

Does God HATE Women?

Peter G Rambo, Sr., M.Div.
February 17, 2020

It is not uncommon to hear the charge, or at least the undertone, when discussing what Scripture has to say concerning male and female roles that God must hate women. I mean, He requires that they submit to their husbands, desires that they be under male headship and seems not to have a problem with polygynous marriages. At the same time, men appear to have much more freedom and self determination. What gives? Does God indeed hate women? Is He a misogynist?

A recent YouTube debate, specifically dealing with the topic of polygamy, yielded a very thought provoking comment that set my thoughts turning on a much broader scale regarding God's attitude toward women and *why* He has decreed what His Word says.

The comment is quoted below with very minor edits,

People accuse the Bible of being misogynistic by supporting polygamy. You have accepted this feminist falsehood, and have then proceeded to reject the clear words of scripture in order to try and make the Bible a little more palatable to the world. This is a serious mistake. The Bible allows polygamy - but it does so FOR THE BENEFIT OF WOMEN! Through most of history there was no social welfare. Widows and single mothers are provided for by God by allowing polygamy. This ensures that every woman can marry, every woman can access the support of a man and a wider family. No woman is left alone. Even in the aftermath of disasters like wars, that kill many of the male population, every woman can still marry.

Look around any church, see how many single women are there. See how they would all want to marry. See how many end up settling for marrying non-believers as they see no other alternative, or remain celibate even though they really want to be married as per God's original intention for mankind! He does not want men and women to be alone - yet monogamy forces women to be alone, because there are not enough good men to go around (especially after war).

God allows polygamy because He loves women. He regulates polygamy in Torah because He wishes to protect women - all His regulations of polygamy are for the benefit

of women (don't marry her sister to vex her, don't marry her daughter as that's even worse, don't neglect the first just because you've taken a second, etc). All of this is because God loves women!

To accept the idea that polygamy is anti-women and something to refute, is to say that the system God allowed and regulated to support women, is anti-women. It is to directly oppose the word of God, to directly oppose His provision for women.

When the Catholic church forbade polygamy, at least they established convents to give another option for the excess women that this policy would leave unable to wed. The modern Protestant church, and it seems the branch of Torah-followers that 119 represents, leaves them with no options at all. It gives them insufficient single Godly men for them to marry, says they can't marry non-believers, says they can't marry proven Godly men who are already married, and doesn't let them become nuns either. That's anti-women.

I'll stick with scripture, which gives every woman the opportunity to marry. Because God did not intend for people to be alone.

~ Samuel Dennis, used with permission

A New Perspective

Suddenly, I had a whole new perspective on God and Scripture.

Cognitively, I know God loves women because He loves everyone (though He may *really* hate what they *do*, i.e., sin...), but I had approached many of the stickier topics regarding male-female relationships in Scripture with a blind acceptance. I would say, 'that's just the way He says it is. If He says it, it must be good, so That's what I believe.' Many specific commands and decrees I could justify and explain with Scripture from an academic perspective, but that was often not satisfying to the person who perceived God as being unfair or misogynistic.

Dennis' comment opened a whole new line of thought to me as I read this debate on polygamy, a concept clearly allowed, even at points seemingly endorsed, by God. And, his answer has a much broader application to the whole of the gender role differences.

Consider how very right Dennis is! There was no social 'safety net' for a woman in ancient times. There was no government to give a hand out, whether food stamps or low income housing. A woman without a man or separate from a family unit, was in a very bad state of

affairs. And, if she had mouths to feed besides her own, she was in a *really* bad place. Practically speaking, *not* having a man and covering was an automatic sentence of poverty and possibly death whether by exposure or starvation.

Gender Population Imbalance

The truth is, throughout history, in nearly every place and time, women have always outnumbered men. Without polygamy *at least being allowed*, there would be *no protection* for many women. Consider these quotes regarding population imbalance from [*The Great Omission*](#), by Clyde Pilkington, Jr.

According to the 2000 United States Census there are 5.3 million *more* women in the United States than there are men. Think of the serious implications of this fact. Where will these 5.3 million women find husbands who will love and cherish them? (pg.13)

[Quoting Phillip Von Hohenheim, Physician (1493-1541)]

- Now it so happens that God has always created many more women than men. And He makes the men die more readily than the women. And, He always lets the women survive and not the men. (pg.14)

[Quoting Patricia Dixon, Professor]

- Males through all stages of the life span and across cultures die disproportionately more than females. Factors contributing to this are higher male infant mortality and premature death, due to occupational hazards and warfare.

[Quoting Adriana Blake, Attorney]

- For every one hundred single women of young marriageable age in the United States, there are fewer than seventy single men. As people get older, the statistics get worse. By age forty-five, for every one hundred available men, there are over two hundred single women.... When a society which insists on a one-to-one relationship in a marriage finds itself with a large surplus of membership of one sex, it behaves like a chemical mixture that has too many electrons. It is unstable, it is volatile, and it will seek change to a state of equilibrium...

Lauren Heiligenthal, in [*Evaluating Western Christianity's Interpretation of Biblical Polygamy*](#), demonstrates clearly that the entire African continent's family and social structure was seriously damaged, if not destroyed, by Christian missionary insistence that conversion to Christ required casting any additional wives out into the street. The result was rampant poverty, countless orphans, millions of single women who resorted to prostitution for survival and the AIDS

epedemic. Hindsight proves that the worst possible move that missionaries could have done was to force monogamy-only as a “Christian doctrine”, albeit a demonstrably false one.

While western culture has not had the shockwave of millions of women and children kicked to the curb, we have instead had a slow burn culturally created by the same false monogamy-only doctrines that disallow millions of single women, many with children, access to a godly man to provide for and protect them. It is a travesty of epic proportions to which the church turns a self-righteous blind eye.

Clearly, polygamy is *one* provision God specifically makes for women to insure they can be cared for and protected. Simply, a man, if he so chooses, can care and provide for more than one woman. Why? Because, *God loves women*, and men are His instrument of covering and protection.

Do not Muzzle the Ox

Sometimes the objection that then comes up sounds like, ‘Great, let a man take care of several women, he just doesn’t need to have relations with them.’ But, this doesn’t answer the more innate human need - that of being loved. Humans need to be loved and needed as much as they require food and water. It is the way God designed both men and women. To deny either physical or emotional needs is to deny needs.

It isn't sustainable or realistic to expect a man to take care of a woman as if she were a wife and not expect him to enjoy the benefits of doing so. This is a clear violation of the Torah principle in Deuteronomy 25:4, "You shall not muzzle the ox while he is threshing." Paul elaborated on this verse in 1 Timothy 5:18, adding to it that "The laborer is worthy of his wages," and in 1 Corinthians 9:7, "Who at any time serves as a soldier at his own expense? Who plants a vineyard and does not eat the fruit of it? Or who tends a flock and does not use the milk of the flock?"

Give Women Choices!

God, in His Word, is very detailed in His *protection of women* by placing boundaries on how they can be treated and ensuring that they are cared for properly. Dennis, in the original quote above, mentions numerous Scriptural commandments that regulate marriage, particularly in a plural situation for the protection of the women involved. God makes sure that they not only have *choices and access* to marriage, but that they are treated fairly within that optional provision.

What is most significant about Dennis' comments, besides the fact that polygamy offers protection and provision for every woman, is that she has *choices*. She doesn't have to 'settle for' whoever is available, but can look at *all men* and seek a suitable covering that is Godly and can best provide for her needs. Dennis' point is that a monogamy only culture denies women choice and denies women protection and provision. Protestantism, as he correctly points out, is guilty of the worst form of hate toward women by denying them the truth of what God's Word teaches and allows. Consider this part of his quote again,

The modern Protestant church, and it seems the branch of Torah-followers that 119 represents, leaves them with no options at all. It gives them insufficient single Godly men for them to marry, says they can't marry non-believers, says they can't marry proven Godly men who are already married, and doesn't let them become nuns either. That's anti-women.

What are single women to do? The 'church' bars them from the best righteous option available to them in Scripture while simultaneously chastising them for seeking any other option. 'Praying for their need' while preventing God's solution is the epitome of the Apostle James' argument regarding faith and works.

James 2:¹⁵ If a brother or sister is without clothing and in need of daily food, ¹⁶ and one of you says to them, "Go in peace, be warmed and be filled," and yet you do not give them what is necessary for *their* body, what use is that?

Conclusion

Are we willing to trust that God's ways are higher than ours?

We should be reminded that *it is not the government's responsibility* to care for widows and orphans. That is the responsibility of the Body! To do so, we *must* be willing to embrace and implement *all* of God's Word according to His provision for the care of women.

Correctly understanding, teaching, and accepting what God's Word says regarding polygamy empowers women and gives them choices within the Body for Godly covering, protection and provision. It is the very essence of demonstrating God's love of women and His concern for their needs, in spite of disparity in numbers of males and females. Indeed, God does *not* hate women. Rather, it is very clear that He provides a way for *all women* to be covered and cared for righteously and polygamy is *one* of those ways.

Therefore, it is not God who hates women, it is those who deny them one of the very best options in the Word for their provision and protection. It is those who demand a monogamy-only doctrine who deny and reveal, whether knowingly or unknowingly, a hate for women.

Additional resources:

113Restoration.com

BiblicalFamilies.org

Patriarchpublishinghouse.com

Patriarchsjournal.com

Natsab.com