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-ideas that repel and terrify us, no matter how elastic is our human sympathy. But admitting all which will deepen around them this undesirable 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 out 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.

As distinguished from other human emotions, only as distinguished from friendship, is the attitude entertained on one human being over another through the agency of our aesthetic sensitiveness; the quality of an object, more or less refined, for beauty. The feeling that expresses distinctly our wish to possess the object we love by physical connection with ourselves. We often renounce ourselves to the being that we love, as much as possible by a physical nearness. At the same time, we seek often to give ourselves up, in an act of personal surrender. The two impulses, the wish and the impulse to surrender, are inextricably linked, and as a rule cannot be parted. The one for possession, the impulse to give ourselves as we wish, must be both physical and psychical, if one is to feel the fullest mystery of love as a passion. The other, just as it be only physical it is not perfect love, and as a rule cannot be parted. The demand for possession, the impulse to give ourselves as we wish, must be both physical and psychical, if one is to feel the fullest mystery of love as a passion. Therefore we surrender ourselves as a matter of course in at-
taining it, then again we do not fully love. There must be the duality of feeling.

Friendship. Now, friendship, as that feeling is commonly understood, does not include this dual desire: this seeking for physical possession. Friendship sometimes hardly demands large psychic possession, or feels a profound spiritual self-surrender. The physical thrill is not of it, no matter how ardent may the friendship be. Logically and clearly, friendship is divorced from the sexual attraction so inseparable from love, and from love's great master-principle of attraction. Our intense admiration of the mere beauty of a man or woman, that is to say of what seems to us their beauty, is not determining in friendship. Hence friendship can never be as vivid and mastering a power, not to say passion, as love. The latter ever remains the most vivid, mysterious and elementary emotion of the human race.

Similisexual Friendships. If friendship be free from real love-emotion, then friendship will be found to reach its truest expression between individuals of the same sex. It represents thus what we will call "similisexual friendship". I am not disparaging here warm and dispassionate friendships between the opposite sexes, constantly met. and so-called (by a term long misused) "Platonic" in their nature. In place of that phrase we will call these "heterosexual friendships," But, no matter how firm and deep are countless instances of heterosexual friendships between persons of the opposite sexes, they do not compare favourably with similisexual friendships. Too frequently they attack elementary purity of the sentiment. Frequently also are they more or less sustained with self-deceptions: no matter what arguments and examples may bring against such a charge. We shall find it needful presently to question nicely the nature of many heterosexual friendships.

We shall be obliged also to question, even more sharply, the close study of the Uranian and Uraniad life, the roster of many similisexual ties, whether between men, men, or women and women; and our conventional notions, of them are likely to be changed before the analysis of this study will be finished. The whole theory of ideal Platonic friendships, of psychic ties of hetero and similisexual kind, is ill-sustained by realities in human-nature and human history. The finest, most unalloyed friendship may be similisexual; even if we admit presently, in a sort of paradox that many relationships seeming precisely as friendship are not so; many that seem not so being really such.

Must the Desire be a Desire There is no grossening of human-nature, no injustice to the finer psyche qualities when we accept the idea that love from one human toward another must include the wish to possess physically, and the yearning to give oneself, physically. We are such a rule seems to accentuate the merely human state in man, we cannot get far away from the idea. If we are honest with ourselves and humanity in our thoughts, we will not try to get away from it. Love must not be the sexual desire, the wish for physical possession. So long as we cannot desire clearer than the place of the brute-world in the mysterious scheme of Nature we need not be too conservative in admitting ourselves as animals in many instances. Here may be noted, apropos of the brute-world, that love between beasts is a sentiment much less often than is one or other degree of sexual admixture and attraction. Interesting examples of friendships of brutes, wild or domestic, are often met; but they are proportionate to the tendency of animals toward this relationship through heterosexual love, or similisexual ties will be touched on later.
"Natural Affections." In speaking of human love, we must differentiate in it certain strong affections, often called love—maternal love, filial love, fraternal love, and so on. Such sentiments however spontaneous, deep, and pure, are not love, as that sentiment really is, and as it should be distinguished from all non-sexual phases of our regard. Parental, filial, fraternal affections are called "love" only by a thousand-year-old looseness of idea and terms. Such sentiments ought to be classed more popularly as "natural affections" just as by that term, they are classed legally. However beautiful, they are far less certain, less genuine, less obscure and less mysterious than love. They refer rather to friendship. They lack the essential sexual note, the desire for possessing beauty. Indeed we may grade the various kind of human sentiments that we feel for our fellow-beings as thus: love, friendship, natural affection, friendly human interest.

Similosexual Love. The instant that the physical desire, with or without a concurrent spiritual desire, springs up in us, stirred to life by a quickening sense of physical beauty in the object of our interest, then there cannot be a logical question of our sentiment being more than mere strong friendship, or more than a minor "natural affection." We are in the presence of passioned sexual love of such love in its lighter or more vehement character, or perhaps, but of erotic love. It is love, no matter who are the real or supposed sexes of the persons concerned. The instant that even vaguely we want to possess, and even vaguely feel that we would be willing to surrender ourselves along with the possession, then no matter how "impossible," how terrifying, how bewildering such an impulse be to us we love, we love sexually. From friendship, we are already far afield.

Similosexual Love not admitted as Legitimate in Man. But with this logical and inevitable conclusion, we come face to face with a convention long-sustained in generally intelligent circles of human thought, with which we are put to startling and bewildered warfare. During a long evolution of centuries, including especially those influenced by Jewish and Christian theological systems of morals, has been affirmed and re-affirmed, has been assumed in public literature and in private conversation, has been held as a basal truth, that a man should love, be sexually drawn to, a woman only; never to a man. In like manner, that a woman should love, be attracted sexually, only to a man; never to a woman.

It has been assured, peremptorily, argumentatively, that a couple of thousand years, that if a man does not, his sexual nature going out toward a woman, anything is distinctly minus in his body or in his development. But if he goes a step further, and not only toward sexual attraction to woman, but by some mystic psychological processes finds himself sexually attracted to another man, feels an admiring physical desire for them, feels concurrent yearning to surrender physically to a man, youthful or older, then he is an abnormality, a shocking degenerate from man-monster or a maniac. During long centuries the ranks of the majority of European nations have recognized such a man only as a monster and a pervert; and in respect of his working out his sexual development of the kind, he ranks legally as a felon, in every country to-day.

Our has been the popular ethical attitude of regarding those mysterious, ungovernable impulses by certain equally large proportion of women are to the generality of the sex, drawn toward other than the sexual love, often along with complete sexual toward men.
But in the case of such abnormal impulses on the part of women, it is important to observe that both socially and legally the matter is far lighter regarded. In fact, it is often smiled at as a feminine pecadillo of perverseness, a womanish weakness or sentimental excess, negligible compared with what is called "unnatural" love in a man. The organic and bodily expression of a woman's sexual passion for another woman is less concrete than is the erotic embrace of the male. This, too, affects the general social sentiment. A woman giving way to similisexual temperament is not a felon. Scarcely ever is her impulse spoken of by law-codes. The Mosaic Canon, so severe as to similisexual love between men, and made the basis of much of our modern system of ethical law, ignores women in its denunciations, wholly. The New Testament Canon, the continuation of the Mosaic system in large part, makes no references to female impulses of the sort, except in the Pauline pastoral to the Romans.

Such is a brief statement of similisexual love, and of its positive distinctions from friendships; whether heterosexual or similisexual. We are all of us familiar, from youth up, with the attitude of the world, intolerant, horror-rified, arbitrary, toward any mature phases of it. We have heard it mocked in our boyish school-days, often with boyish hypocrisy. We have been brought up to manhood and to womanhood, accepting it as a vice and perversion rightfully opposed by law, by all sound social morality. We have turned marvelling from the examples incessantly coming to light, existing all the world over, of especially a man's sexual love for another man. We have also restrictedly, confused it with a phase of it that demanded always a swift and a severe repression, the debauchery of immature and innocent youth. We have wondered.

It is true that, gradually, a more thoughtful element in general society has reflected on the disease, with a careful, scientifically, logically, with broad anthropologic theories, following incidents in all classes of contemporary history, and with the discussions of foreign psychologists and physicians set before them, many men and women have voiced their attitude of repugnance even to look anthropologically. Some English psychologists have gone so far as to say it is a "dark problem," and to remain in a tolerantly conservative toward it. They have met with too many who are feeling honestly clear as to old theories, however disbelieved. But this conservative class has not gone further than the admission that "a dark problem"; "an unexplainable element in psychology"
is involved. If one argue with them against classifying all homosexual impulses with barbarism, pointing out that precisely this instinct of simulsexual love between man and man has always existed, side by side, with the finest social life, with the most virile militarism, with the highest moral and aesthetic civilizations of the past, even to being recognized as a great factor for social good, the argument is not accepted for a moment.

Simulsexual Love Especially Declared Contrary to Christian Morals.

For, one is assured that no ancient civilization obeyed the Christian Dispensation, or compare well with it; that Christian morals as the basis of all sound social and moral law, abhor the homosexual impulse; that the Christian Scriptures have placed it in the category of gravest sins and felonies; and that homosexuality entered into the decadence of races and nations, as an essential factor. We are also informed that simulsexual love "has relatively disappeared": is more and more forgotten, has become a vagabond a moral perversion from humanity today, in all "high civilizations" and all "superior moral life".

We are assured that human nature has emphatically "changed," in this respects as in others thanks to especially the powerful influence of the contemporary Judaism; Christian basis of social ethics. To all such replies, or to others equally without foundation in fact, one can quote only Christopher Sly, and claim that for the sake of those who believe possible such an atrophy of human nature, and who ignore plain and too-often distressing facts. "Tis an excellent piece of work; would it were done!" We shall in another chapter estimate more minutely this matter.

Salient Aspects of Masculine Friendships. For us now turn to what is generally accepted as friendship between men and men. We will revert to what has been termed "simulsexual friendship as distinguished from love; and will narrow our terminology by calling such masculine friendships "friendships," or "friendship." This connection subject to general ideas on the matter; in fact, till I can make clearer to the reader the true meaning of its tie, in numerous examples about us.

Friendships between the deep, often unaccountable, friendships between whether historic or commonplace, whether observed in instances of others or in our own personal experience, has the reader never questioned if there be not at times warmer, often more obscure and irresistible impulse underlying the sentiment? Certainly the need of referring many intensely intimate, passionate and "reasonless," sexual friendships, so-called, to some sexual mystic, often impresses itself on the psychologist. Various such relationships quicken our suspicion. Consequently occurs a new version of the old rhymer about Dr. Fell: we do not know, after all, whether, like Jack or Harry, we only know that we do know of him. Much opposes our sentiment often. But nothing can stop it.

One frequent characteristic is that the friendship of two men are not obviously harmonious or simply psychically: not in their classes, their temperament, their education, their experiences, tastes, prejudices, practical interests and attainments. Another curious objection is met when the two friends are not spiritual enough to be influenced by the intellectual currents, and are peculiarly averse to any spiritual way to finer sorts of sentimentalities; control from the world any lapse toward such "weakness." it seems to them. Again, one understands less the basis of "friendships" when the time has been too short for such strong mutual attraction to be developed by gradual knowledge and study of one another. For, in homosexual friendship, as in alterosexual love,
one man merely crosses the pathway of the other. A few words, a few glances—and lo, relations perhaps mutually in a perfect balance or perhaps quite unequal, but affecting henceforth whatever are life and character for each, or for one the two men, spring into irresistible activity. Scarcely yet quite aware of each other's existence and presence, an Ego, a mutuality still unreasoned-out, a flower of passion vague or absolute, germinated and ripened like the Hindu juggler's mango-tree illusion, such an emotion crystallizes into one of the most beautiful psychologic situations that human nature experiences. This suddenness, of friendship, as a thing illogical as sudden love, is an every-day phenomenon. The men concerned in it are of every class and type. The same conditions of mystery in such processes apply, of course, to many sudden, intimate friendships between women.

The word "passionate" was written a moment ago in speaking of the intenser and more concentrated ardour of male homosexual friendships. With that quality words reach what sharply engages the attention of the exploration into psychology of the affections. For, ever and ever again, in these warm, profound, apparently normal homosexual friendships, can be divined, or else is outspoken, the relative incapability of any woman to be an important sentimental and sexual influence over such preoccupied nature. The men concerned, or one of them, may present the type of the firm "holder-off" from any relations to women, except what are relatively secondary, even apathetic. This is, to woman as a sex. She seems to have no power over the deepest emotional nature, in such men. She plays only a superficial, tolerated, casual role in their lives from day to day. Such men seem to say of love for a woman:

"It is to be all made of fantasy,
All made of passion, and all made of wishes,
All adoration, duty and observance.

And so on I for—no woman!"

We can indeed separate men, roughly-classed, into three distinct groups as to their social attitudes toward woman. They are either woman-haters, or woman-controllers, or woman-worshippers. These three divisions take in pretty completely male humanity, past and present. The woman-worshipper, or lover, is the most frequently met, provided we can accept the sincerity of his outward demeanour. But often the more politic than sincere: appreciating the need of playing his deferential role to the full. For, in this type, the woman-worshipper, frequently is discredited in us in history, biography and daily social life as the most intimate relationship, only if united by friendship of some sort with some man-friend.

The same statement is more clearly true of the secondclass, the woman-controllers. Their attitude—civil, reticent, dispassionate toward women-acquaintances—protects them from critical rebuke from women; but includes no real homage to woman as a responsible factor in the mental or physical well-being of such males. This attitude is not of the sort to approach on such men as generally selfish or generally unimpressionable. Often they are nothing of the sort.

The declared, or undeclared woman-hater, in all sorts of protest forms, frequently exaggerates his pose and eminence. Sometimes, too, with him. But the instances are countless when his pretension is neither his joke nor that of acquaintance. His gradations vary from downright boorish discourtesy to courteous scorn; and of course they may be the inborn painful experience: not enmity that springs from inborn repugnance or indifference. Succeeding pages of this study can painfully illustrate this fact. But
frequently the woman-hater, outspoken or tacit, is neither an eccentric nor a misanthrope; but a gynophobe by his inborn, unchangeable nature. With such women-haters, when men of finer mould and character, we are likely to meet often an interesting special type, the man born for friendship, for “friendship” only; with his own sex only. We discern that his emotional nature is anchored to that, is satisfied with that. Such a man’s innermost soul is created to thrill in that masculine atmosphere, in no other. “Friendship” becomes the secret fire and spirit-throb of his social existence. In such a sentiment arise his profoundest, his most sacred joys and griefs, his most vivid enthusiasms and repulsions. There plies itself instinctively his sharpest differences, his passionate dependencies, his most humbling reconciliations, his noblest sacrifices, fullest altruisms, even to utter self-forgetfulness. By this spell the man’s Ego also commits itself to melancholy errors, to cruel disillusion of sentiments; can become subjected to an hundred influences for good or harm in his character and life, all exactly as in that other more widely understood relation — that of a woman — the asexual love. This deep “friendship” (again I am using a term subject frequently to question) often develops when both parties, or one of the two men, can be set down distinctively as woman-tolerator, woman-hater. Less frequently it comes to our notice with the woman-worshipper, though we shall see presently how it can be consistent in a most significant degree, with outward professions of some absolute Don Juan.

Observation of Donnay. A happy medium between the woman-hater and the woman-tolerator, one frequent in smart social life, is admirably defined by brilliant French dramatist, Donnay, in a dialogue between two men, in his penetrating psychologic comedy “Amanthina,” where the cynical de Sambre ridicules the woman-addict Vétilleuf for his servitude to the sex. De Sambre says:

I have had commerce, that’s the word, with different woman-kind,
We never knew any of them! My dear fellow, it’s all very well;
The originals, they have perfectly understood woman; they
See her in the place where she belongs. We don’t live in the
But the incident, it isn’t a matter of making
Man wear veils, of keeping them shut up between four walls;
But there is the necessity for us of shutting up the
Morally, intellectually, in a haven. That is to say, we
permit her to go wandering around in the domain of our
minds, in the avenues of our hearts, the streets of
Our preconceptions. You understand . . . oh yes, you ask what is to
If she deceives us? as is inevitable, for she will lose
Death in the moral haven. Let her deceive! Do you think
Worrying about mere contingencies? No, no, the thing is that
All conditions woman does not trouble a man any more that is
She has power over a man is curiously reduced; then
Gives herself, whether to you or to your neighbour, you
Her feet down to real value, and not to a fictitious value,
Of our prejudices, our pride, our fancies. You suppose
Help, you suppress paying your court, fag-end, all such
Which take up an enormous amount of time, when they
Are up a man’s entire life! Look at the sort of man who
A man of forty or so is still influenced by woman. He can
Of course, it is really useful, serious in life. How old are you, Vétilleuf? I
— thirty-four perhaps. What have you done with your
Your life in women’s bedrooms, till now you are fairly
Under the skirts of the women, sunk in the middle of the
Whole world, like a diver under his glass bell, as Jean-Paul
Ah, my dear fellow! there are more interesting things
Interesting problems to solve, in any science you

The types of great “friendships,” of the purely passionate intimacy, between two men of
Sensitive mutualitv through life, or long
Long periods of life, have multiplied through the
World’s social history. Such male
take the form of some household names: beloved ideals forever. We
In the nursery, to school-forms and our curricular
Interests in humanity to meet them. Legend,
Religious life and religion blend in their circle. They are
In our own unromantic date, that they
Make it needless to mention here more than a
Supposed instances, Damon and Pythias, Orestes and
Harmodius and Aristogiton, Niuss and Euryalus, the
Great and Hephaestion, Julian the Apostle.
and Sallustius, stand forth out of Grecian and Roman classics. David and Jonathan, Christ and John, the beloved young Disciple, are familiar Biblical "friendships" of exceeding beauty and sentimental tenderness. Coming down into the light of common day the list shines brightly. All temper, all races, all professions add to its be its colouring now of one tinge, now of another. Michael Angelo Buonarroti and Tommaso Cavallieri, Cino da Pistoia, Henri d'Effiat, Francois de Thou, Shakespeare and the young Earl of Southampton, Sir Philip Sydney and his three beloved friends Greville, Dyer and Langstone, Montaigne and Etienne de la Boetie, Erasmus of Rotterdam, and "that one companion of my innermost life"; the learned Boza and his "other self", young Audebert; Edwina II of England and Pier: Cavesteon; James I of England and those intimacies, so strangely passionate which James maintained with Robert Carr, Villiers, Buckingham and others; Frederick the Great with Baron Trenck, Lieutenant Kette, Graf von Gérz, and others; the dauntless Charles XII of Sweden with brother-soldiers sometimes far inferior in rank; the philanthropic Bishop Jocelyn of Clergher and the ill-fortune soldier Henry Mowrey; Lord Byron with Lord Clare, Nicol Girard and Eddleston; Horace Walpole in the one—perhaps deep sentiment of Walpole's life. Sir Henry Conway; Grillparzer and Geo: Altmatter; the masterly historian Johannes Müller and Bonstetten; the unhappy Ludwig II of Bavaria with many men whose kingdoms were only of art or letters, including Richard Wagner, and the gifted and erratic actor Joseph Kainz; not to mention two or three others; General Gordon bravest and yet tender, with Lord Arthur Hamilton—but no need to cite further the record of typically profound "friendships". Worth noting is the fact that many of them refer us not only to aesthetic life, but to the military profession and temperament, to the most genuine and even stalwart men. The will of physiques and occupations, with no trace of effeminacy, or of a degeneracy of mind. 

These are impressive and fine homosexual and similiar "friendships" the property of cultivated natures. The humblest circles of a country village, the regiment of foot-soldiery, the ship, the factory, the prison-bar, the chain-gang, tell the same story of one man's heart meeting another's heart, with all that the Scriptural words long ago ranked truthfully "passing the love of women". And in natures else immature we find striking examples of a ripened and profound sentiment. Between mere lads, youths in schools and colleges, are evolved sex-dramas of tragical force; and the father of the man in this, as in other
either earlier or later in the bond, often it never loses its dominant chemical force in the tie of the bodily power. and sex-motion alike decline from declining life, quite as in the case of after-erotical love. But let us observe that merely to suggest the presence of sexual passion on the part of either friend, the workings of a conscious or subconscious sexual nature, "the desire of beauty," is to meet a shocked, a disgusted incredulity: "Surely we know better than that!" No, no! In such a friendship as So-and-So with So-and-So, no such about amiable perversion exists." So cries, perhaps, the reader of these lines, as he reflects on examples of close and tender masculine intimacies that he feels sure he "knew inside-out," either historic or of mere instances about him that are pertinent; or as he recalls his own friendships. The suggestion of physical impulses in them so far the average observer vis-a-vis with what he calls vice monstrous and unnatural. In fact, the idea of a physical passion between man and man, as between women and women, he cannot "understand," cannot conceive of concrete satisfaction. It seems to him to outrage all sexual virility, the logic of virility and femininity; especially virility. There will be time presently to discuss whether in masculine friendships the element of a satisfied physical desire offers anything unnatural and abnormal. We will confine the study of the Uranian and Uranoid Intersexes we confine upon that matter.

The "Sexual Germ" in Friendships. Meanwhile, however displeasing to the reader, let it be affirmed that all real friendships between men have a sexual germ. Also one declare it as a perfectly assured fact, in hundreds of instances of noble and honored friendships, that suggesting the "model," the "ideal," sort, between men, that the concrete sexual tie and its satisfaction, have been of the first importance in the relation. That has been originally its master-factor. That has rendered such as "friendships" the most concentrated and absorbing of physical loves. No matter what have been the biological glosses and subterfuges, no matter what have been amiable fictions, no matter how indignant have been the dummies that every day could disclose about us, right and left. Everywhere are the ties absolutely embodying a purely, eternal sentiment; yet trembling at revelation to the outside world. The link is a marriage of the body as well as of the soul. It is a love: not a friendship. It is the supremely virile love, expressing the human nature, naturally and inevitably, ever has and is itself in a vast proportion of all races and grades of mankind. But such physical erotism in multitudinous cases has not a jot impaired the high spiritual quality of the relation. It has often enriched it. The psychic and mystical have been intrinsically, in a harmonious humanity, too subtle and natural for vulgar analysis. The psychical and the spiritual passion have been each the component of the other, by Nature's initiative, and by Divine

We may often be misled by one trait toward external to such mysterious passion in the similesexual intimacies—the attitude of one or both friends toward women. Damon may be a lover, is not a woman-hater, not a mere woman-tolerator, perhaps: but a woman-enthusiast, being a "conceur des femmes" at least by repute. The other often plays his social role of woman-enthusiast, in the finest touch of art and nature. But the two knows what we do not know. Their comedy can often be mocked at or deplored by them, according to its difficult and necessities. Marriage can hide the real situation of the similesexual love. But marriage can try in...
Pythias, to one another, no matter what upper currents of their emotional life help them or oblige them to keep their secret. In the majority of such really simulilisexual bonds, the attitude toward women ranges from the generally cordial and admiring, but never self-committing, to the cold and aloof one. The man never wholly surrenders himself; even when he appears to do so. His real self, his full, absolute Ego, surrenders only with his male friend. We shall understand shortly why this is inevitably of such intense personal significance to him, for his joy or grief, for his good or ill; why so often he feels, with a sentiment far deeper and more sexual than is guessed, the message in Emerson’s vibrant lines on male friendships, and the “hidden life” in them:

“A ruddy drop of manly blood
The surging sea outwights,
The world uncertain comes and goes,
The lover, rooted, stays.

My careful heart was free again;
"Oh, friend," my bosom said,
Through thee alone the sky is arched,
Through thee, the rose is red!
All things through thee take nobler form,
And look beyond the earth;
And is the mil-rose of our fate,
A sun-path in thy worth!
Me, too, thy nobleness has taught
To master my despair;
The fountains of my hidden life
Are through thy friendship fair."

CHAPTER IV.

Simulilisexual Love in the Brute World; in Primitive, Barbarous and Semi-Civilized Man; in Ancient Civilizations and Religions; and under Ancient and Modern Statutory Law.

The distinctly individual and biographic contents of this study will be regarded by the less philosophic with more interest than these preliminary analyses of various aspects of simulilisexual passion. But only through these considerations can one enter with full intelligence on the narratives and other clinical memoranda of Uranian and Uranid types.

When we look into sexualism in the brute-world we soon discern that nothing could be more the misuse of a term than to speak of simulilisexual passion as “against nature”, an an “unnatural” impulse, and so on. Everyday observation, wherever wild animals or tame are to be watched, convinces us of the rooted propensity. The entire chain of beasts, birds, fishes, reptiles, and rather in proportion to advances in the consciousness of nervous organism, practice simulilisexual habits by inborn impulses and deliberate choice. By an ill contradiction of phrase, the tendency is called both “unnatural” and a “bestial” one. In the mammals, the horse, the dog, the camel, the ass, the elephant, all numbers of the Ursine, Hupine, bovine and rodent families, the larger and the smaller felines, and in particular the ape and monkey, entire genera are given to it. In Dr. Taurier’s interesting work on Osmans he gives many