

CIOz Special Edition #3

“How I Learned to Hate Common Sense and Love Polygamy”

G'day, fellow Israelites, and welcome to this special edition of the Christian Identity Australia podcast. This is the third special edition of the show. Special editions are devoted to a single topic I discuss at length, a topic I couldn't do justice to on a regular edition of the show, where I cover a range of topics. Today's topic is one I've wanted to discuss for some time now: polygamy. As you've probably gathered from the title of this edition, I'm not a fan of the practice, and that's putting it mildly. In fact, I don't just hate polygamy, I loathe polygamy. But there are some people in Christian Identity who not only advocate but practise it. They're not going like this edition of the show. But then, it isn't aimed at them. I don't expect any of these champions of so-called biblical marriage to change their tune after they listen to this edition, *if* they listen to it. If anything it will probably only strengthen their position on polygamy. The way to turn a lapsed Catholic into a staunch Catholic is to tell him Catholicism is a load of rubbish. Reverse psychology 101. The reason I'm doing this edition is to show people new to Christian Identity or people looking into it for the first time why most Christian Identists do not support the belief that God wants white men to be married to multiple white women, despite the fact He tolerated the practice, in certain instances, in the Old Testament.

But before I dive into this topic, a quick bit of housekeeping. The Christian Identity Forum has a new web address, christianidentityaustralia.org/forum, which is a subdomain of the resurrected Christian Identity Australia blog.

So why did I change the forum's address? A number of reasons. The first is that my web host was charging me 30 Australian dollars per month to host the forum, which didn't get nearly enough traffic to warrant that expense. The second is that technical support from the web host was just about non-existent. When I wanted to transition the forum from an http address to a more secure https address, one with a locked padlock icon in the address bar, they were of no help to me at all. The third is that the forum software was at least five years past its use-by date, and cracks in its coding were beginning to show. For example, it could no longer display embedded YouTube videos, and every time I pasted text copied from a Word document or an online news article, it would convert certain characters into a trademark and other symbols. The fourth is that Yahweh wants me to focus more of the work I do in CI on the place where He's planted me, Australia, so the new website had to be at a new URL with the name of my home country in it. Hence, Christian Identity Australia. And the fifth and last reason is that I wanted a blog rather than a forum to greet people on my website's homepage because blogs tend to get more traffic than forums do nowadays. This is because they offer far greater flexibility, and visitors usually don't have to go through the rigmarole of having to sign up to them to post a comment. With the new website, you'll be able to post on the blog and/or the forum if you so desire. And bless your heart if you do both. Bless your heart if you do just one or the other.

Audio: HBO Big Love Polygamy Rap, Angelo Worthy

Once upon a time, a guy registered as a member of my old forum for the express purpose of "correcting" my anti-polygamy stance. He must have known that I'm no fan of polygamy from my statement of faith. But he'd sent himself on a fool's errand. I wasn't about to change my view on polygamy just because he reckoned he'd found a semantic loophole in the original Greek that gave the questionable practice the divine thumbs up. I sometimes wonder if students of Greek in CI who spend so much time running a microscope over word placement and sentence structure in the original text lose sight of the simplicity of the Gospel in the process. The Bible says to study to show yourself approved (2 Timothy 2:15), not to show yourself incapable of seeing the forest from the trees.

This guy was so enamored with his or perhaps someone else's knowledge of Greek that it blinded him to the utter stupidity of what he was doing. There he was in his very first post having a go at one of my stated beliefs. That's not good forum etiquette. It's like being invited into someone's home and criticizing the décor the second you step through the front door. Evidently, he was too busy poring over the Greek text to read Christ's counsel to be wise as serpents and harmless as doves (Matthew 10:16) in the English text.

Anyway, this is what he posted, quote:

Hello,

You just never know what you might find in scripture, even when you're not looking!

1 Corinthians 7:2 "Nevertheless, because of sexual immorality, let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband."

The Greek word for "own" (heautou) in the phrase "have his own wife" indicates that the man's wife was a personal exclusive possession to the extent that a man possesses a wife. The Greek word for "own" (idios) in the phrase "have her own husband" is not exclusive. Apparently *idios* carries the idea of a communal or shared ownership. Although there are others this one verse alone is Paul pretty much stating that polygyny is sanctioned by scripture. If Paul had wanted to make sure that there was no possible way a person would draw that conclusion he would have used the Greek *heautou* in both phrases.

Unquote.

I'd never encountered the word *polygyny* prior to reading his post, so I looked it up. The *Merriam Webster Dictionary* defines *polygyny* as "the state or practice of having more than one wife or female mate at a time." That definition is so close to the popular definition of *polygamy* that I couldn't tell the difference between the two terms. Wanting to know what the difference was, I Googled *polygamy vs polygyny* and learned that *polygamy* means "the practice of having more than one spouse," a spouse being a wife or a husband, whereas *polygyny*, a more specific term, means only "the practice of having more than one wife." To add to the confusion, there is a third term, *polyandry*, which refers to a woman with more than one husband and which also comes under the banner of *polygamy*. For the sake of simplicity, and because *polygamy* is much easier to pronounce than *polygyny*, I'm going to

use only the term *polygamy* in this discussion and only in the sense of a man with more than one wife.

What I found patronizing about the guy's first post was this statement: *You just never know what you might find in scripture, even when you're not looking!* I won't call him a liar, but I highly doubt that he just happened upon that distinction in the Greek by accident. That he registered on my forum solely to direct my attention to it leads me to believe that polygamy holds a special place in his heart.

But his second post was even more patronizing than his first. This is what he wrote in response to my asking him whether he was a polygamist. Quote:

Just a believer in scripture. It doesn't matter what I think. I only care about what scripture says. I very much enjoy sharing what I find in scripture always trying to avoid my opinion. I see that polygamy is not scriptural. Polygyny is scriptural. Amazing what you find in the Greek eh?

Have a nice day.

Unquote.

Oh my goodness gracious me. Who needs ipecac syrup when people are posting rancid tripe like that online?

You know, over the years I must have heard everyone from Billy Graham to Creflo Dollar claim that they only care about what Scripture says. So I give as much credence to such statements as I do Alex Jones' claim that Arabs financed and produced *Schindler's List*.

Look, there is not one person on the planet who only cares what Scripture says. No matter how hard we try not to taint the Bible with our personal beliefs and prejudices, taint it we do. The trick is to keep that tainting to a minimum. I said at the start of this show that I loathe polygamy—and I don't think it's an idle boast to say there isn't another soul in CI who is more anti-polygamy than this soul is—but despite being upfront about my bias toward the practice, I shall do my darnedest to give a fair and biblically balanced view of it.

Genesis 2:18-24 (Unless I state otherwise, every Scripture quoted in this study is from the Amplified Bible.)

18 Now the LORD God said, "It is not good (beneficial) for the man to be alone; I will make him a helper [one who balances him—a counterpart who is] ^[i]suitable *and* complementary for him."

19 So the LORD God formed out of the ground every animal of the field and every bird of the air, and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them; and whatever the man called a living creature, that was its name.

20 And the man gave names to all the livestock, and to the birds of the air, and to every animal of the field; but for Adam there was not found a **helper** [that was] suitable (a companion) for him.

21 So the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam; and while he slept, He took **one** of his ribs and closed up the flesh at that place.

22 And the **rib** which the LORD God had taken from the man He made (fashioned, formed) into a **woman**, and He brought **her** *and* presented **her** to the man.

23 Then Adam said, “This is now bone of my bones, And flesh of my flesh; **She** shall be called **Woman**, Because she was taken out of Man.”

24 For this reason a man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall be joined to his **wife**; and they shall become **one** flesh.

You would have heard me emphasize certain words in that passage. Words such as *one*, *her*, and *wife*, all of which are in the singular. Nowhere in that passage is it even implied that Yahweh wanted Adam to have more than one wife. He recognized that Adam needed a suitable helper and thus created one for him. Not two. Not three. Not ten. One. Almighty God, the All-Knowing Creator of Heaven and Earth, considered one wife—and one wife alone—suitable and sufficient for Adam. If having multiple wives is better or at least as good as having one wife, why is polygamy conspicuous by its absence in the account of Eve's creation? Why didn't Yahweh tell Adam he could have had a whole harem of wives if he so desired? Because it's not Yahweh's perfect will, and it has never been His perfect will, for Adamic man to have more than one wife.

The number one in the Bible signifies unity and uniqueness, hence there is one God, one Savior, one Spirit, one body, one faith, and one baptism. The marriage union symbolizes Yashua's relationship with His Church. He is the bridegroom and white Christians collectively are His bride, *bride* singular. He is returning for one bride, not multiple brides. This is why in Matthew 19:4-6, in reference to the marriage relationship, He says: “*Have you never read that He who created them from the beginning made them male and female, ⁵ and said, ‘For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and shall be joined inseparably to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh’? ⁶ So they are no longer two, but one flesh. Therefore, what God has joined together, let no one separate.*”

Note that Yahshua does not mention polygamy in this passage and is happy just to repeat the Yahweh-ordained standard for marriage set down in Genesis chapter 2. The Apostle Paul reiterates this standard in Ephesians 5:22-33, where he counsels wives to submit to their husbands, and husbands to love their wives.

Genesis 4:17-19, 23

17 And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch.

18 And unto Enoch was born Irad: and Irad begat Mehujael: and Mehujael begat Methusael: and Methusael begat Lamech.

19 And Lamech took unto him two wives: the name of the one was Adah, and the name of the other Zillah.

23 And Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, Hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech: for I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt.

This is the first account of polygamy in the Bible. And who is the first recorded polygamist? Is it a godly Adamic man who studiously followed Yahweh's law? Nope. It's a descendant of Cain, an ancient Jew, who is not only a polygamist but a murderer. Polygamy isn't off to a good start with this son of the Devil. And I don't believe for one second that it's merely a coincidence that the worst individual you could have picked to be Scripture's inaugural polygamist is indeed Scripture's inaugural polygamist.

Scripture's second recorded polygamist is no better than the first. It's none other than Esau. In Genesis 26:34, we read of him marrying two Hittite women. God had forbidden His people to marry outside of their race, and Hittites were a racially mixed people.

Now, obviously, not every polygamist in the Bible was non-white or a reprobate. There were heroes of faith who practiced polygamy, which is something pro-polygamy folk go to great lengths to point out and is the basis of why they believe as they do. They believe we should or can be polygamists because Abraham, David, Gideon, and other notable sons of God were. But is this sufficient reason?

Genesis 16:1-6

1 Now Sarai, Abram's wife, had not borne him any *children*, and she had an Egyptian maid whose name was Hagar.

2 So Sarai said to Abram, "See here, the LORD has prevented me from bearing *children*. I am asking you to go in to [the bed of] my maid [so that she may bear you a child]; perhaps I will ^[a]obtain children by her." And Abram listened to Sarai *and* did as she said.

3 After Abram had lived in the land of Canaan ten years, Abram's wife Sarai took Hagar the Egyptian [maid], and gave her to her husband Abram to be his [secondary] wife.

4 He went in to [the bed of] Hagar, and she conceived; and when she realized that she had conceived, she looked with contempt on her mistress [regarding Sarai as insignificant because of her infertility].

5 Then Sarai said to Abram, "May [the responsibility for] the wrong done to me [by the arrogant behavior of Hagar] be upon you. I gave my maid into your arms, and when she realized that she had conceived, I was despised *and* looked on with disrespect. May the LORD judge [who has done right] between you and me."

6 But Abram said to Sarai, "Look, your maid is *entirely* in your hands *and* subject to your authority; do as you please with her." So Sarai treated her harshly *and* humiliated her, and Hagar fled from her.

When we look at this example of polygamy, one thing is salient: Abraham, or Abram as he was then known, didn't marry Hagar, that is, have sex with her, out of faith but fear. Sarah, or Sarai, convinced Abraham that Yahweh had denied her a child and that the only solution to the problem was for him to plant his seed in Hagar. And it certainly seems that Abraham didn't need much convincing.

In Genesis 15:4, Yahweh promised Abraham that He would have an heir who would come from his body. In Genesis 2:24, we learn that when a man marries a woman they become one flesh, which means that Abraham's promised heir would not only come from his body but from Sarah's. Abraham must have known this, yet was at such a low point faith-wise in his life that he readily swapped DNA with Hagar in the mistaken belief that this was the only way to bring about the fulfillment of Yahweh's promise.

We all know how this story turned out. Hagar and Sarah ended up despising each other. Sarah treated Hagar so harshly that Hagar eventually ran away and returned purely because an angel of the Lord told her to. Ishmael, the son Hagar had with Abraham, would later mock Isaac, the son Sarah had with Abraham, and the son in whom Yahweh had promised to fulfill His covenant. At Sarah's insistence, Abraham sent Ishmael and Hagar away. Centuries later, when David was king, Ishmael's descendants, the Ishmaelites, conspired to destroy Israel. All of these problems could have easily been avoided if Abraham had remained monogamous and trusted Yahweh to make good on His promise and in His own time.

Abraham, like all of us, was far from perfect. There were times when he demonstrated great faith and times when he demonstrated little faith. While we can and ought to admire him for his general faithfulness, we must not worship him as some kind of Old Testament demigod who is above criticism and did all things well. He was not Jesus Christ. He did not live a sinless life. Not every example he set is worth following, and that goes for his lamentable foray into polygamy.

It's worth noting that Scripture makes no mention of Abraham's son, Isaac, having a wife other than Rebekah. If polygamy is so very crucial to the patriarchs being patriarchs, as some people in Christian Identity teach that it is, why is it noticeably absent from the biblical account of Isaac's life? We could also ask the same question about Job and Noah, both of whom were monogamists. How come they never got to enjoy the blessings of polygamy? Did Yahweh short change them?

How Abraham dealt with Sarah's childlessness and how Isaac dealt with Rebekah's childlessness provides us with a perfect illustration of the difference between acting out of unbelief and acting out of faith. Abraham sought to remedy his situation by siring a child through Hagar, which would cause him no end of domestic problems, whereas Isaac prayed to God, who answered his prayer. Isaac didn't have to contend with a pair of squabbling women for years afterward. Although Esau, one of his twin sons, was a bad seed, Jacob, his other son, whom God loved (Malachi 1:2-3), would become the patriarch of Israel. In fact, God changed Jacob's name to Israel (Genesis 32:28).

David was another patriarch who would pay a steep price for having more than one wife. He had eight wives, possibly more, and a grand total of nineteen sons from a number of those wives. His eldest son, Amnon, raped his (Amnon's) half-sister, Tamar (2 Samuel 13:1-14). Sexual abuse in blended families like David's is far more common than in families with one father and one mother and no stepchildren. David failed to punish Amnon for his crime (2 Samuel 13:20-21). This drove Absalom, one of David's other sons and Tamar's full brother, to kill Amnon. Having done the deed, Absalom, fearing his father's retribution, fled to the Land of Geshur (2 Samuel 13:23-38).

David would ultimately pardon Absalom. However, Absalom had grown to hate David and raised up an army against him. Absalom's army eventually suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of David's forces, and Absalom died a gruesome death not long after. Scripture tells us that David wept and mourned for his dead son (2 Samuel 19:1).

That brave and faithful warrior of Israel, Gideon, had many wives and many sons from those wives, seventy two in total, including one, Abimelech, he sired through a concubine (Judges 8:30-31). Now maybe you think that such a godly man fathering all those white children is a wonderful thing, but put yourself in Gideon's sandals for a second. How are you going to raise and nurture seventy-two sons? How are you going to give them the fatherly love and guidance they need to help them grow into faithful, honorable Israelite men? Even if you didn't have to work, there is no way you'd be able to find the hours in a day or a week to spend a suitable amount of time with each of them. You'd have enough trouble just trying to remember their names. Gideon, being an extremely busy chap, would have had to leave their upbringing almost entirely to their mothers. It's well known that boys raised by one parent, but especially by their mother, have a much greater chance of becoming criminals or sexual

degenerates when they reach adulthood. Boys—girls too—need the stabilizing and manly influence of their fathers daily, not once in a blue moon.

After Gideon died, Israel quickly descended into idolatry, and Abimelech killed all his half-brothers bar one (Judges 9:1-5), which puts paid to the theory that producing oodles of white children through polygamy is conducive to racial and spiritual salvation. The impressive multitude of sons born to Gideon did little to arrest Israel's propensity to rebel against their God. Quantity is no match for quality.

I used to have two dogs, a Labrador and a bitser. Whenever I patted the Labrador in front of the bitser, the bitser would whine and carry on because I wasn't showing it affection, and whenever I patted the bitser in front of the Labrador, the Labrador would whine and carry on because I wasn't showing it affection. This highlights one of the inherent problems with polygamy. Polygamy, by its very nature, is antithetical to harmonious family relations because it creates envy, jealousy, and dissatisfaction within the family unit. A polygamist cannot show affection to all his wives simultaneously. So while he's kissing and caressing or making love to one wife, he's not kissing and caressing or making love to his others. They're forced to miss out for the duration—until it's their turn, I guess. I'm not sure how polygamists work out the lovemaking arrangements with their wives. Maybe they have some sort of roster system. One is inevitably reminded of the Abbott and Costello comedy routine: "Who's on First?"

No self-respecting white woman worth her love for her husband is going to be happy and thrilled to know that while she's lying in her bed alone at night he is in another bed with another woman, grinding groins. To expect a woman to feel anything other than anger and resentment over that situation, is to have a drooling vegetable's grasp of male and female relationships.

There isn't a male proponent of polygamy in Christian Identity who would marry a woman with multiple husbands. The very idea of having to share her with a bunch of other guys would be unthinkable to him, yet he expects women in polygamous relationships to be perfectly fine with their husbands sleeping around—hey, let's call it what it really is. Even women who enter such relationships knowing full well what to expect aren't going to relish the prospect of having to wait in line for hubby to get around to them sexually and romantically. That's just not in their Adamic nature. And the fact that it isn't should serve as a warning that polygamy ought to be shunned by our people rather than promoted by some as God's surefire cure for rampant feminism, zero population growth, and an ailing patriarchy. Don't give me that rubbish about men not being created to be monogamous. Gene Simmons, the womanizing Jew from the flatulent rock group Kiss, says the same thing.

It's virtually impossible for a polygamist to love all his wives equally. And I use the word *love* in its weakest sense possible because, in my considered opinion, love has as much to do with polygamy as artistic excellence has to do with Jackson Pollock's *Blue Poles*. Most likely the polygamist will love one of his wives more than he does the others because she's the best looking of the lot. Remember that Jacob loved Rachel, who was ravishingly beautiful, more than Leah, who was relatively plain. A polygamist is probably going to resent his less comely wives for dragging his attention away from his most attractive wife. That's if he has an attractive wife. Women in polygamous relationships aren't usually known for their physical beauty. Beautiful women aren't so bereft of choice that they're forced to wait around for a guy who collects wives like beer coasters to sweep them off their feet and into his glorified

harem. But unattractive women, especially those not trusting in God to provide them with a godly husband, can't afford to be so picky. This is something to bear in mind if you're thinking of becoming a polygamist and a woman's physical attractiveness is of any importance to you.

The unavoidable favoritism that polygamy often fosters creates bitter rivalries among the wives in such a relationship. We saw that earlier, with Sarah and Hagar. Then there's Hannah, the mother of the prophet Samuel. She was one of two wives who were married to a fellow named Elkanah (1 Samuel 1:2-21). Elkanah loved Hannah more than he did his other wife, Penninah. Whenever he made an offering to Yahweh, he would give Hannah twice the portion he gave Penninah. Hannah was barren, and Penninah, who had bore him children, took advantage of that to make sport of her. Clearly, Penninah was angry, frustrated, and jealous that Hannah received the lion's share of her husband's love. And I can't say I blame her. Although it's easy to cast her as the villain of the story, the real villain is Elkanah for not having enough common sense to realize that giving Hannah such preferential treatment would put his two wives at loggerheads.

We also saw earlier that polygamy creates disharmony among the children born to different mothers in that relationship. Perhaps the most famous example of this is where Joseph's half-brothers chucked him down a well for being Jacob's favorite son and for bragging about the prophetic dream he had in which they bowed down to him (Genesis 37: 3-17; 38:1-24).

But the problems engendered by polygamy don't just end with vicious family spats. There's the spreading of sexually transmitted diseases, as the male polygamist shares his bodily fluids with a different wife every night. I'm not necessarily talking about venereal disease here, but just something as commonplace as a urinary tract infection or mononucleosis.

Then there's the matter of defrauding one another. In his first letter to the Corinthians, Paul wrote that husbands and wives were not to deny each other sexual pleasure unless by mutual consent so that they could devote themselves to prayer and fasting (1 Corinthians 7:1-5). Defrauding in this way is an unavoidable consequence of polygamy because the polygamist can't service all his wives at once, and the more wives he has, the longer each of them will have to wait between servicings. As he grows older and his virility diminishes, his wives will have to wait and wait and wait and, well, you get the picture. To make matters worse, males often reach their sexual peak before females do, so while a polygamist's burning yearning is slowly being doused, his wives' is receiving incendiary squirts of lighter fluid.

Not unexpectedly, Christian Identists who believe it's Yahweh's will for at least some of us to be polygamists have an assortment of Scriptures they love to quote to prove that two birds in the bush are better than one in hand. I'm going to dissect most of these—the passages, not the people—to see whether the pro-polygamy folk are rightly dividing the Word on this hotly debated issue. Incidentally, they're not.

2 Samuel 12:7-9

7 Then Nathan said to David, “You are the man! Thus says the LORD, the God of Israel, ‘I anointed you as king over Israel, and I spared you from the hand of Saul.

8 I also gave you your master’s house, and put your master’s wives into your care *and* under your protection, and I gave you the house (royal dynasty) of Israel and of Judah; and if *that had been* too little, I would have given you much more!

9 Why have you despised the word of the LORD by doing evil in His sight? You have struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword and have taken his wife to be your wife. You have killed him with the sword of the Ammonites.

Pro-polygamy folk believe that, in this passage, God was offering David all the wives he could pretty much get his loins around. But they are mistaken. It was a custom of ancient times for a king's successor to acquire the previous King's possessions. This included his wives. Note that God tells David that He has put his master's wives into his care and under his protection. However, He does not tell Him that they are to share his bed. That would contradict His commandment in relation to the election of the kings of Israel in Deuteronomy 17:17, which, in the King James Version, reads: *Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away: neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold.*

Pro-polygamy folk argue that Yahweh wasn't commanding the kings of Israel not to have more than one wife, He was commanding them not to have too many wives. Which raises the question of how many is too many? Ten? Fifty? A hundred? A thousand? Why didn't Yahweh specify the number or provide a formula for figuring out how many wives they were allowed to have? This would have eliminated all confusion about the matter. But the reason Yahweh didn't is that He had already specified the number in the second chapter of the Book of Genesis: one.

Predictably, the pro-polygamy folk will counter that my interpretation of Deuteronomy 17:17 is fallacious because in verse 16 of that chapter Yahweh commands the kings of Israel not to multiply horses. This means they were not to use horses in an ostentatious display of regal power. They were to possess only as many as they needed. Because the kings were presumably allowed to have a number of horses, though some Bible commentators believe they were permitted just one for personal use, the pro-polygamy folk conclude they were allowed to have a number of wives as well.

The difficulty with this logic is that we're not talking about the daughters of Black Beauty here. We're talking about the daughters of Eve. Horses don't get married. Adamic women do. The message of both verses is that the kings of Israel were to demonstrate they put greater stock in the power of Yahweh than in that of the throne. How many wives did a king of Israel need in order to demonstrate this? How many wives did the king of Eden need?

One Christian Identity pastor teaches that the number of wives a polygamist may acquire is limited only by his financial resources. So I guess if you were a billionaire, a thousand wives or more would not be out of the question. Heaven knows how you would cope if they were menstruating all at once. That's a lot of cranky women to have to deal with every month.

Should polygamy become the norm rather than the exception and well-to-do white men are snapping up brides like heavily discounted stock at a Black Friday sale, that's going to leave a severe shortage of eligible females. According to my rudimentary calculations, there's only so many white women to go round. How then are the other eligible but less financially well-off bachelors supposed to find themselves a mate when all the latter day Joseph Smiths have pretty much grabbed the lot?

Statistics show that for every 100 females born, 105 males are born. If polygamy is supposed to be standard practice for all the white race's budding patriarchs, why isn't the ratio of white females to white males 150 to 100 or greater?

God commands us not to covet another man's wife (Exodus 20:14). Call me a stick in the mud, but it seems to this Christian Identist that polygamy makes coveting another man's wife almost inevitable by making most women of marrying age unavailable to everyone except a select few. Paul wrote that it's better to marry than to burn (1 Corinthians 7:9), that is, to burn with sexual desire; however, for a substantial number of men in a polygamous society, burning with sexual desire is all they have to look forward to. Although, if out of sheer desperation, they turn to foreign or male flesh to douse their hormonal fire, they can look forward to being executed for race mixing or turning poofster.

It's no secret that the translators of the King James Version *tweaked* numerous verses in both Testaments, often changing completely the meaning of the original texts. Deuteronomy 17:17 is a victim of this translational fiddling. This is how it reads in the Amplified Bible: *He shall not acquire multiple wives for himself, or else his heart will turn away [from God]; nor [for the same reason] shall he acquire great amounts of silver and gold.* In the KJV, we have: *Neither shall he multiply wives,* but in the Amplified Bible: *He shall not acquire multiple wives for himself.* The KJV opens the door to polygamy, while the Amplified slams it shut.

The verse warns that having multiple wives will turn the king's heart away from Yahweh. We know that Solomon's wives did this because they were foreign women who worshiped false gods, but no mention is made of foreign wives in this verse, just wives plural. Why would being married to multiple women be so detrimental to a king's relationship with Yahweh? The answer to this question is found in another question. Why would having sex with a different woman every night be so detrimental to a king's relationship with Yahweh?

We poor deluded monogamists frown on people who sleep around, but the sexually liberated pro-polygamy folk don't. They're all for it as long as the string of women whom the randy devil—sorry, polygamist—is sleeping with, so to speak, are married to him.

Deuteronomy 21:15-17

15 If a man has two wives, one loved and the other unloved, and both the loved and the unloved have born him sons, and the firstborn son belongs to the unloved *wife*,
16 then on the day when he wills his possessions to his sons, he cannot treat the son of his loved wife as firstborn in place of the son of the unloved wife—the [actual] firstborn.
17 Instead he shall acknowledge the son of the unloved as the firstborn, by giving him a double portion of all that he has, for he was the beginning of his strength (generative power); to him belongs the right of the firstborn.

Verse 15 of the preceding begins with *If a man has two wives*. Yahweh is not putting out a call here for all or any male Israelites to become polygamists. To say He approved of polygamy because some Israelites were polygamists, would be like saying He approved of mixed multitudes because when the Hebrews left Egypt not all of their number was white (Exodus 12:38). Further, the subject of the passage isn't polygamy but rather the rights of the firstborn, which have been broached because of something discussed previously, namely, a polygamist not loving his wives equally. In this instance, his not loving one at all. That Yahweh had to introduce a law to protect the rights of a firstborn child whose mother had fallen out of favor with her polygamist husband indicates that this was not an uncommon problem.

Isaiah 4:1

And in that day seven women will take hold of one man, saying, “We will eat our own food and wear [and provide] our own clothes; only let us be called by your name; take away our shame [of being unmarried].”

This verse is just a small part of a greater passage of Scripture dealing not with marriage but divine punishment. In the chapter before it, the Prophet Isaiah foretells the terrible chastisements that were about to befall Jerusalem and the tribe of Judah because of their continual disobedience. These include the withholding of bread and water, death by sword, and divesting the smartly dressed women of their prosperity and physical health (Isaiah 3:1, 17-23, 25). The male death toll would be so great that, once the blood-soaked dust had settled, the women would outnumber the men by seven to one. Forgive me for pointing out the obvious, but that is not a good thing, that is a bad thing.

Therefore, when Isaiah prophesies that seven women will take hold of one man, he is not endorsing polygamy, he is describing one of the terrible consequences of Yahweh's displeasure. I fail to see how this presents polygamy in anything but a bad light.

2 Chronicles 24:2-3

2. Joash did what was right in the sight of the LORD all the days of Jehoiada the priest [his uncle].
3. Jehoiada took two wives for him, and he fathered sons and daughters.

While the clause *Jehoiada took two wives for him* makes it appear that Jehoiada was the polygamist in this passage, it's far more likely that Joash was, since Jehoiada was more than 100 years old at this point in time. That a priest ordained by Yahweh gave Joash two wives, assuming he gave them to him simultaneously, presents us at first glance with a strong case for polygamy. Why would Jehoiada give Joash two wives if Yahweh wanted the latter to have only one wife?

In his book *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*, Professor Richard M. Davidson, has this to say about the passage, quote: In 2 Chronicles 24:2–3, the coordinating conjunction *waw* means “but” or “except” rather than “and,” implying divine disapproval for the arranged polygamy: “Joash did what was right in the eyes of the Lord all the days of Jehoiada the priest. [But/Except] Jehoiada got for him two wives.”

Just because a priest is ordained by Yahweh doesn't mean that every decision he makes is approved by Yahweh. Remember Aaron helped the Children of Israel fashion an idol in the form of a golden calf. And his sons, Abihu and Nadab, were struck dead when they offered strange fire to Yahweh. One's position is never a guarantee of one's obedience.

Deuteronomy 25:5

If brothers are living together and one of them dies without a son, the widow of the deceased shall not be *married* outside *the family* to a stranger. Her husband's brother shall be intimate with her after taking her as his wife and perform the duty of a husband's brother to her.

This commandment applied to the Levitical priesthood. We're given no indication that the brother who had to perform the conjugal duties on his late sibling's behalf could get out of doing so if he were already married. It does seem that regardless of whether he had a wife or

not, he was still required, in the words of the KJV, to raise up his brother's seed. If ever there was a scriptural case for polygamy, in a limited sense, anyway, this is certainly it.

But let's take a closer look at this scenario. The deceased brother's wife had to spread her legs for her late husband's brother, even if she couldn't stand the sight of him, and vice versa. And her late husband's brother had to impregnate her, even if he already had a wife, who in all likelihood wouldn't relish the prospect of his having sex with another woman, *repeated* sex if she didn't conceive during the initial coupling, or later gave birth to a daughter instead of a son. This hardly amounts to an enticing advertisement for polygamy. Rather, it is the exception that proves the rule. The rule being that married life is much happier and simpler for all involved when it constitutes just one man and one woman.

Had Adam and Eve not flouted Yahweh's law, there would have been no need for a brother to raise up seed to a departed brother, because every white man and woman would have been immune to sickness and death. Yahweh introduced this law for the Levites only and just as a temporary measure. Once the New Testament was in effect, Israelites were no longer beholden to it, since every Israelite believer, no matter which tribe they belonged to, was and is a priest (see 1 Peter 2:9). That's why in 1 Corinthians 7:39 the Apostle Paul writes: *A wife is bound [to her husband by law] as long as he lives. But if her husband dies, she is free to marry whomever she wishes, only [provided that he too is] in the Lord.* So a widow may marry the man of her choice, provided he is a Christian—and by extension white. This means that there is now no biblical reason for anyone to practice polygamy.

Matthew 25:1-13

1. Then the kingdom of heaven will be like ten virgins, who took their lamps and went to meet the bridegroom.
2. Five of them were foolish [thoughtless, silly, and careless], and five were wise [far-sighted, practical, and sensible].
3. For when the foolish took their lamps, they did not take any [extra] oil with them.
4. But the wise took flasks of oil along with their lamps.
5. Now while the bridegroom was delayed, they all began to nod off, and they fell asleep.
6. But at midnight there was a shout, 'Look! The bridegroom [is coming]! Go out to meet *him*.'
7. Then all those virgins got up and put their own lamps in order [trimmed the wicks and added oil and lit them].
8. But the foolish *virgins* said to the wise, 'Give us some of your oil, because our lamps are going out.'
9. But the wise replied, 'No, otherwise there will not be enough for us and for you, *too*; go instead to the dealers and buy *oil* for yourselves.'
10. But while they were going away to buy *oil*, the bridegroom came, and those who were ready went in with him to the wedding feast; and the door was shut *and* locked.
11. Later the others also came, and said, 'Lord, Lord, open [the door] for us.'
12. But He replied, 'I assure you *and* most solemnly say to you, I do not know you [we have no relationship].'
13. Therefore, be on the alert [be prepared and ready], for you do not know the day nor the hour [when the Son of Man will come].

Some polygamy advocates are of a mind that all ten of the virgins in this parable were betrothed to the bridegroom. As the bridegroom symbolizes Christ, this would make our Lord and Savior a polygamist. While the Church is His bride metaphorically, it is not His bride

literally, for that would make Him not only a polygamist but bisexual because half of the congregants are male.

Christ does not say that the ten virgins were to be married to the bridegroom. However, He does say the five foolish virgins were locked out of the wedding feast. If they were supposed to be married to the bridegroom, wouldn't their being barred from the wedding ceremony be a far worse fate than their missing out on a free feed and wouldn't that rate a mention?

The ten virgins were merely a part of the bridal party. The passage confirms this as does history. It was customary at the time for female friends of the bride to accompany her at her wedding ceremony. Even today, bridesmaids are an integral part of a bridal party. Do bridesmaids marry the bridegroom as well? Psalm 45:9-14 describes a wedding where virgins accompany a king's bride into his palace for the ceremony. The passage states they are her companions and nothing more.

1 Corinthians 7:2

But because of [the temptation to participate in] sexual immorality, let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband.

That is the Amplified rendering of the verse the misguided fellow who posted on my old forum was convinced sanctions polygamy in the New Testament. As you recall, the two Greek words in the verse that he and others claim make a solid pro-argument for polygamy in the NT are *heautou* and *idios*. *Heautou* is 1438 in Strong's Concordance and is a reflexive pronoun that means "himself, herself, themselves, ourselves, or itself". *Idios* is 2398 in Strong's and is an adjective that means "one's own, private, or personal". *Heautou* occurs in the phrase *have his own wife*, and *idios* in the phrase *have her own husband*. The pro-polygamy folk assert that Paul uses these different Greek words to highlight the supposed fact that polygamy was a practice that was every bit as welcome in the New Testament Church as monogamy. They argue that *heautou* connotes that the husband has sole ownership of his wife, whereas *idios* connotes that the wife does not have sole ownership of her husband, that she must share him with his other wives, if he has them.

The basis for their argument rests primarily on one of *idios*' associated meanings, that is, communal ownership. Examples of the word being used in this sense can be found in New Testament verses such as Matthew 9:1 *And Jesus, getting into a boat, crossed over the Sea of Galilee and came to [Capernaum] His own city*, Acts 1:19 *All the people in Jerusalem learned about this, so in their own dialect—Aramaic—they called the piece of land Hakeldama, that is, Field of Blood*, and 1 Thessalonians 2:14 *For you, brothers, became imitators of the churches of God in Christ Jesus which are in Judea; because you too suffered the same things from your own countrymen, even as they did from the Jews*.

Pro-polygamy advocates further argue that because the New Testament's writers always use *idios* rather than *heautou* when discussing wives in relation to their husbands this proves that polygamy in the early Christian Church was both commonplace and heartily endorsed by Yahweh. The problem with this view, however, is that *idios* is often used in the New Testament as a synonym of *heautou*, inasmuch as it too can mean "exclusive ownership." It is used in this sense in verses such as Mark 4:34 *and He did not say anything to them without [using] a parable; He did, however, explain everything privately to His own disciples*, John 5:43 *I have come in My Father's name and with His power, and you do not receive Me [because your minds are closed]; but if another comes in his own name and with no authority*

or power except his own, you will receive him and give your approval to an imposter, and 1 Corinthians 4:12 We work [for our living], working hard with our own hands. When we are reviled and verbally abused, we bless. When we are persecuted, we take it patiently and endure.

The context of the verse, or that of the passage of which it is a part, dictates whether *idios* means "communal ownership" or "exclusive ownership." For example, in Matthew 9:1, we read of Christ arriving at his *own* city. As a city is a place shared by many people, *idios*, in this instance, must mean "communal ownership." Whereas in 1 Corinthians 4:2, we read of the importance of working with our *own* hands. As they are our hands and no one else's, *idios*, in this instance, must mean "exclusive ownership."

So what is the context of 1 Corinthians 7:2? It is marriage as a lawful means of obtaining sexual release. The question, then, is how many wives does a man need to obtain sexual release? Unless he's a raving sex maniac, or a polygamist, he needs only one. Yes, believe it or not, it takes but one wife to satisfy her husband sexually. Satan, pornographers, and polygamists, however, may beg to differ.

Since *a* wife and *a* husband are physically able to meet each other's sexual needs, why would Paul recommend polygamy as a means of avoiding sexual immorality, when, as we have seen, the wives in a polygamous relationship often have to go without sex for extended periods because the oversexed blighter they married can't be in every vagina at once, though he might dearly like to be?

When I was researching this topic, I visited a Bible resource website that has an extensive list of commentaries on 1 Corinthians 7:2, commentaries written by Bible scholars, many of whom are experts on New Testament Greek. When I say experts, I mean people who can speak, read, and write Greek. People who know the Greek language, with all its quirks and idioms, back to front. Yet strangely none of these Bible commentators considers the verse to be either a call to polygamy or even a subtle endorsement of it. How come every one of these learned men is blind to what pro-polygamy folk can apparently see as plain as the toes on their feet? Are these men that hopelessly biased toward polygamy that they'd much rather ignore any positive reference to it in the New Testament and heap God's curses upon their heads by deliberately perverting Scripture to hide any positive reference to it? Or are the pro-polygamy folk simply seeing what they want to see, what they *need* to see?

I also visited a number of pro-polygamy websites, and the publisher of one of them posted a comment that I think is germane to this discussion. (You know germane, he was one of the Jackson 5.) He wrote that if it wasn't for Paul's use of *heautou* and *idios* in 1 Corinthians 7:2, polygamy advocates would be in big trouble because that would mean God really has commanded white Christian men to have just one wife, which in turn would mean that the pro-polygamy folk were advocating something that Scripture does not.

Seeing that Paul is not giving the nod to polygamous relationships in this verse, why does he use two different Greek words with different shades of meaning for the same adjective, *own*?

1 Corinthians 7:3-5

3. The husband must fulfill his [marital] duty to his wife [with good will and kindness], and likewise the wife to her husband.

4. The wife does not have [exclusive] authority over her own body, but the husband *shares with her*; and likewise the husband does not have [exclusive] authority over his body, but the wife *shares with him*.
5. Do not deprive each other [of marital rights], except perhaps by mutual consent for a time, so that you may devote yourselves [unhindered] to prayer, but come together again so that Satan will not tempt you [to sin] because of your lack of self-control.

Here Paul discusses a husband's duty to his wife—*wife* singular—and a wife's duty to her husband—*husband* singular. Both the husband and the wife are to share their body with each other, that is, they are not to deny each other sex. If any abstinence is to take place, it should be by mutual consent for an agreed period of time. Although *mutual* can mean “between two or more parties,” it is clear from the context of this passage that only two parties are being discussed. This is corroborated by Paul explaining that neither the husband nor his wife have exclusive authority over their bodies, for how can a wife exercise that authority if her husband's other wives want to exercise theirs at the same time?

Ephesians 5:22-33

22. Wives, be *subject* to your own husbands, as [a service] to the Lord.
23. For the husband is head of the wife, as Christ is head of the church, Himself *being* the Savior of the body.
24. But as the church is subject to Christ, so also wives should be subject to their husbands in everything [respecting both their position as protector and their responsibility to God as head of the house].
25. Husbands, love your wives [seek the highest good for her and surround her with a caring, unselfish love], just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself up for her,
26. so that He might sanctify the church, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word [of God],
27. so that [in turn] He might present the church to Himself in glorious splendor, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that she would be holy [set apart for God] and blameless.
28. Even so husbands should *and* are morally obligated to love their own wives as [being in a sense] their own bodies. He who loves his own wife loves himself.
29. For no one ever hated his own body, but [instead] he nourishes *and* protects and cherishes it, just as Christ does the church,
30. because we are members (parts) of His body.
31. FOR THIS REASON A MAN SHALL LEAVE HIS FATHER AND HIS MOTHER AND SHALL BE JOINED [and be faithfully devoted] TO HIS WIFE, AND THE TWO SHALL BECOME ONE FLESH.
32. This mystery [of two becoming one] is great; but I am speaking with reference to [the relationship of] Christ and the church.
33. However, each man among you [without exception] is to love his wife as his very own self [with behavior worthy of respect and esteem, always seeking the best for her with an attitude of lovingkindness], and the wife [must see to it] that she respects *and* delights in her husband [that she notices him and prefers him and treats him with loving concern, treasuring him, honoring him, and holding him dear .

In verse 33 of the previous passage, Paul states that a husband is to love his wife as he loves himself, which is another way of saying that he is to treat her as *he* would like to be treated. This echoes Christ's commandment in Matthew 7:12: *So then, in everything treat others the same way you want them to treat you, for this is [the essence of] the Law and the [writings of the] Prophets.* Would a husband want his wife to be have sexual relations with other men? No, he wouldn't. So how could he keep Christ's commandment if he were willing to subject

his wife to something he would never subject himself? That would be breaking the golden rule, would it not?

Paul uses *heatou* and *idios* purely as synonyms in 1 Corinthians 7:2. While these words can have significantly different connotations, they don't connote anything in this verse apart from simple ownership. The husband owns his wife, and the wife owns her husband. Not only does the context of the verse and others, such as Ephesians 5:22-33 and 1 Timothy 3:2, support this view, but so does the great bulk of biblical scholarship. The pro-polygamy folk are reading something into 1 Corinthians 7:2 that just isn't there. If it were, then Paul would discuss polygamy in some detail in both 1 Corinthians 7 and Ephesians 5 rather than leave it up to one connotation of a single Greek word to do all that considerable work for him.

In 1980 I bought myself a copy of The Good News Bible, not the greatest translation of the Bible ever, but it was better than nothing, and I read it from cover to cover. I was searching for biblical truth and had decided that no matter what shape it came in, I would accept it. But once I'd finished reading the Bible, I didn't think to myself, Well, I'd better become a polygamist because there's absolutely no doubt that that's what God wants me to be. I'm afraid polygamy just didn't leap out at me from the pages of the Bible. Even though I'd read all the accounts of the heroes of faith who engaged in the practice, I never once got even the faintest impression that God was leading me to dash out and marry as many white women as I could afford to support. I know many blokes who were in a similar situation to me, and none of them felt the divine call to shack up with more than one wife after reading Genesis to Revelation.

A year later, I began to fellowship at a large Pentecostal church that had many Greek congregants. I got to know two Greek families fairly well because they were in my house meeting. Whenever our house leader had trouble pronouncing a Greek word or required some extra elucidation on it, he would turn to one of the members of these Greek families for assistance. But none of these Greeks or any of the others in the assembly ever drew our attention to this supposed call to polygamy tucked away in the Greek text of 1 Corinthians 7:2, which only pro-polygamy folk have eyes to see. First Corinthians is one of the most popular books in the Bible with Pentecostals because it deals with the operation of the spiritual gifts, such as speaking in tongues, in a Church meeting, even though modern-day Pentecostals don't and can't speak in tongues, because Yahweh has done away with that particular spiritual gift. Some of the Greeks in our church were quite the students of the Bible. They must have read the Greek version of First Corinthians hundreds of times, yet they never once brought to our attention the vital part that polygamy is alleged to play in some marriage relationships. And this was despite the fact that biblical marriage was a frequently discussed topic and 1 Corinthians 7:2 a frequently cited verse in my former church.

This is from *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament* by Ceslas Spicq and James D. Earnest. Quote. *Idios, idia* are similarly used for persons in a way synonymous with a simple possessive, notably with regard to members of a family: one's own brother and sister, mother, father, spouse, son or daughter.

Some Greek lexicons state that *idios* means "being the exclusive property of someone—'one's own, one's property.'" However, at the time 1 Corinthians was written, *idios* was weakened. Unquote.

Robertson and Plummer, in their book *The International Critical Commentary*, share this view of *idios*, stating that the difference between *heatou* and *idios* was becoming blurred.

It's also shared by Johannes P. Louw and Eugene Albert Nida, the authors of *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. Quote. Whether used as adjective, noun, or adverb, this term [*idios*] means "peculiar to, particular, private," but its sense is weakened in the Koine, where it is usually equivalent to a possessive. Unquote.

What these authors are all saying is that *heatou* and *idios* had become synonyms and are used as such in 1 Corinthians 7:2, which means the verse is not giving the OK to polygamy.

I'll give the last say on this scripture to W. Robertson Nicoll, who in his book *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, states, quote, the use of the possessive reflexive pronoun *heautou* and the adjective *idion* imply monogamy. Unquote.

If you're looking for people in Christian Identity who support polygamy or are themselves polygamists, you'll soon find them. I was listening to a podcast hosted by a Christian Identist who mentioned Elohim City. Elohim City is a Christian Identity community in the United States that actively endorses polygamy. Many if not most of the married men who live in that community are polygamists.

Why is polygamy or at least the advocacy of it so commonplace in Christian Identity? What led to this sorry state of affairs?

I believe it can be attributed to several things. First, a backlash against feminism. Feminism has given women power over men they were never meant to have under Yahweh's law. Yahweh assigned men leadership roles in and out of the home. But nowadays, women often rule the roost not only in the home but in the workplace and even the political arena. This seismic shift in the biblical balance of power has led to an exponential increase in marriage and family breakdowns and an exponential decrease in white birth rates. Feminists can screech about women's rights all they like, but when they push for Muslim immigration and stand before massive crowds at political rallies, shouting "Allahu akbar," knowing full well that Islam subjugates women and couldn't give a farthing about their rights, it becomes pretty obvious that feminism's real purpose is to undermine and then eliminate the white male patriarchy and the white race in toto. Feminism is Judaism in drag.

A regrettable number of men in the Christian Identity movement have sought to redress this power imbalance and the shrinking white population by practicing polygamy. They believe that treating women like cattle and impregnating as many as they can is paramount to our racial survival. On a superficial level, it makes a lot of sense—at least the impregnation aspect of it does. I'm sure we all agree that the only way to increase the white population is for whites to have more children. But we need to ask ourselves how feminism gained such traction in white countries in the first place. Was it because our numbers were dwindling or because we as a people were sinning our heads off?

If white countries hadn't been in moral decay when feminism first reared its ugly, Jewish head, then that pernicious ism would have been rejected outright. Our sin is wholly responsible for the inroads that feminism and all the other destructive doctrines that Jewish academics and social agitators have been able to make on white society. The genocidal birth rates we're experiencing are symptomatic of that sin, not the cause of it. In Deuteronomy

28:63, God warned Israel that if they disobeyed His law, He would destroy not multiply them. White men can have all the white children with all the white women they like, but it's not going to reverse our declining numbers, for we are under a curse that guarantees our declining numbers.

Polygamy isn't the solution to the problem. Repentance, *national* repentance, is. If whites as a people repented of their sin and made God's commandments the law of their lands again, monogamous marriages would produce more than enough children for our race to flourish. Moreover, we would become an unstoppable, all-conquering force on planet Earth because God would bless and prosper everything we did.

In view of all this, one might ask if we should bother having children at all. Yes, we should. God commands us to be fruitful and multiply (Genesis 1:28). But although He does bless and prosper individual families who obey His Word, He won't bless and prosper us as a people until we repent as a people.

Another reason some men, and some women, in CI gravitate to polygamy is that, to men with one or more failed marriages under their belts, polygamy can seem an attractive alternative to monogamy. A marriage breakup is often an emotionally devastating experience for a man (and a woman). Polygamy eliminates much of the emotional attachment that develops between a man and a woman in a monogamous relationship by spreading it over numerous relationships, diluting it almost to the point of non-existence. You can't suffer a broken heart over a failed marriage if you were never truly in love with your wife to begin with, and you have a dozen other wives to keep you happy sexually.

And still another reason is that some CI churches teach that polygamy is a blessed and wonderful thing. Members of those churches think it's Yahweh's will for them to be in a polygamous relationship because their pastors, whom they respect and admire and believe would never lead them astray, even unintentionally, are fervent proponents of, quote, biblical marriage, unquote. Once you're in the thrall of a beloved, charismatic preacher, it can be extremely difficult to break free of it. The chances are you're going to drink the doctrinal Kool-Aid along with everyone else rather than risk excommunication and the resulting separation from family and friends it can bring. This is why the Bible commands us to study and rightly divide the Word ourselves (2 Timothy 2:15). Your pastor may know biblical Greek and Hebrew back to front, but that doesn't make him infallible. He might be dead wrong about some of the things he teaches, and if you hang on his every word, you're going to be dead wrong about some things too. It's one thing to believe that Yahweh is fine with polygamy, but it's another to be an actual polygamist. If you're thinking about copying the domestic arrangements of some of the Old Testament patriarchs, you had best make sure from Scripture that that's what Yahweh wants you to do. Don't take your pastor's word for it, and don't take mine. Study to show polygamy approved, or disapproved.

Polygamy advocates complain that modern marriages place too much emphasis on the romantic side of the relationship instead of the practical side. And they're right. But letting the pendulum swing as far as possible in the opposite direction so that romantic love has virtually no role in the relationship is just as bad. Romance is important to any successful marriage. For scriptural proof of this, one need only look at the Song of Solomon, which is filled with the finest poetry ever composed about the sexual and emotional bond between a man and a woman.

I remember listening to an interview a CI pastor conducted with an old woman who had been in a polygamous relationship when she was younger. The woman had nothing but good things to say about the relationship, including how well all of the bloke's wives got on. The scene she painted was one of domestic bliss. Does this mean, then, that polygamy is a good thing, blessed by Yahweh, and that it really, truly works? I'll answer that question with a question. One Sunday afternoon I was standing out the front of my old Pentecostal church, handing out religious tracts to passers-by. I got into a conversation with a guy who turned out to be a Scientologist. He was telling me about the positive impact Scientology had had on his life. Scientology, as far as he was concerned, was the greatest thing that had ever happened to him. Since Scientology was supposedly such a great blessing to the guy, should we become Scientologists too?

Anecdotal evidence of something's worth doesn't necessarily validate its worth. Sodomites claim that so-called gay marriage functions just as well as a marriage between a man and a woman. And there are people who extol the virtues of cannibalism, self-amputation, and blood sacrifices to Satan. No matter how ill-advised a particular practice may be, there will always be someone who will loudly sing its praises.

A popular but poor justification for polygamy is that the Bible doesn't forbid or condemn it outright. Therefore, the Bible must approve of it. While it's true that there is no commandment that states thou shalt not engage in polygamy, there is also no commandment that states thou shalt not engage in pedophilia. In fact, pedophilia doesn't rate a single mention in all of Scripture. So, using the same logic, pedophilia must be OK too. Well, no, pedophilia is not OK, for it and other forms of sexual perversion not explicitly referenced in the Bible are covered by verses like Ephesians 5:3-5 *But sexual immorality and all [moral] impurity [indecent, offensive behavior] or greed must not even be hinted at among you, as is proper among saints [for as believers our way of life, whether in public or in private, reflects the validity of our faith]. Let there be no filthiness and silly talk, or coarse [obscene or vulgar] joking, because such things are not appropriate [for believers]; but instead speak of your thankfulness [to God]. For be sure of this: no immoral, impure, or greedy person—for that one is [in effect] an idolater—has any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God [for such a person places a higher value on something other than God], and Matthew 1:18 *But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.**

But what verses do we have that frown upon polygamy? Well, as we've already discussed at length, 1 Corinthians 7:2. And then there's this verse:

1 Corinthians 10:11 (King James Version)

Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.

Paul is referring here to the Old Testament slip-ups, some of them very serious indeed, of the Israelites. What kind of example did polygamists set in the OT? Did they set an example of harmonious relations, free of duplicity, backbiting, and domestic upheaval. No. Just the opposite. Their polygamy often led to envy, jealousy, treachery, and, in some cases, murder.

But one doesn't have to look at what happened to polygamists in ancient times to see that a house divided by polygamy is not a happy home. I switched on the TV a couple of weeks ago, and a reality series about polygamous Mormons was being broadcast. I watched only

about 10-15 minutes of this show, but that was more than enough to gather that the young man and his young wives, who were the focus of the episode, weren't exactly aglow with domestic rapture. One of his wives was due to give birth, and the others weren't pleased with all the attention he was paying her. They were feeling neglected and resentful, and can you really blame them?

In Matthew 19:6, Christ says that a husband and a wife become one flesh, and that God forbids any man from breaking them apart. Polygamy destroys the sacred bond a man is meant to share with his wife by essentially removing it. How can a man be one flesh with his wife when he is having sexual relations with other women who are also his so-called wives? Polygamy cannot and does not foster unity in a family, only, at best, a tenuous, grudging acceptance of one another.

Soaring divorce rates are cited by pro-polygamy folk as damning proof that monogamous marriages, more often than not, don't work, and that polygamy is Yahweh's time-tested method for keeping marriages, families, and the white race intact. But that has more to do with the soaring rates of sin than with anything else. The fact is that Yahweh created and ordained the institution of monogamous marriage. If they have a problem with that, for them, unpalatable truth, they need to take it up with Him.

One God. One Savior. One Spirit. One body. One faith. One baptism. One wife.

Time to inject some humor into this special edition methinks. Back in the 1980s, I bought a record album on the Rhino label, titled the *World's Worst Records Volume II*. There were a number of excellent tracks on the album but the standout one was the song I'm about to play.

In 1973, an American disc jockey by the name of Shad O'Shea was so depressed and disillusioned with the moral decay of the United States that he decided to record a protest song about it. The result was an apocalyptic lamentation, the likes of which had never been heard before and, odds are, will never be heard again. So many things make this song an unforgettable experience. There's the earnest narration, the plaintive echo at the end, the musical insertions that seemed to have wandered in from different recordings altogether. But the greatest thing about this song is that O'Shea tells us when the you-know-what will finally hit the fan. He doesn't give the exact date, but he does give the exact year, as well as the season. Which means you'll be able to prepare for society's collapse well in advance.

So without any further ado, here is Shad O'Shea with his masterpiece, "Goodbye Sam."

Audio: Goodbye Sam, Shad O'Shea