

**POLYGAMY.**

Emotional ignorance seems constantly in need of something sensational to stimulate its insatiable palate. Ecclesiasticism and politics generally supply the stimulant for this morbid appetite. At present, as is frequently the case, ecclesiasticism and politics have formed a combine or trust. Anti-mormonism is the ecclesiastics-political fad. Strange bedfellows! Corruption is the bed most to their liking. The father of lies often occupies it with them. An unholy trinity! The result of this union is an abortive misconception. Robertsism, or anti-mormonism, is a form of religio-political persecution. It is the old, old story, persecution for opinion's sake. It is in accord with our greatest danger. The political fad of today is really not anti-polygamy, not anti-imperialism. It is anti constitutionalism. It is anarchy. The seeds of revolution are being strewn broadcast by misnamed statesmen and so called reformers. They find fruitful soil in a people gone mad with emotional ignorance in the shape of pseudo-religion and false patriotism. Robertsism and Deweyism are forms of emotional insanity in opposite, not opposing, directions. The devil of ignorance has found means to unite the forces. This anti-polygamy crusade is ecclesiastical, not religious. It is political, not constitutional. Ecclesiastics generally know a little of true religion as politicians do of statesmanship.

**Anti-Mormonism Not Christian.**

It is not Christian if "the essence of Christianity is brotherly love." There is nothing of "the sweet spirit of love" in it. On a somewhat similar occasion one Jesus asked his fellows: "Which among you will cast the first stone?" Can Christian monogamy, with its notorious promiscuity in its sexual indulgences, cast the first stone at Mormon polygamy? Polygyny or promiscuity, is far more plentiful in Christian United States than in Mormon Utah. There are monogamous fathers in New York, Washington, Boston, and Chicago whose promiscuity has extended over hundreds of women during their married life. There are national fathers in Washington and elders in the Christian church whose polygynian lives would put to shameful insignificance the polygamy of the most polygamous Mormon elder. There are far more immoral Brighams parading under the colors and protection of Christianity than Brigham Young or Brigham Roberts. There are congressmen who indulge in promiscuous polygyny at the expense of the people, their mistresses being in the employ of the government and owing their positions to the favor of their congressional protectors. Why then cast these stones at Mormon polygamy while our monag-

amous skirts are so polluted with promiscuous polygyny?

**Polygamy as Natural as Monogamy.**

THE CONSERVATIVE is not interested in entering upon a crusade in favor of polygamy. It is interested in calling to mind a few seemingly unrecognized facts. Polygamy is not of the devil nor is there necessarily any thing satanic in it. Monogamy is not of Heaven nor is it infallibly Heavenly in its results, even though it has a self-claimed infallible church to uphold and bless it. Both are natural, even as all things are the result of natural necessity. Polygamy and monogamy are social institutions, the result of economical necessity. Were the statistics of the human world accurately at command polygamy would be found to largely predominate over monogamy. If there is anything sacred in the modern fad for antiques, polygamy has the advantage of age and numbers over monogamy. If the exact facts were known we should probably be horrified at finding that the primitive natural condition of promiscuous polygyny far outnumbered both polygamy and monogamy.

**Promiscuous Polygyny the Primitive Condition.**

Whoever knows himself knows that polygyny is the natural condition of man as well as the majority of male mammals. The sexual irritability of the male is practically insatiable during the years of virility. Medically speaking it is one of the tests of virility; the primary one, especially to the mind of the patient. Monogamous promiscuity or polygyny finds its origin in male insatiability and the economical ability to gratify it, as well as the necessities of unfortunate women in the struggle for existence. Polygamy developed out of promiscuous polygyny, as did monogamy out of polygamy, is a result of economical necessity.

**Marriage a Social Institution.**

Marriage is not a religious institution, though ecclesiasticism has sought to make it so, that the ecclesiastics might benefit by the fees and the church hold the people in its chains by terrorizing their superstitious ignorance. Marriage is a strictly social institution. The social purpose in marriage was and is to fix male responsibility for the results of its sexual gratifications—the children. The primary purpose was to lessen the number of children produced, which could only be done by making the male responsible for the results of his sexual indulgences. The only way to reach monogamous promiscuity effectively is to give all children the same paternal rights to support and inheritance, whether born in wedlock or not.

Marriage is the recognized or legalized union of a man with one or more women under conditions which make the man responsible for the support of his wife,

or wives, and for their children. Polygamy is as much a form of marriage as monogamy. Monogamy is a more moral or better form of marriage only as it reaches the desired ends better. A few years since a newspaper, journal and pulpit fad was:

**"Is Marriage a Failure?"**

The only correct answer was never given. As the occasion to the institution of marriage was to lessen the competition or severities of the struggle for existence, so the only test of marriage is today, as then: does it increase or lessen the individual severities of the struggle for existence? The question of the actual status of married women outside this one question is of very little importance. The only actual test of marriage is, are the children born under one form, say polygamy, better fitted for the struggle for existence than those born under another form, say monogamy? A critical study of this question might prove interesting and instructive. Under an exact revision of the question of marriage it must be said that every marriage is a failure where there are children born mentally or physically unfitted, or made so by parental indulgence or neglect, to maintain themselves according to the standard of survival in the environment they are born into. Childless marriages have the same standards. If they lead to a self-maintaining survival of the parties united they are a success; if they do not they are failures.

Love might be defined as the ability of a man and woman to live together to mutual strengthening in the struggle for existence, so far as marriage is concerned. This definition will not probably suit the emotionally insane.

**Marriage the Natural Result of Promiscuity.**

Promiscuity was the natural sexual relation in the most primitive social conditions. In the blood-relationship commune there were mothers, but no fathers. The children belonged to the commune. Polygamy was the primitive attempt to restrict procreation. So long as man was socially nothing but a nomadic family, clan or commune, with no fixity of abode and in constant struggle with other similar communes, the struggle for existence, the roaming life, and all its vicissitudes, gave a more than sufficient equalization to the dangers of over-population. Individual survival was dependent on clan solidarity, as clan solidarity was dependent on individual multiplication. There was little or no opportunity for over-population or survival of unfits under such severe conditions. But, when some clans became stronger than others, and greater territory became necessary and the weaker clans were driven out or subjected, it dawned on men that continual roaming