

## Culture Clash: Sexual Monogamy vs. Polyandry

Patrick Fagan, Ph.D.

### Summary

The “monogamous” and the “polyamorous” cultures have totally different approaches to life, with religious worship and monogamous marriage being the defining differences in their different approaches to the sexual act. Coexistence necessitates that the differences be observed by giving parents of both cultures control over the programs that cause conflict: education, adolescent health, and sex education. Monogamous men need to act to obtain this for the sake of their own children.

*The following speech was given by Pat Fagan to the World Congress of Families in Amsterdam on August 12, 2009. The World Congress of Families is the world’s largest conference of pro-family leaders and grass-roots activists.*

### Monogamy and polyandry

**The culture of the traditional family** is now in intense competition with a very different culture. The defining difference between the two is the sexual ideal embraced. The traditional family of Western civilization is based on lifelong monogamy. The competing culture is polyamorous, normally a serial polygamy both before and after the first marriage, but also increasingly polymorphous in its different sexual expressions.

I hope there is an elegance in the simple distinction between the ideals that distinguish the two cultures: monogamy and polymorphous serial polygamy, or “polyamory” for short.

In between these two cultures lies the welfare state and its operational bureaucracy. The question is how this state bureaucracy can serve these two very different cultures.

The complexities of modern life, driven mainly by constant new technologies, give rise to many dangers to individual and common good that were not present in earlier history.

New, complex chemicals can be very dangerous, and bureaucracies ensure they are used safely for the common good; so, too, with cars, highways, aircraft, airports, atomic energy, pharmaceuticals, food distribution, and waste disposal. These physical domain bureaucracies help protect the common good and individual safety by regulating how we harness the physical world today.

But the work and nature of bureaucracies change when in the realm of protecting human beings from their own shortcomings.

These behavioral (social) bureaucracies deal with eliminating poverty, reducing crime and addictions, and also with the downsides of sexuality gone wrong (unwanted pregnancies, infectious diseases).

By and large, the culture of polyamory today embraces the behavioral bureaucracy, while the culture of monogamy has increasing disagreements with it. This is understandable and unavoidable when the differences between the two cultures are examined.

The culture of monogamy and the culture of polyamory differ in profound assumptions on the way society functions. Some of the differences are:

First and foremost, religion has a very different place in both cultures. The culture of monogamy is infused from top to bottom with the sacred, in personal, family, community and national life. Worship of God is frequent and assumed. The culture of polyamory tends much more to hide religion, even to suppress it in all things public. It worships God less and demands religion be private.

The culture of monogamy views freedom as the freedom to be good while for the culture of polyamory freedom views freedom as having no constraints imposed on you.

Thus, in the culture of monogamy, insight and intellect are paramount for knowing the good that has to be pursued, while, in the culture of polyamory, what is paramount is the will to do what one likes.

In metaphysics, the culture of monogamy tends towards a belief in objective truth—that reality exists and can be known, while the culture of polyamory tends towards a relativist and an ideological understanding of truth—that reality results from an imposition of the will.

In morals, the culture of monogamy tends towards universal moral norms, while the culture of polyamory embraces moral relativism.

The language of virtue sits well with the culture of monogamy but uncomfortably with the culture of polyamory.

The laws of the culture of monogamy protect by forbidding—outlawing—certain actions. The culture of polyamory protects by prescribing programs and ensuring outcomes.

Above the floor of the forbidden, the culture of monogamy leaves all goals and actions freely available to everyone. The polyamorous culture, having less of a floor, constantly increases prescriptive and regulatory detail, telling people more and more how they must act.

The laws of the culture of monogamy are designed to protect one's capacity to pursue legitimate goods of one's choice (and they are myriad) but those of the culture of polyamory are designed to guarantee particular outcomes for everyone.

The constitutional state was the product of a monogamous culture; it could never have emerged from a culture of polyamory. It assumes responsible citizens. The expanding social welfare state is the product of the culture of polyamory and is increasingly hostile to the culture of monogamy. It is created for less responsible citizens.

Regulations are minimal in the culture of monogamy because laws, stated clearly in the negative ("Thou shalt not"), require minimal regulatory interpretation. The culture of polyamory through programs and policies aimed at outcomes and safety nets, enumerates what must be done not only that which may not be permitted.

The culture of monogamy, built on appetite constraint, has little need for a behavioral bureaucracy. The culture of polyamory, designed as a safety net not only for the unlucky but the unrestrained, increasingly relies on social welfare programs to rescue its adherents from the effects of its form of sexuality. Without its net, the culture of polyamory would collapse of its own weight and disorder.

The culture of monogamy, by being child-oriented, is future-oriented and full of hope: the child is protected and the next generation, the future of the country, is the main focus of the society's work. For the culture of polyamory, the present welfare of adults is its main focus.

In the culture of monogamy **all human life is sacred and protected**, be it the pre-born, the handicapped, or the elderly. In the culture of polyamory, about one third of the pre-born are killed by their mothers, and the handicapped and elderly are unwelcome and increasingly vulnerable to early elimination.

The culture of monogamy is built around the traditional, natural family for its protection. In the culture of polyamory, the traditional—natural—family is just one option among many and often considered a nuisance because of its claims to special difference and superior effectiveness.

Most noteworthy for political discourse: In the culture of monogamy, **men are anchored in their families and tied to their children and wives, through the free and deliberate focus of their sexuality.** In the culture of polyamory, which treasures sexual freedom or license, such sexual constraint by men or women is not expected nor **is any attempt to foster such acceptable,** for such would be the antithesis of the main project of the culture of polyamory: polymorphous sexuality whenever desired.

The culture of polyamory, contrary to the claims of radical feminists, aggressively fosters the male they most decry: the sexually and physically harassing, the abusing and abandoning male. Being the natural cost of its defining project, these and related dysfunctions justify and necessitate more safety nets.

In sum, in the culture of monogamy men not only are anchored, they are **required** to be so. In the culture of polyamory, women are the anchors while men can drift or be cast adrift, as desired, and they do so in very large numbers.

In the culture of monogamy, gender roles are more differentiated, with women more fertile and likely to give more of their time to the tasks of motherhood, while the men are likely to be the sole or the main source of family income. The culture of polyamory is much more androgynous, its main focus being **equality of outcomes for both men and women in the workplace and in the home.**

The culture of polyamory cultivates strong girls (a good) but at the cost of weaker boys (not a good).

For the public purse, the culture of monogamy is inexpensive; the culture of polyamory is very expensive.

## How can these two cultures live together in the same political order?

**Is it possible for these two cultures to live together in the same political order?** This is the political question which defines our day. Over and above the differences just delineated, two issues leap to the fore in their political consequences:

- In population, the culture of monogamy is fertile and expanding, while the culture of polyamory is below replacement and contracting.
- The culture of monogamy is inexpensive, while the culture of polyamory is very expensive.

Despite these two seeming “killer conclusions,” and contributing significantly to the tension between the two, whether by happenstance or deliberate design, the culture of polyamory has figured out **its** way to survive and even thrive. It does so by controlling three critical areas of public policy, which yield big gains in “converts” from the culture

of monogamy to theirs. These three are childhood education, sex education, and the control of adolescent health programs.

Controlling these three expands the polyamory culture's reach into the traditional monogamous culture and gradually dismantles it, especially when aided by the entertainment industry, which today especially, is a very powerful institution aligned with the culture of polyamory with a massive operative bias against the monogamy culture.

By controlling these three areas (education of children, sex education, and adolescent health), the culture of polyamory diminishes the influence and dismantles the authority and influence of parents of the culture of monogamy, particularly in their ability to form their children as members of their own culture. In a polemical vein, one could say they “snatch” children away from their parents and from the culture of monogamy in ways analogous to the Ottoman Turks of the 14<sup>th</sup> century who raided boys from Christian nations to train them as their own elite warriors, the Janissaries.

This “snatching” is almost complete when these three program areas result in adolescents accepting and engaging in sexual intercourse.

Every time the polyamorous (anti-monogamy) programs and the media succeed in drawing teenagers into sexual activity they have captured another “Janissary” and won a number of victories simultaneously:

- The adolescent has been initiated into the polyamorous culture (albeit without knowledge of what is at stake) by having his first sexual experience outside of marriage;
- With the out-of-wedlock births or abortions that follow, they have broken the family before it has started, solidifying the polyamorous stature of the adolescent or young adult;
- And, especially, they have pulled the young person away from participating in the sacred, because formerly religious teenagers who begin to engage regularly in sex outside of marriage tend to stop worshipping God.

All this the culture of polyamory achieves without any overt, direct attack. It is silent, subtle, but very substantive in its victories and outcomes. And they know it, and are fierce in protecting their control of these programs, with fierceness nothing in the culture of monogamy rivals in intensity or success.

For instance, in the United States of the last decade, the rise of abstinence education—monogamy education—immediately galvanized the institutions of the culture of polyamory in the U.S. into massive political counter-attack, culminating in their recent victory which eliminated federal funding for such programs. This came to pass despite all the good that came with abstinence, including reducing teenage abortions, out-of-wedlock births, and sexually transmitted diseases, while increasing educational attainment.

In Europe, where the culture of polyamory has greater sway, the clearest illustration of its continuing advance is the attack against the monogamy culture's last bastion of effectiveness—home-schooling and home rearing, either in early childhood (up to six years of age) or throughout even longer periods of childhood. In home-schooling, the big three programs (education, adolescent health, and sex education) are all under the control of the parents, and, we know from U.S. data of some depth, yield outcomes far superior to what the state-controlled programs can yield.

## How can the monogamous family survive and thrive in this postmodernist (polyamorous) social welfare state era?

State-controlled programs today in developed countries, almost universally, are polyamorous-friendly and monogamy-hostile. This is unjust from every perspective of political analysis, because those who choose monogamy are, generally, the most effective, the cheapest, and the safest in raising the next generation.

But they are unjust, mainly, because it is a universal, inalienable right of parents to raise their children as they see fit, including raising them in their culture.

Further, the social welfare state asks the monogamous to support the polyamorous, and uses the universal safety net insurance scheme (or taxes) to ensure that the monogamous pay more to support those who choose the polyamory culture. This is plainly unjust, but even more so because the monogamous do not have their own culture-friendly programs and their own children are the target of the culture of polyamory's "Janissary" scheme. Justice will increase and tensions decrease when that culture of polyamory begins to pay its own costs.

One way to progress in this direction and to make the behavioral bureaucracy to serve both cultures is to give all parents, parents of both cultures, and control over the program money set aside for their children. That is giving parents vouchers, in one form or another, for all three program areas.

The social welfare safety net will still be in place but the parents (be they monogamous or polyamorous) will choose who holds the net in place for their children.

This requires a huge political effort on the part of the monogamy culture. It will require diverting the flow of money from the special interest groups (organized doctors, teachers, schools) and instead directing the voucher money (cost per child served) to the parent—who can then choose the individual doctor, teacher, or school they want. The professionals will still receive the same amount of money. But instead of serving a bureaucracy, they will be cooperating with the parents. Such a change is a big one in the political order, and the culture of monogamy must harness itself to the task.

By its very make-up, the culture of monogamy organizes itself bottom-up, not top-down in social (and thus political) matters. It solves its social problems by forming its own private “platoons.” And in the protection of the family, men have the special role of being the primary protector. Thus, in this political competition for peaceful coexistence, the male needs to especially engage the increasingly hostile state and the polygamy culture whenever it “raids” the territory of his family’s domain.

Every male in the monogamy culture, and especially every father, will find his way to be engaged in this protection of his children, and, given what is at stake, other men and women of the culture of monogamy will increasingly expect this of every man.

Monogamous man will be expected to fight for control over is what is his and his family’s just due, what his taxes fund, and what he can use in raising his children: control over the three big programs of childhood education, sex education, and adolescent health programs, so that they can be carried out in a way that supports the norms of the culture of monogamy. In this rearrangement, parents of the culture of polyamory have the same control to do as they wish for their children.

In this way, both cultures can live together with much greater ease and peace.

Now, we are tasked with gathering, planning, and exhorting each other and drawing to our side not only monogamous men but the fathers of good will in the culture of polyamory, for their children will also benefit from their having control over the big three programs.

However, first let monogamous men get serious about being men: protecting their own families by obtaining for them the same resources that the polyamorous are given for their children.

The culture of monogamy has never encountered this type of competition ever before in all of human history. We must engage, if we are to have equality and the peace that comes with it. We can wait no longer; we need men of courage and energy. We are looking for the first few.