

# Ought we to be Hermaphrodite?

3/5

Male & female created he them, while he gave to the worm & the snail the inexpressible advantage of being hermaphrodite, capable of conceiving a complete & harmonious ideal of itself ~~and never born~~ <sup>usurping which</sup> to wander forever in doubtful duality, ~~an antithesis with no synthesis.~~

With Trichotomy Hegel has made us at all events suddenly content - but dichotomy - ~~at~~ why all but the meanest plants seem to branch dichotomously - and to the human mind ~~that~~ with its constant desire for unity it is scarcely to be borne, even in thought, ~~but~~ <sup>And</sup> that man <sup>inevitably</sup> himself who lives by ideals should be ~~be~~ in his very nature split <sup>into</sup> two is in itself a sufficient punishment for all his sins original & otherwise. Poor man, living, ~~if at all solely~~ by ideals & yet condemned never to be able to conceive of a complete human being, to which he can give all worship, & honour. ~~The~~ + from our Protestant ideal at all events women ~~can never~~ must always be in some sort excluded, but Roman Catholicism more gracious & human & less of a frigidity doctrinaire has seen the fallacy & put the Virgin on the same throne with Christ. But <sup>even then</sup> what a poor makeshift - what a confession for a religion which <sup>should</sup> ~~is~~ to unify the universe.

Pato says According to Alcibiades in the symposium we are only corresponding halves of the pristine human being who walked like a cart wheel, and when we consider how awkward ~~that~~ such a mode of progression would be perhaps we are less inclined to lament the punishment which was inflicted on us when we were cut in half. None the less we are cut in half and it seems is a very terrible thing though we have got so much used to our reduced condition that we hardly notice it. But whenever we wake up & say why am I only half a human being we lament bitterly those ancestral crimes that

3/5

deprived us of our birthright.

Plato is ~~and~~ not the only authority I have for thinking that we are but a <sup>poor</sup> remnant. & This is very evident from a study that this Science Biology brings <sup>us</sup> to the same conclusion. and if we no longer we no longer <sup>imagine</sup> ~~think~~ of a complete human ~~to be~~ to be the phrasology of Mr. Pearson <sup>to have excited long ago & then been cut in half and transmitted</sup> but one of our very most glorious and slimiest <sup>The present view is that</sup> ancestors hit upon the idea of getting rid of a part of himself while his future wife got rid of a complementary piece of jolly and so sex was invented & a complete individual became for ever after impossible.

I often feel inclined to address those who survive of such ancestors of mine down a microscope tube and remonstrate with them for their extreme rashness in the following manner "Granted" I say "that we men could never have come into existence if you had gone on reproducing in the old way by budding off a daughter (I have to use the portmanteau word because your children at any point without any fuss, was it after all worth while to give rise to our species, of which we are so ~~very~~ proud, if we were to have all this infernal bother about reproduction? The protozoa at the bottom of the microscope tube very rarely take any notice and go on with their sexual processes as though

I was of no consequence and did not do any  
 harm if ~~one~~<sup>only</sup> took book & no notice. Such  
 inattentive ~~organisms~~ I usually squash ~~between the microscope~~  
 Sometimes however they are more considerate &  
 make a reply which the substance of which I shall  
 endeavor to give later on.

But first I must explain my quarrel with Nature  
 more fully. It is summed up in this terrific thought  
 & that no woman has ever ~~existed~~ nor existed nor while  
 the traditions of our founder Tomlinson + the universe  
~~exists~~ (excuse the tautology) can they exist. The whole  
~~female of woman kind~~. And yet when we discern  
<sup>is</sup> the phenomenal do we not find among them  
 those that strive after existence with all the  
 eager longing of an embryo and ~~be~~ yet hopeless  
 unlike him without hope of ever gain the bliss  
 of true love <sup>They are</sup> for ever beaten back by a stern  
 fate from that <sup>boundary wh. they could pass to</sup> goal - for ever doomed to float  
<sup>terrors</sup> <sup>phantasmal</sup> the bond women of time  
 would be among <sup>doom</sup> of the whole  
 + space. When I contemplate this awful spectacle  
<sup>of women</sup> my heart yearns towards <sup>the</sup> like that of an angel  
 with <sup>which</sup> them might feel  
 and at the best to become <sup>but</sup> the wife of an angel or the wife of a brother

4

Now at this point I feel that the symbolical Bishop of  
Gibraltar was ~~was~~ in a peculiar <sup>sense</sup> right, if one ~~can~~  
choose between things all absolutely ~~wrong~~. For perhaps there  
may be some who ~~suffered~~ by the wind of circumstance  
will declare that the human soul is an ~~essence~~ <sup>thing</sup> ~~independent~~ <sup>women anywhere</sup>  
of the body & therefore of the sex of that body & that is  
But to this I would reply that we know of no such  
thing as a sexless soul & that at all events the  
emotions which are functions of the soul are  
profoundly affected by physiological processes. So  
that the soul of a man so far as we know of it is  
also facts to some extent different from that of a  
woman. Swinburne says, ~~it is true that all~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~the~~ persons  
are bisexual & capable of conceiving & expressing the  
feelings of the other sex, but this is an  
~~intellectual process~~ & more or less independent of  
the fact a feeling may be imagined & expressed by  
an intellectual process and without a person  
coming directly from the soul of the person & having  
formed an integral part of it. You may speak a  
poem in a language <sup>which</sup> you do not fully understand.  
In fact we are cut in half in soul as well  
as in body.

And this is what I complain of. That we have  
very firmly rooted in us the idea of a  
perfect & complete individual who shall be

entirely free from the blemishes of time circumstance  
 who shall be ~~adaptable~~<sup>5</sup>. having every human quality  
 developed to its utmost, and moreover that we strive to  
 attain ~~more or less~~<sup>as far as possible</sup> to this condition ourselves. And  
 but are forever frustrated not only by this insuperable  
 obstacle that we are not Hemaphrodite.

I think By this time the polite protozoan of whom  
 I have spoken had finished the sexual process in  
 which he was concerned + had time to reply to  
 me. His exact words I can't give he did not express  
 himself with sufficient clearness. However he began by  
 referring me to the works of our brother Trunyan. "Do you  
 not remember" he said "the passage "so careful of the  
 type she seems so careless of the single life?" Precisely  
 so I replied but that is just what I am complaining  
 of that while we want to be complete & perfect  
 individuals she goes on with her types and never makes  
 it even possible for us to become & self-sufficient.  
 What we demand is that every human being should have  
 a reasonable hope of becoming thus perfect and in consequence  
 nothing horrifies us so much as when ~~the~~ <sup>an abortion or</sup> Nation  
 produces a madman or an abortion (and ~~any~~ <sup>an abortion or</sup> individual  
~~being~~ is an abortion). produces a madman. Then we  
 then see palpably that he has not much chance of  
 perfection ~~saying~~<sup>for</sup> that he is wanting in some of the qualities  
 that we consider essentially human. Though indeed  
 as I have said before we need not express such horror

at these particular forms of abortions seeing that every  
misexual being is ~~so~~ (an abortion) if so facts.  
And so the ~~aborted~~<sup>undimentionary</sup> mammary glands on the Male  
a man's breast cause me the acutest pain  
because I see in them the stamp of our own  
is inevitable Imperfection

The protozoon then continued :- You ~~will~~ see what misery  
this setting up of your own aims in opposition<sup>to</sup> nature's  
causes you and the wisest thing is to give up your  
~~own aims~~<sup>then up</sup> since you have not much chance of altering  
Nature. In fact you must ~~give up~~ altogether this idea  
of the individual - the individual is ~~faud~~. What you  
have been in the habit of regarding as a complete  
& self-contained whole is only a part of another  
whole & is <sup>in turn</sup> itself made up of parts each of which  
is in itself an individual just as much as you are.  
You have no doubt hit upon a convenient method  
of classification when you regard the ~~one~~ individual as a  
unit but you will find if you try to define it  
that it is just as false to regard ~~as~~ it as completely  
dissociated from its surroundings as you have at last  
discovered it to be to ~~call~~ think of every species  
as separable from every other species. And just as the  
species was ~~for~~ & is a convenient <sup>method of</sup> grouping so is the individual <sup>only you should not</sup> ~~but you have divided~~  
yourselves into thinking that it is a separate whole  
whereas it is really related to ~~to~~ other individuals.

as a branch is to a tree or a single cell of your body to every other cell of your body.

He then referred me to the Journal for Psychical Research & then asked me triumphantly which of the many consciousnesses ~~which~~ into which Mr. Myers can analyze ~~our~~ <sup>the</sup> self I regarded as the true & typical consciousness of the individual. I ~~confessed~~ I was unable to reply.

You confess, he said, that within you there go on a number of independent & parallel states of consciousness each unconscious or ~~only~~ <sup>at best</sup> dimly reminiscent of the others <sup>of limited</sup> & yet you ~~can~~ assert that you are a disconnected <sup>self-consciousness</sup> whole.

I admitted it was not a satisfactory theory. His next remarks were to the following effect. The ~~continued~~ Craving of the human race for a continuation of ~~its~~ the individual and personal life is one of the most disappointing features about the human species, & continues <sup>unfortunately</sup> in spite of the teaching confirmation by Buddha.

Only in our higher moments do we become conscious of our connection with the whole & then the distinction between the ~~individual~~ & ~~particular~~ individual & the universal ~~whole~~. And our self-consciousness tends to become coextensive with the universe. We acknowledge that it is <sup>the</sup> nearest to our true self when this distinction between our self & an external universe is least striking as otherwise. But in our more usual condition we are rather proud of our <sup>fettered</sup> limitation & ~~so~~ unwilling to let go of them. So long as we ~~do~~ so we shall ~~feel~~ feel them.

8.

main limited & personal; but every advance of our nature tends to make us more & more identify ~~ourselves~~ ourselves with the underlying spirit of the universe. We shall now see that our desire for a perfect human individual is a mistake as indeed to draw any sharp line between man & his ~~slaves~~ & ~~other~~ ~~related~~ beings is a mistake. rather he must be regarded as a step in the gradual extension of self-consciousness. ~~which will~~ <sup>in time become universal</sup> ~~not a~~ ~~a~~ ~~fit~~ and therefore in no sense a final & complete consciousness. Being. With a fine rhetorical wave of emotion which he had <sup>tried</sup> produced for the purpose he then quoted the following passage "We live in succession, in division, in parts, in particles. Meantime within man is the soul of the Whole; the wide Silence; the universal beauty, to which every part and particle is equally related; the Eternal One." When he had said this he gave me a magnificent example of the annihilation of individuality which he had been recommending for he burst into innumerable sobs and I suspect lost his individual consciousness.