CHAPTER II.

Male and Female Human Nature as Theory and as Reality: The Theory of Intersexes.

The Male Sex as Consistent, or as Symmetrical. One of the most popular and long-rooted notions in society is the idea that makes a man. the male human species. as distinguished from woman, decidedly more consistent and symmetrical as a type than the female one. If we group together what we are likely to think the most usual and normal masculine traits, putting them into a kind of "property list," we are likely to fancy that the contents of that list are completely approached by the majority of men around us, right and left. But suppose we examine carefully how far this conviction is borne out by facts?

The Ideal "Average" Man. We will say, for instance, that the typical "average" man is likely to be possessed of an independent nature. He should have decided impulses, mental and physical, toward aggressive action, a due sense of the moral perspectives of things, self-reliance, self-control enough for his own good. He should tend to reticence rather than talkativeness, Should disregard detail when a general result is in view. Should be of firm nervous poise, such as the average woman does not exhibit. He should feel especially an inborn, instinctive drawing of his sexual nature toward woman as the mysterious, natural completion of his individuality, both physical and psychical. Shall we accept this as a fair summary? Other details can be added, of course, but this will suffice. I do not lay stress here on the moral equipment, so much as upon the temperamental understructure: the outline of a kind of masculine birthright. The reader will please note, too, that I am expressly avoiding any emphases that will create an "heroic" type, offering the sort of ideal man met in Greek drama, in classic history, or in modern romance.

Similarly, let the reader frame for himself a merely physical masculinity: virile enough, but not at all ideal. We will not busy ourselves with a male type that externally would suit the frieze of the Parthenon, or storm through the pages of Northern Sagas and Malory. Roughly made up, let us picture only a strong frame, that is to say, strong in comparison with a woman's physique; with symmetry of outline, due proportions between head and body and limbs, ordinary aspects of a muscular development capable of endurance; and so on through the details of skin, texture, growth of hair and beard, quality of voice, gait, freedom of movement. All of these are traits that we take for granted as existing in a liberal preponderance among the members of a regiment, a club, or even a house-party, not to speak of the younger or older contingent at a cricket-match or in the crowd of a bank-holiday.

Reverting to the Actual Male Type. Now, after figuring out this type of a normal man, normally manly personality, inward and outward, the reader will please let his mind run over the list of his more intimate male acquaintance. How many of the men that he knows show a decided "working majority" of those traits, fundamental to a normal man' identity? Of the traits that are non-corporeal, how often do we find this or that friend falling short? Add in the list other qualifications: the discrepancies become blander. True self-reliance, aggressiveness, moral perspective, self-control, manly silence, the sense of trifles, as
trifles, of the important as the important, also the decided sexual instinct mentioned—does the widest circle of our acquaintance offer us many men that conform closely to these specifications? Is the reader of these pages a man? Let him review himself, to decide on his conscience, how far he is normal in the due measure. Is one at all struck by the fact that his ego, even if he has never remarked it before, is particularly deficient in essential details of psychical masculinity? With the same thoughtfulness, will the reader think over this or that group of his friends?—analyzing them narrowly, with regard to the outward and inward traits and manners I have set down. We are surprised to discover how continually we have friends and acquaintances that are more or less failures in the way of some plain characteristic that belongs to a manly personality. In fact, true, typical manliness, or, if the reader prefer another term, typical masculinity, seems all at once to be a far more elusive attribute than we had thought it. We are astonished to find how successfully a good many men pass for thoroughly masculine individualities who are imperfect examples of even quite commonplace models of men.

History, as emphatically male, exercising great influence on their associates as absolute men! In all classes and all epochs we meet curious discrepancies, startling inconsistencies, especially as we go upward, in the scale of aesthetic sensitiveness. We meet with the prince in whose nature the arrogance of Lucifer is contrasted with a want of dignity of character that would put to shame a peasant in a potters' shop. We find the great statesman who turns from the working-out of a treaty, or the fight over a great parliamentary measure, to adorn his mirror, or to concoct a wash for his complexion. We smile at the brave soldier who hates to go to bed in the dark, who quivers before a cat or a dentist. We come upon the eloquent divine, apparently much nearer heaven than earth, who has avowedly a master-passion, and to whom a sermon's table is a necessity. The philosopher who loses his temper as he loses his game of cards; the jurist that, off his bench, is stocked with unjust and silly prejudices; the athlete who embroiders; and the pugilist to whom a touch of fur is a nervous distress—all these are to be encountered. And yet we can go on. For, in the more aesthetic walks of life occurs striking temperamental inconsistencies from any perfect moulds of virility. There is the poet whose verse shakes the world with its vigor who cannot look you in the eyes, and who relishes feminine and sweet like a cocotte; the painter of roses and daffodils whose greatest recreation is a prize-ring or a bull-baiting; the composer of delicate harmonies who swears the obscene oaths of bargees; the religious allegorist who haunts the bull-fight. So could we proceed through thousand and examples of inconsistent male making-up; met in all civilizations, and of record in every public library.

We begin to wonder after we have thus reflected, what is the proportion of really manly, masculine, practical men in the world; if there ever has been a large proportion of them as we have taken for
granted. Does Nature so often stand up and say of her normal, usual male product, "This is a man!" The achieved male, whether as to his bodily structure, or his mental and moral and temperamental equipment appears suddenly to grow vague. Yet we have not been searching for ideals, for extraordinary assemblages of distinctive male qualities. We are only trying to find a well-rounded consistency, measured by accepted tests the world over.

A Distinctively Effeminate Male Type Is Not in Question. Let me anticipate a probable comment here: that an effeminat ed man, one effeminat ed mentally, morally, temperamentally and in his body, is never uncommon. But the reader must not confuse such distinctively, offensively effeminat ed types of man with a merely inconsistent one, as to this or that standard of male attributes. The man who in his physique, his intellect, his temperament, his tastes, his mannerisms and so on, peculiarly differs from the truer male standard, presenting obviously a general dissimilarity, is not the personality meant here. We are dealing with one that departs more subtly from a true man-type. Effeminacy in the male, as usually depicted and understood, we may regard as an extreme. It is likely to be particularly associated with the outward man, embodied in his physique, to plain observation. We are dealing more with the psychologic failure of a man to be adequately virile. For that matter, we need not yet bring specially concrete examples into our analysis.

The Average Female Ideal and Divergences from It. Suppose that we now turn from the masculinized feminine to the feminine. Let us think of woman as she is typified and realized, either past or present, in commonplace life. We cannot fail to remark the same sort of divergence from what we call essential womanliness, as in one respect or in another. Our study puts woman after woman more or less out of measure with the feminine symmetry we have a right to expect.

Make the tests again, those of both physiology and psychology. Opposed, for instance, to the accepted idea that the great majority of women are "dependent" in their attitude toward social existence. We find that every walk of life offers types that dominate social life, as a matter of course; floating many canons of intellectual, moral, and even physical relations to it; able to hold their own without struggle. Suppose we endow the "average woman" with theoretic characteristics marking her out. We expect her to be ordinarily not capable of dealing closely with the abstract; to act largely on impulse; to possess nervous energy rather than staying-power; to be uncommunicative; to have ideals as to moral attitudes rather than observances of them by herself; to shun responsibilities of the sort; and (once more important) we endow her with the sexual impulse of seeking her unity with a man and her surrender to him. In place of this type, we constantly encounter a feminine creature of predisposition for that is abstract; governed in personal relations to life by calm reflection; full of physical and mental endurance; aggressive and with even a pleasure in stressful activity. We find women deeply ethical and philosophic. We meet many who are indifferent to much that is a traditional and feminine world, such as their personal beauty, adornment, and their influence as to sex over men: binding the more or less marked dissimilarity from surrender to man, either physically or intellectually. We have analyses and intellectual independence: in a corset: the wife of life ardently carried on in a petticoat! Especially, is to be noted the instinctive absence of sexual instinct that such a woman shows toward a man. The outward physique of such women often does not conform to the correct and ideal female anatomy. The example can outline toward masculinity, as to build, height, features, mannerisms, now as to another: occasionally going so far to be hermaphrodite.
Some Instances of the Type of Masculinity We can select instances at random of the non-conforming woman that are historic; in Woomen, though we shall better understand the wide distribution of the variants when we come to ordinary and private-life examples, and to what they say of themselves, Deborah, Boudicca, Hypatia, Joan of Arc, Elizabeth of England, Christina of Sweden, Mary Somerville, Angela Postnovov, Franziska Skagatue, Anna Maria Scharman, George Sand, George Eliot, give clear traits of the kind sought. The bar, the clinic, the pulpit, the editorial-room, every branch of trade, many of the responsible interests of finance: the university, the gymnasiums, hunting-fields, shooting-boxes, even the army and navy—we have only to look about us to recognize this sort of woman that is only nominally womanly, according to correct prejodies. Let me take pains to remind the reader that I am not laying weight here any more than in speaking of the divergent and inconsistent male type, or what is essentially a physical departure. The unwomanish woman is often wholly feminine in externals, and conforms to them with more or less care. Nevertheless, outward unfeminines of a woman, when it is marked, has rather more significance in our study than has the externally unmasculine in a man.

The Emotional Inconsistencies in Men Whatever the other shortcomings from the correct standard of masculinity, it is in the emotional currents that a man shows to us often his most striking unconformity. These currents are the chief witnesses toward his male-sexual imprecation. Masculine geology is full of what are called "faults," discordant chemistry, mutinous strata. A man outwardly absolutely normal and regarded as of perfect normality of mind, can be a riddle to himself on account of his mysterious emotional eccentricity. A man conceals this, or anything else far better than can a woman, because the method is less superficial. Shakespeare's ejaculation, "O, what may man within him hide!" is newly understood, in considering biographical studies and confessions making part of the study. A man's whole existence, his schoolboy-days, college life, business or professional career, his travel hours, can easily be nothing so much as a comment on all that is most himself, psychologically. To it becomes a second nature, or rather a first one. The more carefully the student of masculine character makes a practical study, gives the right clues for his own sex, in all ranks and phases accessible to the average observer, the sooner he reaches a conclusion that a man's emotional center of gravity is a great deal more definite and stable than current impressions lead us to believe. We can even believe—sometimes—that mankind is likely to be far more the victim of emotional tendencies than are women. Under a well-tinted (frequently a splendidly sustained) dissimulation, intense reserves, veiled by pride or policy, there are sufferings from inherent temperament, organic crises, that are fearful to meet. The closed man may be the last to suspect them: may not he be the one that would wish to find such? In getting into touch with such veiled personal or even this book: liberally offers, we shall find in nothing a man more completely incomparable in his relation to common theories of male nature.

Example in We have thus alluded to the psychologicologic discrepancies that exist now, that ever existed, between received and popular ideals of each great sexual classes, and their current and innate. With this, we come face to face with a matter of first importance: of cosmic breadth of bearing. It is not new: in enlarging on it here I feel analyses and indeed the phrase of many a

Of one brilliant German theorist in particular,
There exists one striking principle of distinction between the works of Nature and the works of Art. Art completes what it undertakes, and therewith makes its products more or less independent from each other. But Nature has never made for us, and never will make, any one thing complete, detached from all other kinds, really independent and finished as a product, by itself. She refuses any labour that has nothing to do with the rest of her cosmic, cyclic, general scheme. Nature in all her work, here or there, is perpetually referring us back or forward to other creations; to things “the same yet not the same”; to the like but not the identical. Putting a little more into one expression of herself, a little less into another, often merely using the same materials in another recipe. Nature keeps on melting, fusing, half-melting, half-fusing; one set of her principles and products with another, almost as if in copious experiment, or as aiming toward some perfect and independent thing never to be realized. She works along an endless chain, full of inter-relationships: gracefully playing with what are not detached performances: from her hand but merely between-expressions. All is of more degrees, all, along her vast system of organic life.

Nature's Endless Unity.

Between whitest of men and the blackest negro stretches out a vast line of intermediate races as to their colours: brown, olive, red tawny, yellow. Between a protozoan and the most perfect development of the mamman, we trace a succession of dependent intersteps. From a fish to a giraffe we can establish a series of details that unites them as form of life: while each middle link has its own place. A tribute is at one end of Nature: a workshop: a Sophea, a Shakespeare, a Mozart: Beethoven is at the other: led to by cunning gradations from the other, strange but natural inter-relation revolts against conforming to details that seem obligations in kind and taste and conduct, crossings of what constitute sexual manhood and wo-
manhood, and their indispensable system of attributes, and if we were to take refuge in any sex other than two widely-parted extremes, Nature constantly demands of us why we have endowed our ideals of the two sexes with only such or such qualities; by what right we have gone on insisting that each specimen of sex in humanity must conform absolutely to two theories, must follow out two programmes only, or else be thought amiss, imperfect and degenerate. Why have we set up masculinity and femininity as processes that have not perfectly logical and respectable inter-steps? We have established, we have decked out, to our own ideas, just two sexes. Where presently we are confronted by what appears an abnormality in their expression we have said that that expression is imperfect, and to be repudiated. The fact is that we have lacked charter-right, guidance and warrant for our arrogance. Generation after generation, we have gone on judging humanity sexually without any full initial authority. Nature, on the contrary, all the while, ever has been striving patiently, silently, to remind us that we have been too narrow; that we called the exceptional, the abnormal, may be perfectly normal in its own right and entitled to its own independent place in nature and recognition in anthropology and society. In defining sex for instance, Nature would not permit us to forget that the physique of the unborn child so embodies the fullness of the traits of two sexes that the skilled anatomist cannot tell us whether the foetus should have been born a boy or a girl.

The Natural Intersexes. Thus become clear the inference, the conviction, the logical truth that evolves from the great major sexes that we recognize as distinctively “man” and “woman,” i.e., as the extreme masculine and the extreme feminine. These Intersexes are not physically obvious in the frank degree that we have already expected such natural differences would be exhibited. The average eye and mind have never learned how to look for them, though they are around us in their positive attributes. They are the less visible because their physical differences from the one or other removed sex toward which they incline, but which they do not attain, are not necessarily readily observable. Their subtle separation from their Over-sex begins in the inner planes, on that alone, constantly — the psychological, not the physical. What masks particularly its presence is that even the psychology stays in hiding; the mind must be trained to recognize its signs. Especially in the Intersexes: established, determined and excused. This is their master-separation, although other intermediate or less concerted and logical therein. Here are the half-steps, the between-beings. Intersexes express the half-steps, the between-beings. Their existence is as irrefutable as immemorial. For the world has narrowed-down mankind into two rows are at least two more than our traditional sexual spectrum has perceived and recognized; and primary importance always.

The Consequences. The theory of these Intersexes is likely to be startling to the layman, so as to be otherwise than as a fantasy, and begins to evince its practical bearing on the world’s social and individual life. We must reconsider many old ideas, especially many theories of the sexual inter-relations of all races and civilizations. Lifelong ideas, rooted and unshakenly are sapped under its chemistry. Intersexual humanity, in the “between-man” or “between-woman,” working out their own emotional lives helplessly and independently even while mocked and defamed, are not to be judged by pulpit or
statute-book, but by medical psychology. By noting else so arbitrarily, because not otherwise so accurately. Particularly must we throw away one long-established notion as to sex in the human race, in general.

Sex is Never to be Determined by the Physique. That special error is the idea that sex is determined by the physique. Physique is not, nor never should be, determinative of sex if man or woman or intersex. No—the one determinative, putting the stress on the word determinative, is the sexual instinct. Nothing else. Not the bodily organs and structures, nor the mental, the moral, the general emotional make-up of the human being, can stand out as a determinative before this one trait. Such details can coincide in a general effect; or they can (as so continually is the case) only help to conceal the true sex, to mislead us cunningly and elaborately; and, what is more, sometimes to deceive perfectly the very person most concerned, who is the unhappy subject of their masquerade.

Sex Determined by Sexual Instinct. We repeat it: sex is determined by the sexual instinct, sexual instinct; by the desire physical and psychical, of one human being for another, no matter what his or her bodily aspects and other endowment. Indeed, every other trait that we have been accustomed to accept as telling of what sex we or another fellow-creature may be. Nature hoodwinks and plays with us, or else gives us relatively superficial clues.

What are the Intersexes? Taking this series of conclusions as our guidance, let us re-distribute the human race sexually. To the one extreme and perfect masculinity, to the perfectly masculine yet not fully a man, the other sex, a man, and to the other extreme and perfect femininity, toward the typtic feminine yet not fully a woman, sex, a woman, we will add at least two Intersexes. These Intersexes partake of the natures and temperaments and individuals of both the male and the female, to one extent, to another. Departing from the first sex in proportion to the rest of mankind. These In-
CHAPTER III.

Alterosexual Love and Friendship:

Similisexual Love and Friendship.
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