

All Rights Reserved By HDM For This Digital Publication
Copyright 1998 Holiness Data Ministry

Duplication of this CD by any means is forbidden, and
copies of individual files must be made in accordance with
the restrictions stated in the B4Ucopy.txt file on this CD.

* * * * *

LONG HAIR -- A WOMAN'S GLORY
By Joseph S. Pitts

"Her price is far above rubies."

Printed 1966
Fellowship Promoter Press
203 W. Cherry St.
Bicknell, Indiana 47512

Printed Book No Copyright

* * * * *

A PICTURE OF THE AUTHOR INCLUDED

A picture of Joseph S. Pitts is included with this digital publication as hdm0653.jpg. When the proper filter is selected, this picture can be displayed in any graphics program capable of opening JPEG graphics.

* * * * *

Digital Edition 05/14/98
By Holiness Data Ministry

* * * * *

CONTENTS

Introduction

- 01 -- Long Hair -- A Woman's Glory
- 02 -- Is It Trivial?
- 03 -- A Delicate Subject
- 04 -- Is It Scriptural?
- 05 -- Rare In Former Days
- 06 -- Was It Only A Custom?

- 07 -- Was The Hair Question A Problem Only Of The Corinthian Church?
- 08 -- The Protestant Position Is Inconsistent
- 09 -- Is The Scripture Binding?
- 10 -- How Long Is Long Hair?
- 11 -- Shall We Forget The Scripture?
- 12 -- The Scriptures Are At Stake
- 13 -- The Manual Vs. The Bible
- 14 -- Pronouncements Of Former Assemblies And Leaders Of The Church Of The Nazarene
- 15 -- Long Haired Men Vs. Short Haired Women
- 16 -- Nature's Glory And Beauty For Women
- 17 -- Your Body -- God's Temple
- 18 -- Harmony With Whom?
- 19 -- Alibis
- 20 -- A Sign Of The Times
- 21 -- God's Curse Against Worldliness
- 22 -- A Good Rule To Follow
- 23 -- Shall We Submit To The "Challenge Of The Majority?"

* * * * *

INTRODUCTION

This booklet discusses a vital question that is facing the church world today -- that of women bobbing their hair. The Scripture in I Corinthians 11:1-16 gives a clear picture of the problem and instructions to women of all ages, and is discussed quite clearly in this booklet. The cutting of the hair is a violation of the Bible, although some argue this point, and is a means by which the devil has helped to bring the great Holiness movement of our day into a falling away.

When Joseph and Pearl went to the Philippines, under the appointment of the General Board of the Church of the Nazarene, the Filipino women did not bob their hair and there was no problem. In time the church here in the home land became so overwhelmed with the fad or custom of women bobbing their hair, until the wives of the General leaders, and the pastor's wives and almost every church in the denomination were affected. In time, missionaries were sent to the mission field with bobbed hair, as well as other worldly practices.

In the Philippines, the mission field was split over the issue of worldliness because the General Board and the General Superintendents sent missionaries wearing jewelry and with bobbed hair, with the intent of breaking down the standards held on this mission field against such practices. The National workers protested to my brother, and he protested to the Board of General Superintendents. It resulted in Joseph and Pearl being recalled home. They met all five of the General Superintendents, on August 31, 1957. For three and one half hours they discussed every phase of the problem. The high points of this conference are given in this booklet. After four and one-half years, with the help of the Church Board, of the First Church of the Nazarene, Lake Charles, La., they returned to the Philippines to work with the Filipino nationals who stood true to their convictions, and worked as their missionaries in independent work. For this they were

dropped from the District Assembly roll in Louisiana. But God has blessed their labors, and their work in the Philippines is growing.

Paul Pitts, Box 1642
Lake Charles, La.

* * * * *

01 -- LONG HAIR -- A WOMAN'S GLORY

"Should a Christian woman have her hair bobbed? Is the widely prevalent custom of women bobbing their hair pleasing to God or sanctioned in the Scriptures?"

* * *

02 -- IS IT TRIVIAL?

To some, these questions are considered too trivial for serious thought. They consider it a personal matter, and not inconsistent with Christian conduct. But remember God says, "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much." (Luke 16:10). It is the little things that mold our lives and shape our character. Little things are as important in the spiritual as in the physical realm. The hairspring on a lady's watch is a very small thing, but is it trivial to the running of the watch? Let it get broken and the watch will stop. A fly, a trifling thing, once stopped a great passenger train crossing the western plains! How? It got into the oil line that carried oil to one of the drive wheel bearings, plugging up the line. So the bearing overheated and stopped the train. Many hours were lost by crew and passengers, all because of a trifling insect.

One day a professor took little paper pellets and threw them at an iron beam, that hung from the ceiling of the classroom. It seemed like child's play, and at first nothing happened. But he kept on throwing little paper pellets: those little nothings, at the iron beam until the class saw it begin to vibrate, then to move, and at last to swing. Now, what was the force that caused this? Accumulated trifles! Every trifle contributed its little part till the beam was swinging. And so it has been in the churches, even in the holiness churches that held such high standards of separation from the world. The little trifles of worldly fads and fashions, first appeared only occasionally here and there, until now all Christendom is swinging to their tune.

* * *

03 -- A DELICATE SUBJECT

The subject of a woman's hair and dress is a very delicate subject to touch upon, and because of this, many preachers have omitted it from their preaching, if not banned it from their pulpits. They fear that they might offend and drive some people from their congregations. Because of this willful neglect to preach on these and kindred subjects, worldly fads and fashions have spread like wild fire through the churches, and the younger generation of holiness youth are growing up with little knowledge of what the Bible teaches on these matters.

* * *

04 -- IS IT SCRIPTURAL?

It is not our personal opinion about a matter that makes it right or wrong! The important point is: What does the Bible teach about the matter? All orthodox churches believe and teach that the Apostles wrote under inspiration of the Holy Spirit. So what did the Apostles have to say about Christian women's hair and dress? St. Paul wrote:

"Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven. For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn: but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered. For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man. For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels. Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God. Judge in yourselves; is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered? Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering. But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." (I Cor. 11:4-16).

"In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shame-facedness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array, but (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works." (I Tim. 2:9-10).

Speaking to wives, St. Peter wrote:

"Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of (costly or gaudy) apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible; even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price." (I Pet. 3:3-4).

These passages of scripture show that in New Testament times there were outlandish styles in women's dress and "hairdos" that tended to puff them up with pride, and therefore were unbecoming to Christian women.

In his "Studies in First Corinthians," Dr. M. R. De Haan, commenting on First Corinthians 11:5-15, asked the questions I quoted at the beginning of this booklet. Then he continued, "Since the Bible has something to say on the matter, we cannot avoid dealing with it ... If we are to declare the whole and complete counsel of God ... Faithfulness to the Word of God prompts us to speak the truth without compromise." Would to God that every minister would be that honest with people in dealing with the Word of God.

* * *

05 -- RARE IN FORMER DAYS

Bobbed hair, jewelry and immodest apparel were quite rare in all the holiness churches before World War II, but now these worldly adornments are quite prevalent among them. Back in the twenties when the "flappers" with their bobbed hair were prevalent among worldlings, pastors and evangelists throughout the holiness denominations cried out against these forms of worldliness. A bobbed haired pastor's wife was unheard of in holiness churches in those days, for no church would have tolerated a pastor with such a wife, but now they are quite common.

* * *

06 -- WAS IT ONLY A CUSTOM?

Some people claim, "This is not worldly, because it is only a custom of our day," for they claim, "long hair was only a custom in the New Testament times, and because it was a custom, therefore the Scriptures regarding it are not binding upon us today." This very opinion was expressed to me by one of the General Superintendents of the Church of the Nazarene in a conference that my wife and I had with them immediately after we were recalled from the Philippines in 1957, because of our stand against bobbed hair and other forms of worldliness being brought into our mission field by the missionaries they had sent, (as told in my pamphlet, "Voices from the Philippines," published in 1958). But his logic and reasoning regarding the question was very weak. Granting that long hair for women was a custom in the New Testament Church, it had the Apostle's and God's approval on it, and if God approved it, He still approves of it, and so the women of the church ought to conform to it. What St. Paul wrote shows that God had ordained that women should have long hair, and if He was pleased with it then, He could not be pleased with the custom of bobbed hair for women that prevails now, for God never changes; He is the same yesterday, today and forever. The custom which St. Paul said they did not have ("we have no such custom" he said) was the custom of contending against what God revealed as His will. St. Paul anticipated opposition and objection to what he wrote, but he concluded the matter thus: (paraphrasing his words) "If you want to disagree and be contentious, you can be contentious, but this is the revelation from God as I have received it, and the churches accept it as their custom."

Dr. De Haan thought the issue here was more than a mere custom. He said:

"Now for the controversial question. What is meant by 'having her head covered?' There are those who claim it refers to a hat or some other little thing which remotely resembles a hat, which must be worn by the woman whenever she enters the assembly. Now it seems that in the light of verse 15 there should be no difficulty. Paul says plainly here, "But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering. The covering which Paul speaks of in this verse (I Cor. 11:15) is "long hair" in its primary implication ... It is the badge of her obedience and submission to her own husband. It is a sign of dignified femininity, and so to have it

bobbed constitutes a denial of the authority of her husband, and a sign of not being in subjection to her head (her husband). It destroys the beautiful type of the subjection of the church to her Lord."

* * *

07 -- WAS THE HAIR QUESTION A PROBLEM ONLY OF THE CORINTHIAN CHURCH?

One of the General Superintendents in that conference which I referred to expressed the opinion that the Corinthian Church was a problem church, and that the hair question was just a problem of that church, and that what St. Paul wrote applies to them, but not to us today. But that was an inconsistent position to take. Granting that the Corinthian Church was a problem church, and that the hair question was a problem in that church, then it follows logically, that whatever St. Paul wrote to correct that problem and set them straight (for he wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit), will apply with equal force to any church in any day or age, in which the same problem arises. That is our situation today. The Scripture that St. Paul wrote to correct the bobbed-haired situation in the Corinthian Church should be preached by every true, God-called preacher today, to correct this worldly fashion of bobbed-hair prevailing in the Christian world.

On the other hand, if the General Superintendent's argument is right, then:

* * *

08 -- THE PROTESTANT POSITION IS INCONSISTENT

The Catholics have always held that the "covering" spoken of by St. Paul in I Cor. 11:5-15 referred to a veil of some kind, and that what he wrote was inspired and binding upon all Christians down to the present day. So whenever a Catholic woman enters a Catholic church or cathedral, she always puts a veil over her head so that she may pray and worship in the church. But most of the Protestants, before the fad of short-hair swept America, held that the "covering" referred to by St. Paul was a woman's long hair. Now, since this fad, of women cutting their hair, has become so prevalent, it has left the short-haired Protestant women in an inconsistent position or condition when they go into their churches to worship; for they have neither long hair nor a veil for a covering on their heads. And their leaders deliberately ignore St. Paul's Scripture as being binding on them today. If St. Paul's writing was inspired, then a woman having neither long hair nor a veil to cover her head when she worships, has no right to pray, sing or testify in the church.

* * *

09 -- IS THE SCRIPTURE BINDING?

I had written the Board of General Superintendents from the Philippines, before I was recalled, asking whether they considered the Scripture in I Cor. 11:4-15 both inspired and binding upon us today? Afterward I wrote by a brother: "If the Generals were to give a ruling that they considered the scripture in question both inspired and binding, then the liberals and worldlings in the church would raise a cry of protest that their liberties were restricted; and if they were to give a ruling that they did not consider it binding upon us today, then the radicals in the church (who

were still quite numerous at that time), would raise a cry of alarm, that the leaders of the church had become liberal, worldly and modern." So I was not surprised in the conference when one of the Generals opened up with this question: "Is foot-washing binding; is foot-washing binding?" I replied that the Apostles themselves must not have understood Christ's words to mean that foot-washing was to be an ordinance of the church, for in their writings, none of the Apostles gave any instructions to that effect. Only one Apostle mentioned foot-washing in any of his Epistles (St. Paul), and he referred to it as a practice to be observed in the home.

The next week this same General conducted the District Assembly I attended. One day I approached him about his reference to foot-washing, and asked him pointedly: "Why does not the Church of the Nazarene consider foot-washing binding, in the light of what Christ said?" His reply was to this effect: "The Church of the Nazarene follows the historical position. Historically, the church, down through the ages, has not considered foot-washing binding as an ordinance of the church, and the Church of the Nazarene has followed that position." When he finished with his remarks along that line, then I said to him: "Then, Doctor, explain to me why the Church of the Nazarene has not followed the historical position regarding woman's hair? Historically, for almost two thousand years, the church has held that what St. Paul wrote meant that women should let their hair grow long, and the men should have theirs cut short. Only in recent years has the church changed its position to allow its women to cut and bob their hair." The General replied to the effect that the new position had been taken by both ministers and laymen throughout the Church in general, and that the General Superintendents could only follow the trend of the church. It seemed a strange position, for when the Generals did not want to bear any blame, then they claim to be followers instead of leaders, in filling the highest office in the church!

* * *

10 -- HOW LONG IS LONG HAIR?

Another one of the General Superintendents asked me these questions: "Do not the women wear their hair longer than the men? Then how long is long hair?" God had given me the answer beforehand. While still in the Philippines before being called home, that question had been asked me, and I had taken it to God in prayer. One day while on my knees, God gave the answer, and here it is: St. Paul claimed that even "nature itself" should teach you that "if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her." (I Cor. 11:14, 15). Is not nature the same today as it was in that day? Does it not teach the same today that it taught then? Yes, indeed. Now, if nature teaches you, it can give but one answer concerning the length of a woman's hair, and that is: only its natural length can suffice before God for long hair to be a glory to a woman. No arbitrary length will do, for different women may have hair that will grow to different lengths. Women of the Negro race have very short hair, but if it is the natural length, then it is as much a glory to them as longer hair among women of other races.

One of the Editors of the Herald of Holiness (the official voice of the Church of the Nazarene) wrote me objecting to this reasoning thus: "Women have bobbed hair according to you if they cut off only one-sixth of an inch; and a man has short hair, and meets the Bible demands, if he takes off only one-sixth of an inch." This Editor was my logic teacher in college, so I was quite surprised at his reasoning. Why? If cutting off one-sixth of an inch of a woman's hair does not make

it short, then to cut off another one-sixth of an inch would not make it short either, nor would another one-sixth, nor another. Theoretically, you could keep cutting off one-sixth of an inch each time until there was only one-sixth of an inch left. Then according to his logic, the woman should still have long hair! But this cannot be. So at what point in this process would the hair cease to be long, and start becoming short? Evidently, it is at the first cutting of the hair; for regardless of how much or how little was cut off, it would cease to be its natural length.

* * *

11 -- SHALL WE FORGET THE SCRIPTURE?

Another General Superintendent said something to this effect in the conference: He considered the scripture regarding woman's hair in I Cor. 11:4-15 along with or the same as the passage in I Cor 14 where St. Paul said to "let the women keep silent in the church," and he added, "I just forget both of them!" But what does God say about a person "adding to or taking from" His Word? In Rev. 22:19, St. John wrote: "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophesy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life." To deliberately forget passages of God's Word, and deliberately omit them from one's preaching of God's Word, is tantamount to "taking away" a part of His Word. No preacher has a right under God to deliberately omit any part of God's Word from his preaching. A preacher that does so, is not worthy of a place in the Christian ministry, and much less in the holiness ministry, which is supposed to preach the highest state of grace and hold up the highest standards of any segment of the Church of Jesus Christ.

The Scripture in I Cor. 11:5-6 shows that if a woman had her head covered she had a right both to "pray and prophesy in the churches." Does I Cor. 14:34, where St. Paul says, "let your women keep silence in the churches," nullify this? The Scriptures certainly do not contradict themselves, so we need to study these scriptures very carefully.

In the passage, "Let your women keep silence in the church for it is not permitted unto them to speak," (I Cor. 14:34), the words, "your women" could not mean or include the women of all other churches, for St. Paul knew that Philip had four daughters who were prophetesses. St. Paul must have good reasons to write to them that their women should keep silence in the churches. Here are some of them:

1. This passage was written in connection with a gibberish being spoken in the Corinthian Church, causing confusion, so that they needed to keep silence to stop this confusion.

2. These women of this church were ignorant women for in the next verse St. Paul writes, "And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home." Ignorant women should keep silence in the churches.

3. These women were the "bobbed haired" women of the New Testament churches, and St. Paul had already written to the effect that such women ought not to "pray or prophesy" in the churches without a veil or covering for he says, "Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head." (I Cor. 11:5) In verses 14-15 he points out that long

hair is God's covering, for he says, "Doth not even nature itself teach you, that ... if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given to her for a covering."

In the passage (I Cor. 14:34) the Greek word "laleo," which means speak, talk, say, converse, etc., also means to "babel" This meaning carries with it the idea of "confusion," and that is what St. Paul was speaking of in the preceding verse (14:33) where he said, "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints." The meaning of a word is always determined by the way it is used in the context. So when St. Paul used "laleo" he must have meant "to babel." Put this meaning into the next verses, (14:34-35) and the passage will have a logical, harmonious rendering, reading thus:

"Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them 'to babel' ... for it is a shame for women 'to babel' in the churches."

With this rendering, this passage will harmonize instead of conflict with I Cor. 11:4, where women are permitted to pray and to testify with covered heads. With this harmony, we can see that both passages are inspired and applicable to us today.

Dr. De Haan agrees with this interpretation, thus:

"Let me point out that this verse (I Cor. 11:5) does not forbid a woman to testify or pray in the public assembly ... In the passage in chapter 14 where Paul says, 'Let the women keep silence in the churches,' he is dealing with 'speaking in tongues,' not with the conduct at the Lord's Table. He forbids women to speak in tongues in the assembly, at any time ... It is definitely implied that if a woman's head is covered she is permitted to speak and to pray otherwise there would be no point in stating: 'But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head; for that is even all one, as if she were shaven.' (I Cor. 11:5)."

* * *

12 -- THE SCRIPTURES ARE AT STAKE

The real issue involved is not merely long or short hair -- no more so than was a piece of fruit the real issue involved in the Garden of Eden with Adam and Eve. The "apple" or piece of forbidden fruit would have fallen to the ground and rotted anyway. The real issue in the Garden of Eden was the Word of God, and that is the real issue at stake today. Is God's Word which bears on this question inspired and binding upon us today as it was upon them in the New Testament times? Did God say what He meant? and did He mean what He said? I think He did. If any part of God's Word ought to be forgotten or is unworthy to be preached, then how can we be sure that any of it is inspired, or is any more worthy to be preached than the writings of other men?

In the question box of the Herald of Holiness for January 21, 1959, commenting on I Cor. 11:15 regarding women having long hair, the Editor wrote: "I believe that it was a religious rite, or ceremony, which was observed in that day but is not compulsory today. Moreover, the holiness movement has never placed great emphasis upon the mere outward forms which accompany heartfelt religion."

I wrote the Editor thus: "Your statement needs further explanation. Do you believe it was a religious rite or ceremony among the old Jewish church, or among the heathen, or among the Christians of that day? If among Christians then where did they get this religious rite or ceremony? And what makes you think it was a religious rite or ceremony? Did they get it from God or from the world? If it was religious, then it pertained to their worship of God and certainly the Christians did not get that from the world. If it was from God, it had God's approval upon it: then, when did God change it or take His approval off of it? If it were proper then for a woman to have long hair or have her head covered when she worshipped God, why is it not proper for our holiness women when they worship God in this day? Who made the change, and why was it made?"

In his reply, the Editor avoided all these questions, making no attempt to answer any of them. Instead, he disclaimed being a liberal and fenced for a middle-of-the-road position. He enclosed an article by a Mennonite Bishop on the scripture in question, then wrote, "I could give you all sorts of differences of opinion on this subject by good Bible students ... The Mennonite Bishop thought the special emphasis in the passage that I wrote about was not referring to the hair, but rather on the wearing of a hat, or not wearing a hat in church. This Bishop points out that the writer is talking about not just women, but men also, and it's just as necessary for them to observe their rule as it is for the women to observe their rule." (But strangely this Editor did not think that either needed to observe their respective rule, for then he wrote:) "But for me to say that every woman who had bobbed hair, or every man who has long hair, is a sinner is a step that I wouldn't take."

In my next letter to this Editor I wrote, "As I see the question, it would not make much difference whether St. Paul meant "hat" or "hair" but certainly he must have meant one or the other. But our leaders are taking the position that it does not mean either, or that it does not make any difference which way it is interpreted, or whether it is observed at all or not. The Mennonite Bishop, in his last paragraph dealt very pointedly with this attitude, saying: "It would seem strange that Paul, after his earnest reproof and pointed declarations, should now nullify the whole thing which he tried so earnestly to impress upon the minds of the Corinthians, by saying, "But after all it does not matter you can do as you please." Would not his writing on this point have been all in vain? Most certainly. But we do not find Paul thus writing in vain, or for naught. He always wrote with a purpose and so also here, and he meant to say 'If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom (that our women pray or prophesy with uncovered heads) neither the churches of God,' for this was the fault that he tried to correct." Then I continued, "But in our churches it is all right for a woman to pray, testify, and preach, with neither long hair nor any other covering on her head. Surely God has a right to say how a woman comes into His presence to pray and worship. Our Nazarene churches and leaders are setting this portion of Scripture aside, as if it has no application for us today. Was St. Paul writing just regarding the conditions in the Corinthian Church, or does what he wrote apply in any generation where the conditions are similar to those that existed in the Corinthian Church?"

In his reply, the Editor wrote, "From the way you write, you don't think there is anything in the Bible but what should be observed today." How strange! He also upbraided me in this letter for not being consistent. But let us see how consistent he was. In the question box of the Herald of Holiness for May 29, 1957, this same Editor had written on this question: "What do Protestants

think about the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope?" His answer was: "I might say that, naturally, they do not agree with it. Martin Luther, and those who have followed him have centered infallibility in the Bible, not in the Roman Catholic church nor the pope as its supreme representative."

Perhaps this Editor does not consider himself a follower of Martin Luther, but if he does, why does he object to our insistence on observing I Cor. 5-15? If the Bible is infallible, then God said what He meant, and He meant what He said. Why not accept the Bible at what it says on little points as well as on big ones? The Bible says, it is "the little foxes that spoil the vines." (Sol. 2:15). If the Bible is not infallible on minor points, how can we depend upon it as infallible on the major issues? Whether major or minor, there can be no nonessentials in God's Word. God says, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (I Tim. 3:10-17). Christ said, "It is written, that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God." (Luke 4:4)

* * *

13 -- THE MANUAL VS. THE BIBLE

One of the General Superintendents in the conference my wife and I had with them, wanted to know of me, why it was that I was so against bobbed hair when the Manual of the Church of the Nazarene was not against it, for, as he pointed out, the Manual does not require the women of the Church to have long hair? I replied that I had always considered that the position of the Church had been this: That when the Church has taken a stand against vices and worldly practices which we considered wrong, but on which the Bible is silent, such as the use of tobacco, gambling, attending the theater and circus, etc., then it needed to be in the Manual as the voice of the Church; but concerning those matters on which the Bible has spoken, such as this question of long hair for women, then we do not necessarily need it in the Manual, for the Bible should be sufficient.

The General's reply to this was that they could defend only the Manual position: if the Manual was against a thing, then they would be against it, but if the Manual was silent on a matter, then they would have to be silent on it too. How strange! For it puts the Manual above the Bible! It makes the voice of the Church more important than the Voice of God!

* * *

14 -- PRONOUNCEMENTS OF FORMER ASSEMBLIES AND LEADERS OF THE CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE

In the 22nd Annual Assembly of the Chicago-Central District of the Church of the Nazarene, held September 1-5, 1926, in the report of the Committee on the State of the Church, is this resolution:

"That we deplore our people adopting the modern fads and fashions of the day, such as the bobbing of hair, short sleeves, low necks and other styles and forms of dress, which we believe to

be contrary to the Word of God and our Manual, and not conducive to holiness, and, that by precept and example, we discourage the same."

In 1932 that same committee wrote:

"As we look into the future we ask ourselves the question: will the younger generation also catch the vision that our beloved founders had in building a holy church, free from the world, on fire for God, and with a passion for the lost? Will the church of tomorrow as we increase in numbers, continue to hold up the standards of holiness as our founders did, or will they gradually compromise with the world as other denominations have done?"

The record of the church is a sad commentary on the above, for the Church of the Nazarene has compromised and become worldly like other denominations the founding fathers considered worldly, but which the present leaders call "our sister denominations."

We could produce similar recommendations and resolutions from almost every district assembly's Committee on the State of the Church in those days.

In 1942, Dr. E. O. Chalfant, the District Superintendent of the Chicago Central District, in his annual report, wrote:

"STICK TO OUR STANDARDS ... everyone should stand for an old-fashioned separation life from this old world -- no rings, no jewelry, no dressing half-naked, no slipping around and going to shows on the side ... Keeping all of our institutions and all the organizations in our church in line with holiness standards. Holiness schools have always taken a stand against the world. That was the stand of our denomination in our last General Assembly. Watch this worldly devil."

In the later years of his ministry, Dr. James B. Chapman, a former General Superintendent of the Church of the Nazarene, wrote on the hair question in the Question Box of the Herald of Holiness, April 20, 1942. Commenting on I Cor. 11:15-16 he said:

"I think the meaning of the passage in question might be better seen if we remember that Paul has just contended that a short-haired woman (a recent convert whose hair had not yet had time to grow) should perform her public Christian duties of prayer and testimony with a veil over her head, that none might be offended by the evidence that her hair answered for the covering. And as to long-haired men, Paul said let such be sheared, for long hair was the sign of abandonment to ungraceful living on the part of the man. And now as a parting word, after the argument was finished, Paul said (paraphrasing his words), 'But if any man be contentious in arguing that it is all right for a man to wear long hair and for a shorn woman to appear in the public services without a veil, let him know that neither we, the Apostles, nor the churches of God have any such practice or custom, for with us and them, the short haired women veil themselves and the long haired men have their hair cut off.'"

* * *

Now, let us make a comparison of men and women on this point. In Oklahoma, where I grew up in my teens, I have seen men of American Indian tribes with long hair hanging in braids around their shoulders. In India I have seen "holy men" with long, stringy hair as a badge of their "holiness." In the Philippines where I am now writing, there is a tribe of people in which all the men have long hair, and there is also a cult known as "The Apostles of World Peace," in which the distinguishing garb of the men is that of having long hair, wearing long robes, and going barefooted. In any of these lands, when any of these long haired men get saved, the Protestant Christians and missionaries insist that they cut off their long hair. But if these men wanted to insist on keeping their long hair, they would have just as much right to do so as our Christian women have to bob theirs, for the same scripture which tells us men that our hair should be short, also tells the women that their hair should be long.

* * *

16 -- NATURE'S GLORY AND BEAUTY FOR WOMEN

There is a feminine, womanly dignity attached to long hair which St. Paul calls a woman's "glory." When women cut their hair they are either trying to be masculine or trying to mimic the showy, gaudy fashions of the world that robs them of their refined womanly dignity. Trying to be masculine has lost them the respect of many men. Yet they want and demand the same respect that the saintly, godly women with long hair of other days had. A Filipino friend of mine said, "You can be sure that even non-Christians have more respect for ladies with long hair than for those that have bobbed hair."

Dr. J. B. Phillips in his Letters to Young Churches, agrees with this position in his translation of I Cor. 11:13-15 thus:

"Do you think it right and proper for a woman to pray to God bareheaded? Isn't there a natural principle here, that makes us feel that long hair is disgraceful to a man, but of glorious beauty to a woman? We feel this because long hair is the cover provided by nature for the woman's head."

In Luke 7:37-38 is the account of a woman who came to Christ weeping. Her tears bathed Christ's feet, then with her hair she dried them. Evidently she had not cut her hair before she got to Christ. She could not have wiped Jesus' feet had her hair been short. Jesus seemed pleased at what happened. If it was wise for New Testament women and the Corinthian women to have long hair back then, it seems logical for our Christian women to have theirs long now in order to please God.

* * *

17 -- YOUR BODY -- GOD'S TEMPLE

In the highest and strictest sense, a "saint" is a sanctified person whose body is the temple of the Holy Spirit. St. Paul says, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of

God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy." (I Cor. 3:16-17).

A person can defile God's temple, not only with vile, sinful habits, but also by dressing and adorning his body with worldly fashions and forbidden ornaments, such as bobbed hair and the wearing of gold and pearls and immodest apparel (which were forbidden by both the Apostle Paul and the Apostle Peter) and wearing of clothes pertaining to a man which is an abomination to God, (see Deut. 22:5).

Closely associated with the thought that our bodies are the temple of God, and that a woman is a beautiful type of the subjection of the church to her Lord, St. Paul sets forth another reason why a woman's head should be covered in the assembly. "For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels." (I Cor. 11:10).

The Twentieth Century New Testament rendering or translation is: "Man was not created for the sake of woman, but woman for the sake of man. And, therefore a woman ought to wear on her head a symbol of her subjection, because of the presence of the angels."

Dr. J. B. Phillips in his LETTERS TO YOUNG CHURCHES renders it thus: "A woman ought to bear on her head an outward sign of man's authority for all the angels to see."

Dr. De Haan says, "We believe that holy angels who worship and adore the Lord are present when the saints remember the Lord, and because of their ministering presence every thing should be according to God's will." It certainly is God's will for a woman's head to be covered when she prays or testifies or prophesies (preaches), and that covering should be long hair. It is doubtful that an angel would remain in a worship service where the pastor or the leaders of the service and the people in general set their sanction upon the women worshipping in violation to God's inspired Word given by St. Paul. Dr. De Haan adds, "We believe that the custom of Christian women wearing short hair is contrary to the Scriptures and against the clear teaching of the Word of God."

What St. Paul wrote shows that God was pleased with the custom in the church, and if He was pleased with it then, He must be grieved with so much bobbed hair and worldliness in the churches now.

* * *

18 -- HARMONY WITH WHOM?

Some claim the liberals want the question dropped in the church. But at what cost? It is at the expense of disobedience to God and His Word. There can be no harmony between true holiness and a sinful world. The three Hebrew children could have had harmony just by bowing to Nebuchadnezzar's image. Shall God's true holiness people bow to the fashions of the world just to have harmony in the Church? Most of those who have refused to bow have been forced out of the Church of the Nazarene, and those who have stayed in, have had to tone down their preaching in order to be inoffensive to the liberal, worldly crowd that dominates the Church.

To me it seems somewhat strange that I find myself on this subject in harmony with men like Dr. M. R. De Haan, an outstanding commentator and radio preacher of our day; and Dr. J. B. Phillips, another great commentator, who wrote "Letters to Young Churches," but out of harmony with the leaders of a great holiness denomination, whose founding fathers were so radical.

* * *

19 -- ALIBIS

Alibis are often used to excuse Christian women for having their hair bobbed. One common excuse is this: "God looketh on the heart but you cannot." They mean by this that God does not pay any attention to whether you look worldly on the outside, but rather looks at your heart to see whether you feel worldly on the inside. But how can a person look worldly on the outside without feeling worldly on the inside? Christ said, "For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts an evil eye pride, foolishness." (Mk. 7:21-22). If a person follows a sane, sensible reasoning you would expect him not to mind too much about his or her outward appearance, for the world only will see that Christians are not to dress to please the world, but to please their Lord and Saviour; so they should look well to their inward heart condition where God will look, for a person should want to please Him above all things. As a Filipino friend of mine put it: "This is identical with faith and works. Faith which God can only see justifies man before God, while works which man can see justifies him before the world." And then he added, "What is on the inside which only God can see must be shown outside that men can see it too, and glorify God for it." How true. The outward appearance is an indication of the inward condition of the heart. Why dress and look worldly in your outward appearances, if you want men to believe you are "unworldly," spiritual and Christ-like in your heart and life?

Another excuse is: "Some of our preachers are defending bobbed hair; and if it is all right for them, it is all right for me." Now what does that prove? Peter, one of Christ's chosen twelve, denied his Lord. Would you deny Jesus too? David, God's chosen king, committed adultery. Would you do the same? Judas, who was given power to cast out devils, betrayed our Lord and hanged himself. Would you do likewise? No, of course not. Then how can you justify yourself in following this worldliness because someone argues for it?

Another similar argument favoring bobbed hair is this: "Many of our women with bobbed hair claim to be sanctified, and God blesses them. And some of our women preachers have bobbed hair, and they have the Holy Ghost, and God blesses them in their ministry; so if bobbed hair doesn't hinder them from being sanctified and having the blessings of God upon them, then bobbed hair should not hinder me either." But how will this argument stand up in the light of Matthew 7:22 where Christ said, "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you." I would not want the Lord to say that to me because of deliberate disobedience, would you? If these professing holiness people are really sanctified and really have the Holy Spirit in their hearts, then the Scriptures do not always say what God means, or else God does not always mean what His Word says!

Some claim that long hair is unsanitary, and that it takes too much of a woman's time to do up her hair. I have lived with long-haired women all my life, and I have not seen anything unsanitary about it. My mother had long hair, and so has my wife, and both kept their hair clean and sanitary. Neither of them spent much time with their hair. They did it up in the morning, and that lasted for the day. I have noticed women with bobbed hair spending lots more time primping and fixing at their hair during the day, than ever my mother or my wife did. And the bobbed haired women certainly spend lots more money going to the beauty shops trying to get some artificial beauty roasted into their hair, after having the natural beauty of their hair cut off. But sitting under an "octopus" at a beauty shop can never replace the natural beauty that God gave and ordained for them in having long, natural hair.

When the Lord comes to rapture His saints, many of these professing holiness women who have violated the Scripture in cutting their hair, may expect the Lord to send His angels into the beauty shops to get them out from under the "octopus" hair-curlers and take them to the Marriage Supper in the skies. They may rationalize to themselves that they are only getting their hair fixed so they will look nice at the Marriage Supper! They claim their conscience does not condemn them, nor the Holy Spirit. So, some of them have "boyish" bobs, "poodle-dog" bobs, "rooster-tail" bobs "duck-tail" bobs, "wind-swept" bobs, etc., all ready and waiting for the rapture and the Marriage Supper, so they can sit down with the "old-fashioned" holy women of all the ages who have known no other fashion but long hair. Of course, these newfangled holiness women may think they are prepared to enlighten those "old-fashioned" women by informing them that they were all mistaken about the matter that women of the church needed to wear long, unsanitary hair to please their Lord! But how terribly mistaken they will be! If they were to get to the Marriage Supper, they would feel so out of place, they would be terribly miserable.

* * *

20 -- A SIGN OF THE TIMES

When facing the five Nazarene General Superintendents, I stated to them that I thought that bobbed hair was one of the "Signs of the Times" -- that there must be some connection between the widespread custom of women cutting their hair and the prevalence of immorality in our day. One of the Generals jumped to his feet and retorted, "I thought so. So you think that every woman with bobbed hair is an immoral woman?" "No," I said, and he knew I did not. There had been an article in a recent issue of the Herald of Holiness, that set forth the same thought, and I cited that to him, but he would not accept it.

Another one of the General Superintendents stated, "At least 50 per cent of our women have bobbed hair, and whatever is to become the custom of the day, we as a church will have to accept it." With such leadership as that the Church of the Nazarene has done just that with the fashion or fad of bobbed hair for women, and with the T.V; when it came on the scene. But why should Christianity or the Church bow to worldly fashions or worldly pleasures of the age? Does it have to marry the harlot to save her from her life of sin?

Recently, I came across a little book entitled, "Lessons on Apostasy From Church History," by David Budensiek Professor in Marion College, Marion, Indiana. In it he refers to the Kensey

Report given in Life Magazine, August 24, 1935. Since I do not have access to that report, I will quote from this little book:

"You say, 'Well, what is wrong with a woman cutting her hair?' The Bible says it is wrong; that is the first reason. But people don't accept that any more. You have to quote science, it seems. And so let's go on to science just a moment.

"Some of you have heard about the Kensey Report ... Now, Mr. Kensey, at the Indiana University, is far from believing what we believe ... But he made just a little study, and here is what he says He found that of the women who grew up before 1920, 85 per cent were virgins at the age of 25, if they were not married. What happened in 1920? That is when the Hollywood fashions of cutting and curling hair, shortening dresses, and all the rest of it hit our country, right after World War I. Now what did Kensey find out about the women who grew up since 1920? They say it doesn't make any difference how a woman dresses, but let us see what the Kensey Report has to say. He found out that of the women who went through the teenage period after 1920, only 64 per cent were virgins, if unmarried at 25. Over one-third had fallen before they were 25 years of age; but before 1920 only 15 per cent. He says that today only 50 per cent of the girls getting married are virgins. God said in the Bible that it would be that way. He warned against dressing as they do. Now we find the facts are verified in a report of this kind."

Since Dr. M. R. De Haan wrote at length on this question, I want to quote again from him:

"... There is far more involved here than a mere custom. It is I believe, a sign of the times. In the Old Testament, it was the custom to uncover a woman's head when she had been unfaithful to her husband." (Numbers 5:18). [Num 5:18 (KJV) And the priest shall set the woman before the LORD, and uncover the woman's head, and put the offering of memorial in her hands, which is the jealousy offering: and the priest shall have in his hand the bitter water that causeth the curse.]

"It is moreover, a significant fact, which cannot be explained as a mere coincidence, that at the same time that bobbing of woman's hair came into vogue, women also began the debasing practice of wearing men's apparel."

"I say that it is more than mere coincidence that the masculinizing of women's dress and habits had gone hand in hand with the upsurge of immorality, looseness of living and the violation of the marriage vows and the appalling increase in divorce and the resultant evil of broken homes, juvenile delinquency, and all the other evils."

* * *

21 -- GOD'S CURSE AGAINST WORLDLINESS

Isaiah prophesied against the "daughters of Zion" (the Church is spiritual Zion), and foretells the judgments that God will send upon them for their worldliness, (Isaiah 3:16-24).

"Moreover the Lord saith, Because the daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with stretched forth necks and wanton eyes ... Therefore the Lord will smite with a scab the crown of the head of the daughters of Zion.

"In that day the Lord will take away the bravery of their tinkling ornaments about their feet ... and the headbands ... and the earrings.

"The rings, and nose jewels and the wimples, and the cringing pins...

"And it shall come to pass, that instead of sweet smell there shall be stink, and instead of a girdle a rent: and instead of well-set hair, baldness."

If the modern fashion of short, curled, frizzled, well-set hair is so nice and inoffensive to God, then why does Isaiah prophesy that a day is coming when God will smite women with baldness because of it? Many women are finding now that because they have bobbed hair, their hair is coming out, and they are getting baldheaded. And so, they are having to wear wigs to cover up their baldness. If God did not smite these bobbed haired professing Christian women with baldness before the day of His Second Coming, then He would need to apologize to the women of Israel who were threatened with baldness in the above scripture just quoted. The women of Israel were doing only the same things that the professing holiness women are doing now, and yet God pronounced a curse upon them. Will He not bring the same curse upon the professing holiness women of our day who are doing just what the women of Israel were doing then?

* * *

22 -- A GOOD RULE TO FOLLOW

Here is a good rule to follow that is very applicable to the bobbing of the hair, or to any other form of worldliness: When the WORLD sets up any custom, form, fashion or practice that is contrary to the requirements and teachings of the scriptures, then Christians should not conform to them. To do so shows that they love the world more than they love God and His Holy Word. St. Paul wrote: "Be not conformed to this world." There are many customs and fashions we follow which do not conflict with God's Word, but when Christians conform to a fashion or a custom which causes them to violate a scripture, they become guilty of ignoring or disobeying God's Word, bringing condemnation to their hearts.

* * *

23 -- SHALL WE SUBMIT TO THE "CHALLENGE OF THE MAJORITY?"

One General Superintendent tried to convince me that we should not contend for our private conscience and convictions against the "conscience of the majority." He reasoned that we are not responsible for the "conscience of the majority," so when our individual conscience conflicts with the "conscience of the majority," we are obligated, as officials of the church, to go along with the majority and abide by their "conscience." But what kind of reasoning is this? In fact there is in reality no such thing as a "conscience of the majority." At the judgment, who will

answer for the aggregate "conscience of the majority?" Certainly, the majority will not answer for an individual's conscience in that day. Each individual will answer for his own conscience, and for how he lets himself become influenced by the majority. In his argument, the General also used the term, "sanctified conscience of the majority." How strange! when the majority in the church are not sanctified. The majority in the church are just as carnal as the Corinthian Church in St. Paul's day.

It is doubtful whether the majority have ever been right, even in the history of the Church. The majority of the spies sent by Moses into Canaan returned with a wrong report. The majority of the children of Israel perished in the wilderness for accepting their report. The majority of the Jewish Church rejected Christ: His followers were only a small minority. So, seldom, if ever, is the majority, right. If it were, then we would all need to be Catholics, or a member of some heathen religion. Protestants number only eight per cent of the world's population. Joshua, Daniel, Luther, George Fox, John Wesley, and even Jesus, all had to stand alone. In the eleventh chapter of Hebrews is a long list of holy men of God who had to stand alone, being rejected and persecuted by the majority of those who were supposed to be God's people.

In a sermon to his congregation in the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City, Dr. Paul Wolfe gave timely warnings along this line. May I close with a quotation from him:

"Where once they stood for liberty of conscience, these Free Churches today are stressing 'group thinking' and the 'collective mind.' Pronouncements purporting to represent the 'group mind' of the Church, are used to compel the individual Christians to conform...

"These pronouncements are not the voice of the Church. If they were the voice of the Church, they would have to be debated in every session, in every Board of Deacons, in every congregation, debated back and forth until they actually expressed the judgment of the responsible courts of the Church. This, however, is not what happens. The pronouncements represent the political maneuvering of a hard core of committee entrenched individuals who use a majority vote of a council to promote their social prejudices ... writing their 'prophetic' resolutions.

"Such action is not prophetic action. Prophecy does not count noses or operate through majority votes. The prophets of the Old Testament were lonely men ... The men who were defeating righteousness were the organized prophets who set their truth (their reasoning) in place of God's truth. The true Prophet said, I stand alone and I speak alone because God commanded me to speak...

"... Luther pointed out that the individual Christian is alone and the same time the most free and the most bound of all men; he is free from the authority of men but he is bound by the revelation of the Bible and the truth of God's Word. He is bound by the voice of God speaking in his own conscience."

"There is a scene in Luther's life which no liberty loving Christian should ever forget. A lone man, isolated and seemingly forsaken; stood before the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and representatives of the Roman Church. On a table before them were the man's writings. Had he written them? He had. The writings had been condemned by the Roman Church: Did he still

believe what he had written? He did. He knew the penalty for heresy? He did. Would he retract and recant? The man paused before he answered and then spoke in measured words. 'I cannot submit my faith either to the Pope or to the councils because they have frequently erred and contradicted each other. Unless I am convicted by the testimony of Scripture or by clear reasoning since my conscience is thus bound by the Word of God I cannot and will not retract; for it is unsafe and injurious to act against one's conscience. Here I stand: I can do no other. May God help me. Amen.'

* * * * *

THE END