

## CHAPTER II.

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

---

**The Male Sex as Consistent, or as Unsymmetrical.** One of the most popular and long-rooted notions in society is the idea which 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 quite completely is 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 frailer physique; with symmetry of outline, due proportion 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 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's identity? Of the traits that are non-corporeal, how often do we find this or that friend falling short! Add to the list other qualifications: the discrepancies become plainer. 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.

**Historic Masculinity Examined as to Psychology.** From the circle of our own acquaintance, we will turn to the pages of history, biography, memoirs, correspondence and travel. Also let us consider many sorts of literature, apart from obvious fiction, in which men have written themselves down in portraiture more or less sincere and true, or have so depicted others. The class of records I mean (and it is especially inclusive of the most intimate of human chronicles) is not to be mixed with conventional and second-hand studies of the kind, where the subject has been put into poses-plastiques by editors of more art than sincerity. Out of true human documents, what surprising divergencies from a fully masculine image in our minds do many men show! — having passed through the world, and into

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 pothouse. We find the great statesman who turns from the working-out of a treaty, or the fight over a great parliamentary measure, to adore 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 avarice as a master-passion, and to whom a gourmand'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 occur striking temperamental inconsistencies from any perfect moulds of virility. There is the poet whose verse shakes the world with its vigor and who cannot look you in the eyes, and who relishes champagne and sweets like a cocotte; the painter of roses and lilies whose greatest recreation is a prize-ring or a bull-fighting; 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 thousands of examples of inconsistent male making-up; met in all ages, 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, symmetrical men in the world; if there ever has been so large a 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 effeminated man, one effeminated mentally, morally, temperamentally and in his body, is never uncommon. But the reader must not confuse such distinctively, offensively effeminated 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 dissent, is not the personality meant here. We are dealing with one that departs more subtly from a true man-type. Effemacy 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.

**Of the Average Female Ideal and Divergences from It.** Suppose that we now turn from the masculine line 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, 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 uncombative; to have ideals as to moral attitudes rather than observations of them by herself; to shun responsibilities of every 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 the 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 part of the feminine world, such as their personal beauty, adornment, and their influence as to sex over men; including the more or less marked dissent from surrender to a man, either physically or intellectually. We have analyses and intellectual independence in a corset; the style of life ardently carried on in a petticoat! Especially, is to be noted the instinctive absence of sexual interest 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 be given toward masculinity, as to build, height, features, mannerisms, now as to another; occasionally going so far as to be hermaphroditic.

**Some Instances of the Type of Masculinity in Woman.** We can select instances at random of the non-conforming woman that are historic; 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, Boadicea, Hypatia, Joan of Arc, Elizabeth, of England, Christina of Sweden, Mary Somerville, Angela Postovoitov, Franziska Skanagatta, Anna Maria Schurman, 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 prejudices. 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, on 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 unfeminineness 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 imperfection. 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

think him hide!" is newly understood, in considering biographical studies and confessions making part of a study. A man's whole existence, his schoolboy-days, his university life, business or professional career, his married hours, can easily be nothing so much as a contentment of all that is most himself, psychologically. To him 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 clews 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 male humanity is likely to be far more the victim of emotional tendencies than are women. Under a well-learned (frequently a splendidly sustained) dissimulation, with intense reserves, veiled by pride or policy, there are hidden sufferings from inborn temperamental causes, and emotional crises, that are fearful to meet. The closest friend may be the last to suspect them; may be the last one that the sufferer would wish to find suspected. In getting into touch with such veiled personal life, as even this book liberally offers, we shall find that in nothing is a man more completely inconformable than in his relation to common theories of male psychology and nature.

**Example in** We have thus alluded to the psychological discrepancies that exist now, that ever existed, between received and popular ideals of each of the two great sexual classes, and their current and changing. With this, we come face to face with a matter of the first importance; of cosmic breadth of bearing. It is not new; in enlarging on it here I am following analyses and indeed the phrase of many a theorist—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 never has 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 capricious experiment, or as aiming toward some perfect and independent thing never to be realized. She works along an endless chain, full of interrelationships; gracefully playing with what are not detached performances from her fine hand but merely between-expressions. All is of mere 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 intermediary races as to their colours: brown, olive, red tawny, yellow. Between a protozoan and the most perfect development of the mammalia, 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 trilobite is at one end of Nature's workshop; a Spinoza, a Shakespeare, a Beethoven is at the other; led-to by cunning gradations. Nature can "evolve" an onion into a philosopher, or a mollusk to a prime-minister. The spectrum is a chain. From violet and indigo into scarlet, there is nothing but

succession of gradient hues. Each link is, in paradox, a matter of dependence on the whole system, yet of independence: part of its nearer neighbours, while having right to be accounted relatively separate and responsible by itself. There is no absolute darkness: there is no absolute light. There is no absolute heat, no absolute cold. In fact, Nature abhors the absolute, delights in the relative. We have no right to consider any of her works as a link; though we are logically bound to give them fractional autonomy. Hence, equally by logic, we must be on our guard against quarrelling with it. It "ought to be" more complete toward genus, toward type, than it is. For, Nature is continually rebuking our narrow, proud, perverse definitism. She asks: "We are so exact, we do not blame the dawn for being rosy instead of glowing white, do not throw contempt on the hedge-rose because it lacks the peculiar colours of so many stately garden-beauties; do not scold the bull because he does not boast the antlers of the stag; do not despise the ostrich because it has not the wings of the eagle; do not think that the terrible beauty of the tropical serpent is ruined since it has not even the legs as the tiniest lizard; do not reject as defective and incomplete and hesitant in the evolution of life such intermediaries as we find in the platypus, the manatee, the whale, the quadrumana, in even the most complex and complex and firmly-elaborated creations." Every where we encounter borrowings from one form from the other, strange but natural inter-relations that revolts against conforming to details that seem to be obligations in kind and taste and conduct, crossings and mixings that seem natural boundaries, whole kingdoms of life that are constituted in an allowed and eternal rebellion from a law.

**Human Speculative Theoretic Names.** We must thus dismiss some popular notions of what constitutes sexual manhood and wo-

manhood, and their indispensable system of attributes, as being 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 have we lacked charter-right, guidance and warrant for our arrogance. Generation after generation, we have gone on, judging humanity sexually without 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 what we call the exceptional, the abnormal, may be perfectly normal, mature to itself and entitled to its own independent place 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 for many weeks 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 cyclic Nature has always maintained in the human species a series of graduated and necessary Intersexes, between the two 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

usually expected such natural differences would be expressed. 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 noted 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 noted. Their subtle separation from their Over-sex begins on a higher plane, on that alone, constantly — the psychological, not physical. What masks particularly its presence is that even the psychology stays in hiding; the mind must be trained to recognize its signs. Especially where Intersexes established, determined and excused, we find a supremely natural factor in them—the sexual inter-relationship. This is their master-separation, although other factors are more or less concurrent and logical therein. Intersexes express the half-steps, the between-beings whose existence is as irrefutable as immemorial. For the world has narrowed-down mankind into two sexes, there are at least two more than our traditional biological spectrum has perceived and recognized; and of primary importance always.

**Consequences.** The theory of these Intersexes is likely to be startling to the layman, as soon as we begin to consider its practical bearings; on the world's social conditions it has much in it revolutionary of social, individual life. We must reconsider many old theories, especially many theories of the sexual inter-relationship, all races and civilizations. Lifelong ideas, rooted in the mind, suddenly are sapped under its chemistry. Intersexual humanity, in the "between-man" or "between-woman" working out their own emotional and intellectual life helplessly and independently even while mocked and despised therefor, 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 to be *determined* by the physique. Physique is not, and never should be, determinative of sex in 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 structure, not the mental, the moral, the general emotional making-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 unlucky subject of their masquerade.

**Sex Determined.** We repeat it: sex is determined by the sexual instinct; by the desire physical and psychological, of one human being for another, no matter what his or her bodily aspects and other endowment. In 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 masculine sex, a man, and to the other extreme and perfect feminine sex, a woman, we will add at least two Intersexes. These Intersexes partake of the natures and temperaments and physiques of both the male and the female, now to one extent, now to another. Departing from the first sex

we establish a second and "intersexual" sex, known in European medico-psychologic literature as the Uranian, or Uranian sex. The name is derived from the classic of the "Venus Urania", and from the Platonic notions concerning a mystic "nobler Venus" the divine class of similisexual, passionless loves, especially beloved by males' re-affirming the theory of there having been not only one single human sex of old; that only later came to subsist two types with their separate sexual natures in mankind, each by divine insinuation; We next may wish to re-establish, a third sex, or intersex, called the Uraniad, which refers to the feminine, but more feminine sexually masculinized; of which sex many "man-seeming" women are members. Last, we place the perfectly feminine sex, its extreme, the woman as we have long recognized her. The arrangement of these sexes makes the sorting of the two "intersexes" thus, has been questioned. There are subtle and interesting arguments for putting the Uranian, or masculine intersex, first, as the first and completest of the sexes known, and the Uraniad as an intersex; at the same time relegating the Uranian type as commonly met, to the merely intersexual class. There is also a considerable line of finer intersexual distinctions and types, adjusted by various psychia- tric methods, which makes the list of intersexes exceed the four usually published. But for all ordinary purposes the re- sult is to four, and the foregoing adjustments are suf-

These two Intersexes named here as the Uranian and Uraniad, the one partaking most of the outwardly outwardly masculine yet not fully a man, the other toward the typic feminine yet not fully woman, are indisputably a blend of the two extreme sexes, and more or less indisputably entitled to recognition as individual rights; each exists now as ever in a most important proportion to the rest of mankind. These In-

tersexes are constantly working-out about us, with or without social recognition and sanction, their own sexual instincts. Too often such types are not only unknown to their fellow-men for what they are, but also too often not known to — themselves. Especially do we find them the victims of sexual repression, seekers after a sexual expression that they cannot obtain without disgraces, dangers, and crimes. Not less especially are they petitioners for at least a tentative, a cautious consideration and tolerance, social and legal; fugitives from miseries and injustices which an unreasoning and ill-informed world, with its tendency to generalize, has far too little suspected. It is true that they present inevitably and often painfully, whether taken as individuals or as classes, many traits, claims, theories, impulses, practices, deviations from the more or less normally human, which cannot be tolerated in ethics and social life by even philosophic justice however dispassionate. They have sex-idioms that repel and terrify us, no matter how elastic is our human sympathy. But admitting all which will deepen around them this undeniable shadow, the fact remains that a great proportion of Intersexual lives are led and probably for a long time to come must be led, under a sexual, social and moral ban that blots our human civilization. Day by day is continued about us, no matter with what outward serenity a chronicle of underserved martyrdom that can be dramatic beyond any description in its emotional currents, demanding relief by a psychiatric enlightenment not yet more than begun.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### Alterosexual Love and Friendship: Similisexual Love and Friendship.

---

defined. Before we enter further upon analyses of Eros and Uranian and Uranian Intersexes, some considerations of this chapter and its successor will be of importance to those who for the first time find themselves analytically sexual feelings.

Love, as distinguished from other human emotions, and as distinguished from friendship, is the attraction exerted on one human being over another through the intensity of our aesthetic sensitiveness; the quality of the object, more or less refined, for beauty. The feeling distinguishes our wish to *possess* the object of love by physical connection with ourselves. We unite ourselves to the being that we love, as far as possible by a physical nearness. At the moment we seek often to give ourselves up, in an absolute personal surrender. The two impulses, the wish to possess, and the impulse to surrender, are inextricably bound together in real love, and as a rule cannot be parted. The wish for possession, the impulse to give ourselves as we are, must be both physical and psychical, if one is to feel the fullest mystery of love as a passion. If the attachment be only physical it is not perfect love, if it be only psychologic, if we do not feel so much the physical possession, nor feel the surrender ourselves as a matter of course in at-