of Female-trousers: The Nigerian scenario

My Take on Female-trousers!

Insights from the Bible

Key Text: Deut. 22:5 – “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.”

Key Questions:

Is there any evidence from the Bible that the biblical terms variously translated “breeches”, “loincloth” or “trousers”, or “hose” are, indeed, identical and/or typical to present-day “Trousers”?

If so, is there substantial textual evidence from the Bible that demonstrates that the biblical terms variously translated “breeches”, “loincloth” or “trousers”, or “hose”, being identical and/or typical to present-day “Trousers”, strictly “pertaineth unto a man” and were used to describe/differentiate man’s garment, as opposed to “a woman's garment” {cf. Deut. 22:5}?

Is Trousers (as a concept of wear, particularly, as a bifurcated, outer-garment covering!) a man’s garment (that is, “which pertaineth unto a man”) as opposed to “a woman's garment” {cf. Deut. 22:5}?

Compare the use of the terms: “Breeches” or “Loincloth” with “Trousers”

(KJV) Ex 28:42 And thou shalt make them linen breeches to cover their nakedness; from the loins even unto the thighs they shall reach: {their...: Heb. flesh of their nakedness} {reach: Heb. be}

(NKJV) Ex 28:42 "And you shall make for them linen trousers to cover their nakedness; they shall reach from the waist to the thighs.

(KJV) Ex 39:28 And a mitre of fine linen, and goodly bonnets of fine linen, and linen breeches of fine twined linen,

(NKJV) Ex 39:28 a turban of fine linen, exquisite hats of fine linen, short trousers of fine woven linen,

(KJV) Le 6:10 And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and his linen breeches shall he put upon his flesh, and take up the ashes which the fire hath consumed with the burnt offering on the altar, and he shall put them beside the altar.

(NKJV) Le 6:10 'And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and his linen trousers he shall put on his body, and take up the ashes of the burnt offering which the fire has consumed on the altar, and he shall put them beside the altar.

(KJV) Le 16:4 He shall put on the holy linen coat, and he shall have the linen breeches upon his flesh, and shall be girded with a linen girdle, and with the linen mitre shall he be attired: these are holy garments; therefore shall he wash his flesh in water, and so put them on.

(NKJV) Le 16:4 "He shall put the holy linen tunic and the linen trousers on his body; he shall be girded with a linen sash, and with the linen turban he shall be attired. These are holy garments. Therefore he shall wash his body in water, and put them on.

(KJV) Eze 44:18 They shall have linen bonnets upon their heads, and shall have linen breeches upon their loins; they shall not gird themselves with any thing that causeth sweat. {with...: or, in sweating places: Heb. in, or, with sweat}

(NKJV) Eze 44:18 "They shall have linen turbans on their heads and linen trousers on their bodies; they shall not clothe themselves with anything that causes sweat.

(KJV) Da 3:21 Then these men were bound in their coats, their hosen, and their hats, and their other garments, and were cast into the midst of the burning fiery furnace. {coats: or, mantles} {hats: or, turbans}

(NKJV) Da 3:21 Then these men were bound in their coats, their trousers, their turbans, and their other garments, and were cast into the midst of the burning fiery furnace.

Observations:

1. THE MOST TEXTUALLY-CONSISTENT AND SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION OF “BREECHES” (KJV), AS USED IN KING JAMES’ VERSION OF THE BIBLE IS AS TRANSLATED IN THE NEW KING JAMES’ VERSION AS “SHORT TROUSERS” (Ex 39:28; NKJV); BETTER STILL, “SHORT, UNDER-GARMENT, TROUSERS” OR KNEE BREECHES. WHEREAS, THE TERM, “HOSE” OR “HOSEN” (Dan. 3:21; KJV) APPLIES MORE DIRECTLY TO THE MODERN-DAY CONCEPT OF “TROUSERS” AS A BIFURCATED AND OUTER GARMENT COVERING.

2. “BREECHES” OR “TROUSERS” OR “HOSE/HOSEN” WERE ONLY USED AS RECORDED IN THE BIBLE TO DESCRIBE OR PERTAIN TO ONLY MAN’S GARMENT, NEVER A WOMAN’S GARMENT OR A UNISEX WEAR. (ONLY THE MALE GENDER OCCUPIED THE OFFICE OF THE PRIESTS AND PASTORS/ELDERS/BISHOPS/OVERSEER.)

HISTORICAL INVESTIGATION USING ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA ULTIMATE REFERENCE SUITE (SOFTWARE).

{SOURCE: trousers. (2012). Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.}

Trousers [also spelled trowsers, also called pants or slacks]

- an outer garment covering the lower half of the body from the waist to the ankles and divided into sections to cover each leg separately. In attempting to define trousers, historians often explain that if any portion of a garment passed between the legs, it was an ancestor of this garment. Thus defined, trousers can be traced to ancient times and were especially common among equestrian peoples such as the Scythians and Mongols.

- Until the end of the 18th century, bifurcated European garments took forms such as breeches, knickerbockers, and pantaloons. By 1820 trousers as they are known today had come into general use among men. Since then, they have been the basic style of dress for men, varying in style from the narrow cut to the extremely wide Oxford bags of 1924.

- Within Western society, trousers were long regarded as masculine apparel. Although 19th-century dress reformers tried to introduce trousers for women (known as bloomers), the style was rejected as too radical. It was only in the 20th century that it was deemed appropriate for women to wear

trousers—first for sport, then for casual attire, and finally for business and formal wear.

{SOURCE: Fashion and Dress. (2012). Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.}

- Fashion and Dress [Britannica Book of the Year Article: Lisbeth Levine, “Women’s Fashion. 1993: (from Fashion and Dress”]
- ... In keeping with the new softness, the predominant silhouette was a gently flowing A-line that flared from narrow shoulders. It was often achieved with a dress or an elongated vest and wide-legged pants.
- Trousers were emphasized more than skirts as hemlines continued to descend for most of the year. Although trousers were still frowned upon in many conservative professions, they gained ground as more women began wearing pantsuits to work. Even the U.S. Senate changed its dress code to permit both sexes to wear trousers after a female senator wore them.
- Women who wore skirts to the office mostly favoured those with knee-length hemlines. French designers created confusion by elongating hemlines through the fall season in their ready-to-wear collections and then doing an about-face by showing microminis in their fall haute couture collections. Within weeks, New York City department stores were displaying miniskirts in their windows. ...

NOTE: IT IS INSTRUCTIVE TO NOTE THAT A HACKNEYED SUBSTITUTE FOR THE TERM, “TROUSERS”, PARTICULARLY FEMALE-TROUSERS, IS THE TERM, “SLACK”. BELOW IS THE HISTORY BEHIND “SLACK”.

{SOURCE: Morris, Esther Hobart McQuigg Slack. (2012). Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.}

Morris, Esther Hobart McQuigg Slack

- née Esther Hobart McQuigg , born Aug. 8, 1814, near Spencer, N.Y., U.S., died April 2, 1902, Cheyenne, Wyo.
- American suffragist and public official whose major role in gaining voting rights for women in Wyoming was a milestone for the national woman suffrage movement.
- Esther McQuigg was orphaned at age 11. In 1841 she married Artemus Slack, who died three years later. She later married John Morris, with whom she moved to Wyoming Territory in 1869. There Morris apparently exerted her considerable personality on behalf of woman suffrage. The legislator

elected from her district promptly introduced a bill providing for woman suffrage that was passed in December of that year.

- In 1870 Morris was appointed justice of the peace for South Pass City, a job for which, despite the rough character of the gold-mining town, her robust frame and blunt fearlessness well suited her. She was the first woman ever to hold such a position, and in her eight and a half months in the post she tried more than 70 cases expeditiously and without reversal. In 1871 she left her husband and moved to Laramie, where in 1873 she was briefly on the ballot for state representative.

- In her later years Morris was increasingly honoured for her role in the attainment of suffrage in Wyoming, the first success of the movement for national woman suffrage. Her reputation continued to grow in the years after her death, and in 1960 statues of her were placed in Statuary Hall of the U.S. Capitol and before the Wyoming state house in Cheyenne.

Preliminary Implication: TROUSERS, AS A CONCEPT OF WEAR, WAS ORIGINALLY A MEN'S ATTIRE! MEANWHILE, FEMALE-TROUSERS, AS A CONCEPT OF WEAR, ORIGINATED WITH THE WOMEN-LIBERATION OR GENDER-RIGHTS/EQUALITY MOVEMENT!

{SOURCE: rhinegraves. (2012). Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.}

rhinegraves

- wide breeches worn by men in the mid-17th century in Europe. The breeches were probably named for Karl Florentin, Rheingraf von Salm. Not unlike a divided skirt, they were sometimes called "petticoat breeches." They were usually fastened above the knee and decorated with ribbons. In England, rhinegraves were fashionable from 1660 until 1666, when Charles II dropped the style.

Implication: UP UNTIL 1660 – 1666, BREECHES, FAR FROM BEING CONSIDERED "UNISEX", GENERALLY PERTAINED TO MEN!

{SOURCE: Geneva Bible. (2012). Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.}

Geneva Bible [also called Breeches Bible]

- new translation of the Bible published in Geneva (New Testament, 1557; Old Testament, 1560) by a colony of Protestant scholars in exile from England who worked under the general direction of Miles Coverdale and John Knox and under the influence of John Calvin. The English churchmen had fled London during the repressive reign of the Roman Catholic Mary I, which had halted the publication of Bibles there.

- The work acquired the sobriquet “Breeches Bible” because it described Adam and Eve as having made “breeches” to cover their nakedness (Genesis 3:7), instead of “aprons” or “loincloths.” The Great Bible (named for its large page size and first ordered by Henry VIII in 1538) was restored to the churches after Elizabeth I's succession halted persecution of Anglicans and Protestants, but the Geneva Bible, imported from Europe and not printed in England until 1576, quickly surpassed the Great Bible in public favour. The work's enduring popularity made the Geneva Bible an important influence on the translators of the King James Version of 1611.

Implication: THE BOGUS CLAIM THAT SUGGESTS THE USE OF BREECHES AS A UNISEX WEAR BY ADAM AND EVE WAS CONSIDERED SO WEIRD AND REVOLUTIONARY (AS AT 1557 – 1560 – 1570) THAT THE GENEVA BIBLE “ACQUIRED THE SOBRIQUET ‘BREECHES BIBLE’ BECAUSE IT DESCRIBED ADAM AND EVE AS HAVING MADE ‘BREECHES’ TO COVER THEIR NAKEDNESS (GENESIS 3:7), INSTEAD OF ‘APRONS’ OR ‘LOINCLOTHS.’”

{SOURCE: sansculotte. (2012). Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.}

Sansculotte [French sans-culotte ("without knee breeches")]

- in the French Revolution, a label for the more militant supporters of that movement, especially in the years 1792 to 1795. Sansculottes presented themselves as members of the poorer classes or leaders of the common people, but during the Reign of Terror public functionaries and educated men also adopted the label to demonstrate their patriotism.
- The distinctive costume of the typical sansculotte was the pantalon (long trousers) in place of the culotte (silk breeches) worn by the upper classes, as well as the carmagnole (short jacket) and the red cap of liberty. Jacques-René Hébert's popular newspaper, the Père Duchesne, did much to spread the image of the sansculotte: a woodcut on the front page of each issue showed a man in Revolutionary costume, holding a musket and smoking a pipe.
- The influence of the sansculottes declined sharply after Hébert's execution in March 1794. The defeat of the desperate popular uprisings of Germinal and Prairial, year III (spring of 1795), marked the end of their public role.

Implication: BOTH LONG-TROUSERS (“PANTALON”) AND BREECHES (SILK-BREECHES OR “CULOTTE”) WERE CONSIDERED MEN’S ATTIRE, NOT UNISEX WEARS WITH FEMALE-VARIANTS. {SOURCE: Schwingen. (2012). Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.}

Schwingen

- (German: “swinging”), form of wrestling native to Switzerland and the Tirolese valleys. Wrestlers wear Schwinghosen (wrestling breeches) with strong belts on which holds are taken. Lifting and tripping are common, and the first man down loses the bout. Schwingen tournaments were organized as early as 1805.

Implication: AGAIN, “BREECHES” IS USED TO DESCRIBE MAN’S GARMENT!

[SOURCE: Reproduced by permission of the trustees of the Wallace Collection, London; photograph, J.R. Freeman & Co. Ltd.]

suit: French dress of the Louis XIV period

French dress of the Louis XIV period: male attire of long coat with wide, turned-back sleeves, waistcoat, lace cravat, tight-fitting breeches, and periwig. Louis XIV and His Family, oil painting by Nicolas de Largillière, 1711; in the Wallace Collection, London.

Implication: EVEN A SECULAR EUROPEAN NATION AS FRANCE RECOGNIZED THE DISTINCTLY “MALE ATTIRE” CONSISTING OF “BREECHES”, IN CONTRADISTINCTION FROM THE TRADITIONAL “FEMALE ATTIRE”, THE GOWN.

{SOURCE: codpiece. (2012). Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.}

codpiece

- pouchlike addition to men's long hose, located at the crotch, popular in Europe from the 15th to the early 18th century. It came into fashion with hose that were like tights and continued to be worn with breeches. An earlier, narrower form of codpiece, worn with a belt or loincloth instead of hose or tights, was the basic fashion for men in the Aegean area during the Bronze Age.

- In the early and mid-16th century the codpiece was padded, prominent, and decorated, even with jewels, but by 1580 it was mocked and thought indecent. After the pouch had disappeared, the name continued to be used into the 18th century for the front fastening of breeches.

Implication: “HOSE”, LIKE “BREECHES” AND “LOINCLOTH” CONSTITUTED THE “BASIC FASHION FOR MEN” RIGHT FROM THE “BRONZE AGE” [WHICH BEGAN BEFORE 3000 BC IN GREECE AND CHINA, AND ABOUT 1900 BC IN BRITAIN.] {SOURCE: loincloth. (2012). Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.}

loincloth

- usually, a rectangular piece of cloth draped around the hips and groin. One of the earliest forms of clothing, it is derived, perhaps, from a narrow band around the waist from which amuletic and decorative pendants were hung. From about 3000 BC, the Egyptians wore schenti of woven material that was wrapped around the body several times and tied in front or belted. Sometimes the schenti was pleated or partially pleated and sometimes stiffened to project in front.
- Cretan loincloths from around 2000 BC were highly patterned and decorated. Loincloths are still worn in the 20th century in some tropical and subtropical areas of the world.

Implication: BY ITS VERY NATURE, THE “LOINCLOTH” IS MEANT TO COVER THE GROIN; THAT IS, THE GENITALS (ESPECIALLY THE TESTICLES) OR THE AREA BETWEEN THE TOPS OF THE THIGHS AND THE ABDOMEN. THEREFORE, WE MAY EXPECT THAT THE EARLIEST OR CRUDEST FORM OF DRESS (PRIMARILY MEANT TO COVER NAKEDNESS) FOR BOTH SEXES WAS CONSTITUTED LOINCLOTHS; EVEN AT THAT, THE BIOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MALE AND FEMALE PHYSIQUE WARRANTS NO UNISEX LOINCLOTH, AT LEAST, NOT IN DESIGN, STRUCTURE OR TEXTURE. HENCE, IT IS PLAUSIBLE TO IMAGINE A MALE-LOINCLOTH AND A FEMALE-LOINCLOTH, WITH THE MALE-LOINCLOTH EASILY MODIFIED INTO THE EARLIEST FORMS OF MALE-BREECHES OR SIMPLY, BREECHES. HISTORY HOWEVER CONSISTENTLY PORTRAYS THE LOINCLOTH AS MOSTLY A MASCULINE ATTIRE. IN FACT, ENCARTA DICTIONARY DEFINES LOINCLOTH AS “A CLOTH COVERING THE HIPS AND THE GENITAL AREA TYPICALLY WORN BY MEN IN HOT COUNTRIES”.

HISTORICAL/FACTUAL EVIDENCE TO PROVE THAT FEMALE-TROUSERS (AS AN OUTER GARMENT, OF FASHION!) WAS AND IS NOT THE TRADITIONAL/ORIGINAL CULTURE OF THE WESTERN/AMERICAN/EUROPEAN/TEMPERATE WORLD!

{SOURCE: dress. (2012). Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.}

dress (also called apparel or attire)

...

Europe and America: 19th and 20th centuries

The 19th century

The influence of national features in dress had been declining since about 1675 and by 1800 had become negligible; from then on fashionable dress design was international. The character of the feminine wardrobe stemmed from Paris, the masculine from London. The English gentleman was established as the best-dressed in Europe

It was during this period (c. 1811–20) that English modes for men became everywhere accepted as correct, even in Napoleonic France (the top hat, for example, became almost universal). ... The tailcoat, waisted and padded on the chest, was de rigueur, accompanied by a waistcoat and close-fitting trousers called pantaloons, which were first buckled at the ankle and later, after 1820, strapped under the instep.

French dominance of women's fashion was absolute during the 19th century.

Until about 1820 women's dress continued to reflect the Neoclassical styles initiated in the era of the French Revolution. These fashions were supposedly based upon the Classical dress of ancient Greece. Ladies wore loose, draped, high-waisted gowns in white or pale colours in imitation of those depicted by white marble statuary. Corsets became less restrictive or were abandoned. Hair was dressed in Classical fashion, usually in a chignon bound with ribbons. The Romantic age of the 1830s brought back more colour, a tighter waistline at a more natural level, fuller skirts, leg-of-mutton sleeves, and complex high coiffures surmounted by large-brimmed hats or bonnets.

... . The three-piece lounge suit, with a jacket instead of a tailcoat, was introduced in the 1850s for informal occasions. In the last two decades of the century a more countrified attire consisting of Norfolk jacket and knickerbockers became popular. ...

...

The second half of the 19th century was a time of prosperity in Europe. Despite wars and upheavals, the bourgeoisie dressed fashionably and luxuriously. The styles worn by men and women acted as foils to one another—the men's dress sombre, dignified, and only slowly changing, the women's dress colourful and changing ever faster in a kaleidoscope of modes.

Women's dress from 1840 onward was dominated by a boned corset and framework underskirt. The fullness of the skirt was at first achieved by adding more layers of petticoats, leading to the crinoline petticoat of 1850. Named after the materials from which it was originally made (Latin: crinis,

“[horse] hair”; linum, “thread”), this petticoat was, like its predecessors the farthingale and the hoop, a heavy underskirt reinforced by circular hoops, in this case of whalebone. By 1856 the weight of the petticoats became intolerable, and the cage crinoline was invented. This was a flexible steel framework joined by tapes and having no covering fabric.

Gradually, in the 1860s, the shape of the crinoline changed, metamorphosing into that of the rear bustle, which was fashionable in the 1870s and '80s. Only in the 1890s did the skirt return to a relatively slender silhouette, but there was no letup in the constrictive corset, which was then at its most painful and harmful stage. In general, the styles of the late 19th century were feminine and elegant but not easy to wear. They restricted natural movement with their multiple layers, extensive decoration, and sheer quantity of material.

Women's hair, always worn long during the century, was from about 1840 to 1870 dressed in a severe style in which it was drawn back tightly from a centre parting into a bun at the back. Later styles were dressed high on top and in a chignon or ringlets behind. The bonnet in many and varied guises was the chief head covering and was replaced by dainty hats only in the 1870s and '80s. Throughout the 19th century cosmetics were worn mostly by actresses, and rarely if ever by “respectable” women.

...

An earlier attempt to introduce a more comfortable, practical attire for women had been made by the American Elizabeth Smith Miller. The costume she designed was enthusiastically advocated by her friend Amelia Jenks Bloomer, a journalist and writer. In 1851 Bloomer traveled to London and Dublin to publicize this dress reform. The outfit, consisting of a jacket and knee-length skirt worn over Turkish-style trousers, was regarded as immodest and unfeminine. It was greeted with horror and disdain, and the idea quickly died. What has survived is the name bloomers, which originally referred to Miller's full trousers but was later applied to long knickers worn as underwear in the early 20th century. Miller's garment was also the inspiration for “rationals” (sometimes also known as bloomers), the knickerbockers worn by women for cycling and sport in the 1890s.

James Laver

The early 20th century

There were dramatic changes in women's dress during the first decade of the 20th century. Men, however, continued to wear a black frock coat with gray striped trousers for formal day wear and a black tailcoat and trousers with a white waistcoat for evening wear if ladies were present. Three-piece lounge suits were worn for less formal day functions, and for country and sportswear the Norfolk jacket and knickerbockers remained popular.

Women's fashions changed considerably between 1900 and 1910. The fashion of 1900 was characterized by an S-shaped silhouette that was achieved mainly by a boned corset that was long and rigid in front and shorter at the rear. The costume was extremely feminine, overdecorated with flounces and lace, frills and embroidery. Picture hats were set upon pompadour coiffures, affixed with hat pins. The neckline was high, and the skirt reached the ground.

...

[NOTE THAT UP UNTIL 1910, THE CONCEPT OF FEMALE-TROUSERS (AS AN OUTER GARMENT, RATHER THAN AS AN UNDERWEAR!) WAS ALIEN, STRANGE, UNPOPULAR, UNFASHIONABLE, AND GENERALLY CONSIDERED IMMODEST AND UNFEMININE BOTH IN AMERICA AND IN EUROPE!]

Working women tended to wear a blouse and skirt. During the war years of 1914–18 a minority of women were in uniform, but far more worked in factories, in offices, as postal carriers, and in other jobs previously performed by men. They sometimes wore trousers. Shorter skirts also appeared by 1915, which showed even more of the ankle than Poiret's slit skirts of 1912.

...

For women in the 1920s, freedom in dress reflected the new freedoms opening up for them to take up careers, to study at college, and to enter professions. The skirt hemline rose steadily to become, at its shortest in the years 1925–27, knee-length. ... Marcel waving, introduced in the late 19th century, and the later “perm,” or permanent wave, also became popular at this time. The new hairstyles were accompanied by the cloche hat, which closely covered the head.

[NOTE THAT HISTORY CONSISTENTLY LINKS THE MOVE OF FASHION TOWARDS FAVOURING FEMALE-TROUSERS WITH THE WOMEN'S RIGHTS/GENDER-EQUALITY MOVEMENT, JUST LIKE ELLEN G. WHITE LINKED THEM!]

Femininity returned to fashion in the 1930s. The ideal figure was still slim, but the waistline returned to its natural level. The skirt lengthened again until it reached about eight inches above the ground for the daytime and ground length for the evening. ... Brassieres were redesigned to emphasize the breasts.

By this time there was available a great variety of specialized clothing for different occasions, including for sport and leisure or resort activities, such as swimming, skiing, and golfing. The cosmetics industry had also expanded and became big business in the 1930s; most women routinely carried face

powder, lipstick, eye shadow, and tweezers in their handbags for running repairs.

[AND NOW COMES THE WATERSHED TURN-AROUND POINT OF ADOPTION OF FEMALE-TROUSERS!]

The high proportion of men and women in uniform in the years 1939–45 strongly influenced the civilian dress style. For women, garments had square padded shoulder lines, and skirts were a practical knee length. Trousers were widely worn by both civilian and military women. After World War II, trousers and trouser suits remained popular, especially between 1945 and 1970. In Europe, the war years meant austerity and clothing coupons; fashion did not have a high priority. Shortages of materials both during and immediately after the war led to the introduction of “utility” styles, especially in Britain, where government rulings insisted on the removal of all superfluous trimmings, including pockets and pleats, and restricted the fullness of garments in order to economize on the amount of fabric used.

[NOTE: AT THIS POINT IT IS LEFT TO THE READER TO DETERMINE IF THIS ADOPTION OF FEMALE-TROUSERS (AS FASHIONABLE WEAR!) WAS FOR RELIGIOUS, CULTURAL, CLIMATIC OR HEALTH EXIGENCIES; OR, AS WE HAVE SEEN, THE GRADUAL CHANGE TO FEMALE-TROUSERS WAS DETERMINED/ CHAMPIONED BY THE FOLLOWING FACTORS/FORCES: WOMEN’S RIGHTS MOVEMENT, UNISEX IDEOLOGY OF THE MILITARY, POST-WAR ECONOMIC IMPOVERISHMENT/ SCARCITY OF ENOUGH FABRIC, UTILITY STYLES FOR CONVENIENCE, AND MORE IMPORTANTLY, DEMON-GODDESS OF EVER-CHANGING, SENSUAL/ EROTIC/ SEDUCTIVE/ ROMANTIC/ SEXY-OBSSESSED FASHION.]

Post-World War II

...

Soon after the war the French designer Christian Dior introduced his 1947 “Corolle” collection, quickly dubbed the “New Look” by the American press. Here was a return to femininity: a long, full skirt with a bouffant ruffled petticoat beneath, a slender waist, and sloping shoulders. This set the style for the next decade or so of feminine fashions and was supplanted only by the rise of the miniskirt in the 1960s. These very short skirts were introduced first in London by Mary Quant and several years later by André Courrèges in Paris. Starting at the knee, the hemline over time crept upward to the upper thigh, a style that had only been made feasible by the introduction of nylon tights (panty hose in the United States). In 1970 other lengths appeared—the midi and the maxi—but neither was as popular as the mini.

After 1945 much emphasis was placed on clothes for the young. Throughout most of history, children and young people had worn basically the same type

of clothes as their parents. After 1945 a complete teenage wardrobe evolved, comprising garments that tended to be either extremely tight-fitting or baggy. Blue jeans, once scorned as the attire of prisoners, were popularized by films with young, charismatic stars; perhaps the most important example was *Rebel Without a Cause* (1955), in which James Dean played the jeans-clad protagonist.

...

Doreen Yarwood

Conclusions on the history of trousers and/or female-trousers!

a. Trousers, as a wear, originated among nomadic peoples who traveled immense distances on horseback, their attire being suited to their way of life, both sexes wore similar garments consisting of a woolen tunic over a shirt and wide trousers or leg-banding; and, among the Eskimos and Aleut in the form identical with loose-fitting hose, as adaptation to the Arctic cold. Thus, it was only a utility wear; in fact, an underwear.

b. Trousers was not a sine qua non for surviving or living in the temperate/arctic climate-condition; all other ancient civilizations: Ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, the Aegean, Ancient Greece, Etruria, Ancient Rome, Ancient nonclassical Europe and the Pre-Columbian Americas never had anything identical to “Female-Trousers” as an outer garment (of fashion) but all had draped outer garments, tunics/mantles or cloaks, with distinctly feminine or masculine attires. Apart from during the earliest times, the loincloth and/or breech were generally unique for men, whereas the gowns, skirt, dress and/or blouse were generally unique for women.

c. Factors/forces that historically: women’s rights movement, unisex ideology of the military, post-war economic impoverishment/scarcity of enough fabric, utility styles for convenience, and more importantly, demon-goddess of ever-changing, sensual/erotic/seductive/romantic/sexy-obsessed fashion.

d. Up until the turn of the twentieth century (1900s), Trousers was universally recognized as a distinctly MALE GARMENT/OUTFIT, particularly as an outer garment or fashion-outfit. If there were any exceptions, they were very rare and insignificant and in very small culturally isolated remote areas of the world. THIS IS HISTORICAL FACT!

ELLEN GOULD WHITE, A MODERN PROPHET, WHO SAW THE EMERGENCE OF THE “AMERICAN COSTUME” OF FEMALE-TROUSERS “REFORM” FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY TO THE TURN OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY DECRIES [in 1T - Testimonies For The Church Volume One (1855-1868)]:

“No occasion should be given to unbelievers to reproach our faith. We are considered odd and singular, and should not take a course to lead unbelievers to think us more so than our faith requires us to be. {1T 420.2}

Some who believe the truth may think that it would be more healthful for the sisters to adopt the American costume, yet if that mode of dress would cripple our influence among unbelievers so that we could not so readily gain access to them, we should by no means adopt it, though we suffered much in consequence. But some are deceived in thinking there is so much benefit to be received from this costume. While it may prove a benefit to some, it is an injury to others. [SEE APPENDIX.] {1T 421.1}

I saw that God's order has been reversed, and His special directions disregarded, by those who adopt the American costume. I was referred to Deuteronomy 22:5: "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." God would not have His people adopt the so-called reform dress. It is immodest apparel, wholly unfitted for the modest, humble followers of Christ. {1T 421.2}

There is an increasing tendency to have women in their dress and appearance as near like the other sex as possible, and to fashion their dress very much like that of men, but God pronounces it abomination. "In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety." 1 Timothy 2:9. {1T 421.3}

Those who feel called out to join the movement in favor of woman's rights and the so-called dress reform might as well sever all connection with the third angel's message. The spirit which attends the one cannot be in harmony with the other. The Scriptures are plain upon the relations and rights of men and women. Spiritualists have, to quite an extent, adopted this singular mode of dress. Seventh-day Adventists, who believe in the restoration of the gifts, are often branded as spiritualists. Let them adopt this costume, and their influence is dead. The people would place them on a level with spiritualists and would refuse to listen to them. {1T 421.4}

With the so-called dress reform there goes a spirit of levity and boldness just in keeping with the dress. Modesty and reserve seem to depart from many as they adopt that style of dress. I was shown that God would have us take a course consistent and explainable. Let the sisters adopt the American costume and they would destroy their own influence and that of their husbands. They would become a byword and a derision. Our Saviour says: "Ye are the light of the world." "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." There is a great work for us to do in the world, and God would not have us take a course to lessen or destroy our influence with the world. - {1T 422.1}

NOTES IN APPENDIX [AS REFERRED TO IN 1T 421.1!]:

PAGES 421, 456, DRESS REFORM--THE DRESSES GENERALLY WORN BY WOMEN IN AMERICA AT THE TIME THIS WAS WRITTEN (1863, 1867), WERE VERY DELETERIOUS TO HEALTH. THEY WERE ESPECIALLY OBJECTIONABLE BECAUSE OF THEIR EXTREME LENGTH, THE CONSTRICTION OF THE WAIST BY THE CORSET, AND THE WEIGHT OF THE HEAVY SKIRTS WHICH WERE SUSPENDED FROM THE HIPS. ABOUT A DECADE EARLIER A FEW WOMEN OF NATIONAL PROMINENCE INITIATED A MOVEMENT TO ADOPT A NEW STYLE OF DRESS THAT WOULD BE FREE FROM THESE SERIOUS OBJECTIONS. THE NEW MODE OF DRESS WAS SOMEWHAT LIKE THE TURKISH COSTUME WORN BY MEN AND WOMEN ALIKE. THE MOVEMENT BECAME SO POPULAR THAT FOR A TIME "DRESS REFORM" CONVENTIONS WERE HELD ANNUALLY. {1T 717.3}

"THE AMERICAN COSTUME," HERE REFERRED TO BY MRS. WHITE, WAS A MODIFICATION OF THE EARLIER STYLE AND WAS SPONSORED BY DR. HARRIET AUSTIN OF DANVILLE, NEW YORK. IT COMBINED THE SHORT SKIRT, "REACHING ABOUT HALFWAY FROM THE HIP TO THE KNEE," WITH MANNISH-LOOKING TROUSERS, COAT, AND VEST. SEE DESCRIPTION ON PAGE 465. THIS "SO-CALLED REFORM DRESS" WAS IN 1864 SHOWN TO MRS. WHITE TO BE UNSUITABLE FOR ADOPTION BY GOD'S PEOPLE. {1T 717.4}

FOR THE DESCRIPTION OF THE "AMERICAN COSTUME" [AS REFERRED TO IN 1T 421.1 AND 1T 717.4!]:

The above-described dress we believe to be worthy of the name of the reform short dress. It is being adopted at the Western Health Reform Institute and by some of the sisters at Battle Creek and other places where the matter is properly set before the people. In wide contrast with this modest dress is the so-called American costume, resembling very nearly the dress worn by men. It consists of a vest, pants, and a dress resembling a coat and reaching about halfway from the hip to the knee. This dress I have opposed, from what has been shown me as in harmony with the word of God; while the other I have recommended as modest, comfortable, convenient, and healthful. {1T 465.1}

More admonitions of Ellen G. White on "Fashion"!

Ellen G. White says [in *Ev - Evangelism* (1946)]:

"Simplicity of Dress.--We are nearing the close of this world's history. A plain, direct testimony is now needed, as given in the Word of God, in regard to plainness of dress. This should be our burden. But it is too late now to become enthusiastic in making a test of this matter. The dress of our people should be made most simply. . . . No one precise style has been given me as the exact rule to guide all in their dress. . . . {*Ev* 272.4}

Our sisters should clothe themselves with modest apparel. They should dress with simplicity. Your hats and dresses need not the extra trimmings that are put upon them. You are to be clothed with modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety. Give to the world a living illustration of the inward adorning of the grace of God. Let our sisters dress plainly, as many do, having the dress of good material, durable, modest, appropriate for this age, and let not the dress question fill the mind.”--Manuscript 97, 1908. {Ev 273.1}

Many dress like the world in order to have an influence over unbelievers, but here they make a sad mistake. If they would have a true and saving influence, let them live out their profession, show their faith by their righteous works, and make the distinction plain between the Christian and the worldling. The words, the dress, the actions, should tell for God. Then a holy influence will be shed upon all around them, and even unbelievers will take knowledge of them that they have been with Jesus. If any wish to have their influence tell in favor of truth, let them live out their profession and thus imitate the humble Pattern. {4T 633.3}

Pride, ignorance, and folly are constant companions. The Lord is displeased with the pride manifested among His professed people. He is dishonored by their conformity to the unhealthful, immodest, and expensive fashions of this degenerate age. {4T 634.1}

Fashion rules the world; and she is a tyrannical mistress, often compelling her devotees to submit to the greatest inconvenience and discomfort. Fashion taxes without reason and collects without mercy. She has a fascinating power, and stands ready to criticize and ridicule the poor if they do not follow in her wake at any cost, even the sacrifice of life itself. Satan triumphs that his devices succeed so well, and Death laughs at the health-destroying folly and blind zeal of the worshipers at Fashion's shrine. {4T 634.2}

...

Will my sisters accept this style of dress and refuse to imitate the fashions that are devised by Satan and continually changing? No one can tell what freak fashion will take next. Worldlings whose only care is, "What shall we eat, and what shall we wear?" should not be our criterion. {4T 640.2}

Some have said: "After I wear out this dress, I will make the next plainer." Now, if conformity to the fashions of the world is right and pleasing to God, where is the need of making a change at all? But if it is wrong, is it best to continue in the wrong any longer than is positively necessary to make the change? Right here we would remind you of the zeal and earnestness, the skill and perseverance, you manifested in preparing your dress according to the fashion. Would it not be praiseworthy to manifest at least equal

earnestness to make it conform to the Bible standard? Precious, God-given time and means were used in fashioning those garments; and now what are you willing to sacrifice to correct the wrong example you have been giving to others? {4T 640.3}

It is a shame to our sisters to so forget their holy character and their duty to God as to imitate the fashions of the world. There is no excuse for us except the perversity of our own hearts. We do not extend our influence by such a course. It is so inconsistent with our profession of faith that it makes us ridiculous in the eyes of worldlings. {4T 641.1}

Many a soul who was convinced of the truth has been led to decide against it by the pride and love of the world displayed by our sisters. The doctrine preached seemed clear and harmonious, and the hearers felt that a heavy cross must be lifted by them in taking the truth. When these persons have seen our sisters making so much display in dress, they have said: "This people dress fully as much as we do. They cannot really believe what they profess; and, after all, they must be deceived. If they really thought that Christ was soon coming, and the case of every soul was to be decided for eternal life or death, they could not devote time and money to dress according to the existing fashions." How little did those professedly believing sisters know of the sermon their dress was preaching! {4T 641.2}

BIBLICAL PRINCIPLES AGAINST LICENTIOUS USE OF FEMALE TROUSERS: THE NIGERIAN SCENARIO.

Let me prepare our minds:

“Every human being, created in the image of God, is endowed with a power akin to that of the Creator – individuality, power to think and to do. The men in whom this power is developed are the men who bear responsibilities, who are leaders in enterprise, and who influence character. It is the work of true education to develop this power, to train the youth to be thinkers, and not mere reflectors of other men’s thought. Instead of confining their study to that which men have said or written, let students be directed to the sources of truth, to the vast fields opened to for research in nature and revelation. Let them contemplate the great facts of duty and destiny, and the mind will expand and strengthen. Instead of educated weaklings, institutions of learning may send forth men strong to think and to act, men who are masters and not slaves of circumstances, men who possess breadth of mind, clearness of thought, and the courage of their convictions”.

– E. G. White’s “Education”, pp. 17-18.

“Some need to discipline the mind by exercise. They should force it to think. While they depend upon someone to think for them, to solve their difficulties, and they refuse to tax the mind with thought, the inability to

remember, to look ahead and discriminate, will continue. Efforts must be made by every individual to educate the mind.”

- E. G. White’s “Testimonies”, vol. 2, p. 188 (“Christian Service”, p.224)

“Mental culture is that we, as a people, need and what we must have in order to meet the demands of the time.”

- E. G. White’s “Testimonies”, vol.4, p.414 (“Christian Service”, p. 224)

“God does not want us to be content with lazy, undisciplined minds, dull thoughts, and loose memories.”

- E. G. White’s “Counsels to Teachers”, p. 506. (“Christian Service”, p. 224)

“Numberless words need not be put in paper to justify what speaks for itself and shines in its clearness. Truth is straight, plain, clear, and stands out boldly in its own defense; but it is not so with error. It is so winding and twisting that it needs a multitude of words to explain it in its crooked form”.

- E. G. White’s “Early Writings”, p. 96.

Guiding Principles for Taking a Stand on the Controversial Matter of Female-Trousers

i. Rom 14:13

Do not take a stand or a course of action that will “put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in [your] brother’s way”

HOW EASY IT IS FOR THE WEARING OF FEMALE TROUSERS TO “PUT A STUMBLING BLOCK” TO AN EVANGELISTIC CAMPAIGN, PARTICULARLY, IN NIGERIA!

ii. Rom 14:16

“Let not then your good be evil spoken of”; always avoid extremes.

NO MATTER THE CLEARNESS OF CONSCIENCE OF THE DEVOUT WEARER OF FEMALE TROUSERS, HOW EASY IT IS FOR THE “GOOD” TO BE “EVIL SPOKEN OF” AS UNBEPFITTING FOR A “BORN AGAIN” – IN THE NIGERIAN CONTEXT!

God has no special reward for extremists!

iii. Rom 14:19

“Follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another”.

HOW EASY IT IS FOR EVEN A CASUAL USE OF FEMALE TROUSERS TO DESTROY PEACE AND CAUSE CONFUSION OR DISAFFECTION!

iv. Rom 14:22

Honestly examine your conscience; never go against your personal conviction and godliness-sensitive conscience; for “Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth”, avoid guilt!

HOW EASY IT IS FOR THOSE WHO WEAR FEMALE TROUSERS IN PUBLIC TO FEEL A BIT EMBARRASSED OR ASHAMED WHEN THEY MEET A CHURCH MEMBER, PARTICULARLY, A RESPECTED CHURCH LEADER! HOW COMFORTABLE WILL THEY BE IF THEY WERE TO ENTER INTO THE SANCTUARY FOR WORSHIP IN SUCH AN ATTIRE?

v. Rom 14:23

Avoid self-righteousness, legalism and fanaticism; for “whatsoever is not of faith is sin”

HOW EASY IT IS FOR THE TRANSITION FROM A NON-WEARER TO AN OBSESSED WEARER TO BE SO SUDDEN AND BORNE OUT OF A REACTION TO THE PRESSURE OF POPULAR (WORLDLY) FASHION TREND AND NOT OUT OF ANY CLEAR MORAL CONVICTION OR “OF FAITH”!

Practical Guideline for Resolving the Controversial Issue of Female-Trousers

Where you don't seem to find a clear and positive biblical stance on any particular controversial issue:

i. practice only the related aspect of the controversial issue that you are sure that the Bible clearly supports.

ARE THERE SAFE ALTERNATIVES? IS THE ISSUE A MORAL IMPERATIVE?

ii. remember that it is always safer to start-off cautiously from a conservative (that is, from a strictly bible-believing) point of view, as long as you keep an open mind towards other people's opinion and particularly, to the continuing, progressive revelation of God's will, towards a broader understanding and application of Biblical truth, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, as can be indicated through: The Spirit of Prophecy (E.G. White writings); Growing personal conviction; The worldwide resolution of the Church in General Conference Session; and Counsels from experienced and devoted church leaders.

WHILE IT IS TRUE THAT IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS THIS ISSUE MIGHT NO LONGER BE CONTROVERSIAL, AS IT IS NOW IN NIGERIA, AND THAT FEMALE TROUSERS MIGHT BECOME FULLY ACCEPTED BY THE SOCIETY (RELIGIOUS AND SECULAR), WHILE IT IS ALSO TRUE THAT WE MUST NOT

BE THE FIRST OR LAST TO ACCEPT A NEW TREND IN FASHION; WHILE IT IS TRUE THAT FEMALE TROUSERS EXISTED EVEN IN THE 18TH AND 19TH CENTURIES (AND HAD VERY LIMITED, CLIMATE-CONDITIONED AND CULTURAL USE EVEN WITHIN THE CHURCH, BUT NEVER BECAME AN OUTER-GARMENT OUTFIT OF FASHION, MUCH LESS THE OFFICIAL OR PREFERRED FEMALE OUTFIT FOR FORMAL OR WORSHIP OCCASIONS THEN), ARE WE CONVINCED THAT ITS FUNCTIONAL AND UTILITY RELEVANCE AND USE THEN IS IDENTICAL TO ITS SEXY-ENHANCEMENT, FASHIONED-BASED RELEVANCE TODAY? HAS IT REALLY BEEN ABOUT CONVENIENCE OR CLIMATE?

Next, let us consider some basic principles that govern Christian dress and adornment.

Simple, Universal Principles of Christian Dress and Adornment

a. Ornament of a meek and quiet spirit. 1 Peter 3:3-5

IF YOU MUST WEAR BE SURE YOU MEET THIS STANDARD!

b. Adornment with shamefacedness (that is, self-forgetfulness) and sobriety (that is, sober reflection of your identity in Christ through the modesty of dress and style). 1 Tim 2:9-10,15.

IF YOUR WEARING FEMALE-TROUSERS IS PRIMARILY BORNE OUT OF A DESIRE TO BE TRENDY AND FASHIONABLE, AND NOT OUT OF A CULTURAL, OCCUPATIONAL, RECREATIONAL OR MORAL IMPERATIVE; THEN, FORGET IT! YOU ARE NOT LIKELY TO MEET THIS STANDARD!

c. Appearance of natural simplicity (Isa 3:16-23), while avoiding

i. vanity, or obsession and self indulgence

VANITY, OBSESSION AND SELF INDULGENCE IN STYLE, TASTE, COLOUR, ETC! HOW COME YOU NOT ONLY WEAR BUT YOU HAVE SUDDENLY DISLIKED THE PREVIOUS “ALTERNATIVES” – GOWNS, SKIRTS, ETC?

ii. Extravagance or waste

HOW COME YOU FIND IT DIFFICULT TO FAITHFULLY RETURN YOUR TITHE AND OFFERINGS, ESPECIALLY BECAUSE YOU SPEND SO MUCH ON “LOOKING GOOD”.

iii. Haughty spirit or show of pride.

IF YOU ARE A FASHION FREAK, FORGET IT! YOU CAN NOT BE TRUSTED TO KNOW THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MODEST USE OF FEMALE-TROUSERS AND THE WORLDLY!

d. Reflection of moral chastity and Christian deportment, by avoiding

i. anything that can be confused with a “harlot’s attire”(Prov 7:10) or “strange apparel” (Zeph. 1:8).

MUST YOU PREFER THE POPULAR STYLES THAT WOULD FLATTER AND EMPHASISE YOUR FEMININE CURVES AND CONTOURS? YET YOU CLAIM MODESTY!

ii. anything that can arouse or foster “the subtle heart”(cf. Prov 7:10) of a seductress(or seducer) and thereby lead another into sin.

IF ONLY YOU CAN TELL YOURSELF THE TRUTH! DOES FEMALE-TROUSERS MAKE YOU FEEL MORE SEXY OR NOT? IF YES, BEWARE!

e. Reflection of the principles of Rom 14:13, 16, 19, 22, 23.

In other words, the dress and style should:

i. not lead another into sin

SOME OTHERS MAY JUST COPY THE HABIT FROM YOU WITHOUT REALLY TAKING NOTE OF THE SCRUPLES YOU HAVE TO GO THROUGH BEFORE MAKING YOUR PRINCIPLE-BASED CHOICE OF DIFFERENCE IN YOUR WEARS/STYLES.

ii. not be obsessive or extreme

IF YOU FEEL ADDICTED TO IT, THEN KNOW THAT YOU SHOULD STOP!

iii. preach a good sermon and “edify another”

IF YOU CAN BE COMFORTABLE WEARING IT AND GOING ABOUT IN THE STREETS PREACHING THE WORD OF GOD, WITHOUT BEING DESPISED FOR IT BY A MAJORITY IN CHRISTENDOM OR GENERAL SOCIETY, THEN BRAVO!

iv. reflect a clear conscience

BE SURE THAT YOUR CONSCIENCE IS NOT SEARED OR CORRUPTED IN THIS MATTER, MOST LIKELY AS A RESULT OF FAMILIARITY! BEWARE OF SELF-DECEPTION AND CONCEIT. (See Prov. 14:12; 16:25)

v. reflect faith in God, without pretense.

IF YOU FIND NOTHING TO BE CAUTIOUS OF ABOUT WEARING FEMALE-TROUSERS, THEN BE CONSISTENT! WEAR IT (EVEN THE MOST CORPORATE/FORMAL FORM) TO CHURCH (LIKE, HOLY COMMUNION); WEAR IT FOR A PROFOUNDLY TRADITIONAL/CULTURAL CEREMONY (LIKE, MARRIAGE). IF YOU CAN OR YOU DO, THEN BE SURE THAT THE

DECENCY/MODESTY/ LOOSE-FITTING/COVERING – LEVEL OF/FOR THE TYPE/KIND PREFERRED FOR DIVINE WORSHIP IS THE SAME AS THE TYPE/KIND PREFERRED FOR GALLAVANTING IN THE STREETS OR IN SOCIAL GATHERINGS. AFTER ALL, DOES DECENCY/MODESTY/HOLY-LIVING HAVE DIFFERENT STANDARDS?

Conclusion

A word is enough for the wise!

Always remember that Deuteronomy 22:5 outlines the fundamental principle that CANNOT become out-dated or old-fashioned! The principle does not forbid the article of cloth/clothe/clothing, as SIN, in itself; instead, Deuteronomy 22:5 outlines only the principle that is applicable to all articles of cloth/clothe/clothing and/or fashion: *THERE MUST BE/REMAIN GENDER-DIFFERENCES IN FASHION, FASHION-WEARS AND STYLES AND/OR IN THE USE/WEARING OF CLOTH/CLOTHE/CLOTHING.*

Lest I forget!

1. The Bible was never particular about any clothe or clothing or dress outfit, or was it? What is made to apply to “trousers” whether male or female must be also made to apply to “wrapper”, “shirt”, “tie”, etc.
2. If female “trousers” is in itself sin, then there should be no female “pyjamas”, “jumpers”, “joggers”, or sportswear that may have the likeness of BIFURCATED/OUTER-GARMENT “trousers”. There may be no need for female shorts/knickerbockers/pantaloons/bloomers or breeches too, underwear or not!
3. If there is nothing absolutely questionable about female-trousers, then there should be nothing questionable about wearing it to church, or during traditional functions like traditional marriages. Which modern girl would wear female trousers on her traditional marriage, or to meet with her in-laws, officially or customarily, for the first time? If few, then it is evidence that female trousers is not in harmony with the Nigerian-African culture; despite our being a “global village”, the inter-cultural acculturation is not yet powerful enough to obliterate the awareness of the Nigerian-African culture.
4. The issue with female-trousers is not whether or not wearing it is a sin or whether it is “lawful”, the issues are:
 - i. whether it is “expedient” or necessary in any particular circumstance
 - ii. whether one can safely be modest in its use
 - iii. whether it is old-fashioned to decide not to adopt it as a formal female wear, at least for the mean time.

iv. whether we are not just looking for cheap excuses to be “like the world” for the shame of being different.

v. whether there are no alternatives in almost all circumstances, if one decides to stick to the universally conventional female wears: gowns, skirt and blouse, traditional “wrappers”, dress, etc.

5. This subject-matter does not deserve the attention it is given, neither does it deserve the controversy it creates; therefore, it should be settled once and for all (as much as possible, by the Church Leadership, particularly in Nigeria!) and thereafter, laid to rest!

Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.

If you cannot fault any or all of the above-stated reasoning or arguments, why ignore them?

MY FINAL TAKE ON FEMALE TROUSERS!

The nail on the head: If I were a girl, lady or woman, I would not join the bandwagon to wear female-trousers as a regular "fashionable" casual or corporate (don't even think of worship services!) wear, except for/as: pyjamas/night/sleeping wear; certain kinds of sports; winter-weather protection (in case I find myself in temperate regions); a member of the community in the western, temperate world, where it does not arouse the kind of confusion/suspicion/offense that it generates here in Nigeria, in Africa; in an established corporate-cultural female trousers outfit (like those of the Hausa women or the Indians!) with the cultural peculiarity, among other things, of not being a tight-fitted or elastic, body-hugging fabric/style as well as with an overflowing gown, dress or blouse that comes below the heaps and thighs, even unto the knees; and finally, during times of emergency, when life is at stake and trousers would be the only reasonably convenient alternative!

What I won't do is to coerce any against his/her own conscience, yet I would never hesitate to help people understand the Biblical principles at stake that could arouse their Bible-based convictions (as against the sentimental and self-deceptive "conviction" of the carnal heart/mind) and guide them to make enlightened personal decisions, according to the light, understanding and convictions that they may have, since some persons may be "weak" in faith while others may be "strong" in faith. In fact, I unequivocally discourage the increasing trend of settling for female-trousers when there are less controversial, more dignifying, decent and culturally acceptable alternatives!