

UNDERSTANDING FEMALE SEXUALITY AND PORN

(by way of a commentary on the Guardian newspaper “Men And Porn”
2003 article)

by Sam Fryman

As someone has posted the 2003 Guardian Newspaper article which accompanies this commentary, and it was downloaded over a thousand times on one site, even as a Word document, this subject seems to be sufficiently interesting to the torrent site users that we feel we should try to cast some light upon it based on our own twenty-five years or more of study of human psychology and Eastern philosophy, as well as our long experience – and please note, this *is* in the author’s view of *vital importance* – of being *a man*.

The author has chosen to comment on this article in particular, because it shows the minefield of delusions, and the often unhelpful and woolly thinking on this subject by almost all of the parties concerned.

We welcome the *posting* of this article as it has given us this opportunity, and we applaud *the basic intent* of the article, which is to acknowledge for what might have even been the very first time in a major serious British newspaper, that porn could be more of a problem to men than it has been to be women, such that in the past, the “war against porn” has been seen as almost exclusively a “womens’ rights” or “feminist” issue.

Not only that, regardless of the appearance of this posting, this is clearly, as the article – which we note is nearly *three years old* – has revealed, a problem which affects a huge proportion of men in modern Western society, and no doubt, especially due to the Internet, increasingly everywhere on the planet.

We are also going to do our best to reveal women’s *true attitudes and feelings* about sex, the ignorance of which we believe to be one of the principal causes, if not *the* principal cause of porn use, especially amongst the young.

Men are being taught – especially now by the pop videos – from an early age to see women as seductresses and sex goddesses, and not as human beings, and we intend to show this illusory view men have got of women is very far from the truth, almost a total illusion and lie, with which the powers that be, and to a large extent *women in general* themselves are happy to see men buy into, in order that men can be controlled and dominated, like a herd of docile sheep.

So now we have explained our motivation we shall begin.

Imagine one man friend told another (or just as likely nowadays one *boy* told another) about a room that existed, that he had the key to, and that inside this room there were countless thousands of naked women – even perhaps some known personally to him in his everyday life, should he look long and hard enough – and a good proportion of them even engaged in sex acts, from the most normal to the most perverse kinds.

Then imagine still further, that the man friend was told that, once he had the key, he could go into this room any time he pleased, and best of all, *not one of the women in this room would object to his presence*, because in this amazing room he would be *invisible*.

So let us ask the reader – whether male or female – if such a place *really* existed, and a man was told of it by such a friend and offered the key, how many men do we think would not *want* to enter such a room?

Supposing such a place like that really did exist.

But yet *it does*. It is called *pornography*.

And because all males with few exceptions (i.e. those who for whatever reason are *exclusively* homosexual) are driven *as animals* mainly by *sex* – that is, *the impulse to copulate and therefore reproduce* – naturally *if they are honest*, virtually no man alive, unless senile, would not like to go into that room.

So it therefore appears to the author, that the question we need to answer, is not so much why a huge number of men are using porn, but why in fact there are any men at all *who have access to it* who are *not*.

Because we are all fundamentally *animals* aren't we?

(though some might argue “spiritual animals”)

So we are all driven by these basic desires to survive and reproduce, and for men that means *having sex*.

And we find in practice, even if we are in a relationship where we have the opportunity to get regular sex without difficulty – which is far less people than might be assumed, especially nowadays, there being such an unprecedented huge number of *single* people, without any regular partner at all – even if we are so “lucky” to have a *real life sex* “on tap”, as it were, we are not immune to taking a

passing fancy at someone else besides our current partner.

But because we know that to pursue such passing fancies beyond imagination could be disastrous to any current relationship we may have, most of us generally don't pursue all these “forbidden fruits” – certainly those who have children, in any case.

And it appears in this process of temptation, or of this “infidelity in the mind”, oftentimes women are no more immune than men from these temptations.

Long conversations with and studying the writings and interviews of women over decades however – i.e. this is the *eye-witness evidence* – suggests to the author, that *most* women are more fascinated with the idea of being *intimate* with men, the *romance* of it, more than the straightforward sex that most men tend to primarily seek *in affairs*.

(for example, a very recent British survey has found that almost fifty-percent of British women have some kind of a problem with *their sex desire*, and twenty-five percent have *hardly any sex desire at all*).

That is, women tend to be more *romantic* than men, that's why all those countless millions of *Mills and Boons* (“ten cent” romance books) sell, and other romantic but not sexually explicit fiction, like *Wuthering Heights* or *Pride and Prejudice*, though the author is not naïve, and is well aware that there is a lot of darker, more or less pornographic fiction aimed at and clearly being read by a fair number of modern women now, who are ever more encouraged to explore their sexuality as some kind of a “right.”

Which must seem laughable to the vast majority of those sex and porn addicts depicted in the Guardian article, who are struggling their hardest – and often unsuccessfully – to control a desire that they are trying their very best to *minimise* rather than encourage.

As usual, though it may take some time, women will sooner or later find out for themselves, that living in what they see as the traditional “man's world” – e.g. being a policeman or soldier, binge drinking, swearing, getting into fights, having loads of casual sex, working long hours and competing to the get to the top and treading on the next person in that process – is not such a great place to be, after all.

But rather, in terms of the *extra-marital affair*, what women are really looking for – so they have told the author – is love, romance, intimacy, as likewise that is what

most of them despite all rumours are still looking for in bed.

Even the women who are – so they say – very into sex, tend not to be interested in images of the male body *to the degree* that men are interested in the female one.

For after all, what is a “*men’s magazine*” all about?

It is about cars, sport and women with no clothes on, or half-naked in glamorous underwear, whereas in all women’s magazines, the emphasis tends to be always upon *relationships*.

There have been books written *for women* with titles such as *How To Drive You Man Wild in Bed*.

What do we think is the purpose of that, of such a book being written, and women wanting to buy it?

It is obviously to teach women how to be so skilful as to give as much pleasure as possible to their men, *so that their men don’t go off looking for it someplace else*.

Note the use of the word *their* in the last sentence.

Women want to *possess* men, which we do not necessarily say is wrong, but surely, if that is how women feel – *and they do* – then when a man talks and acts possessively about a woman, saying *my wife*, as a kind of possession also – or as the feminists like to quote in order to whip up man-hate and rebellious frenzy, *chattel* – then what is good for the goose must be good for the gander, and it is thus not a reasonable position for women to object that *they too* should be thought of as their partner’s “possession”, when they are thinking of *him* in exactly the same way.

So this *sexual possessiveness*, “ownership” and “power” over men is what women are interested in, not so much *sex* itself, as men are.

Women’s porn magazines have *never* been anything more than a dismal failure, and never will be, because women *in real life* are more interested in man’s character, his status in life, and above all *his feelings for them* than they are in whether or not he has rippling biceps or a “six-pack” of steely abdominal muscles, or even *we assure you his penis size*.

We only need take a look on the streets or in a bar or other social gathering at the bald, fat and fairly plain looking men who have gorgeous women on their arms if

we don't believe this e.g. Arthur Miller, a “nerdy” looking intellectual writer was once married to screen “goddess” *Marilyn Monroe*.

Women are interested in *relationships*, and their so called “porn” tends to be very elaborate, and more to do with fantasy situations that arouse moods than any particular interest in the male body parts.

The very *fact* also that the vast majority of sex aids are being sold to *women*, e.g. via the vastly successful “*Ann Summers parties*”, attended exclusively by women, shows the great difficulty most women have in achieving orgasm, and how they therefore need to go to such desperate lengths to achieve it (for those who consider the effort worthwhile, which a large, but statistically, likely impossible to assess number *do not*).

There are of course *very obvious* but *constantly overlooked* reasons in terms of the survival of the species and biology why this should be so.

That is, *biologically* – whatever some “women’s libbers” may argue – women are still at least fifty-percent like any other *animal* (as are *men* of course) whose goal is therefore to survive and *above all* reproduce.

Thus *having and supporting babies* is *always* going to be the primary destination of any interest women have in men, and indeed in having sex *per se*, and it is therefore not surprising that there are millions of adult women who report they have never even had an orgasm.

For if we look at things *scientifically*, instead of through the smokescreen of hypnotic propaganda which we are continually being assaulted with – which is forever seeking to tell us that women themselves are sexy and sex-obsessed multi-orgasmic goddesses – we see it simply is not necessary *biologically* speaking, that is, to carry out their *biological* mission of reproducing.

So it is no surprise to find out in practice, that the satisfaction that most women are getting out of *sexual relationships* is not generally mainly the pure physical pleasure of orgasm that a man gets.

In the less evolved women, it is more the “dare of it”, the idea that it’s “naughty”, and moreover, the feeling of *possessing and controlling a man*; and in the more evolved women, it’s the feeling of *intimacy* and *completion*, and in fact many women do not even care for the sex act itself much at all – i.e. consider it nothing, or are indifferent to it – which is one reason why so many women can easily become prostitutes, which of course most of the feminists and women’s libbers are too emotionally blinded to see, imagining that this is some sort of horrific assault

on women and denial of their most sacred human rights.

Men *may think, may imagine* that women are interested in sex in the way they are themselves, but the vast majority of women in relationships admit they have *faked* orgasm at least once, and many more admit they do so *routinely*, so what does that say?

The author finds it absolutely ridiculous that so many men worry about “how good they are in bed.”

Women – except *some* of the modern brainwashed ones – really don’t care!

If they did, they would all choose some big muscular hunk with a large penis, rather than the doctors, teachers, business and professional classes whom they in reality choose and therefore *prefer*, but in practice we find they go only to mainly *laugh at* and humiliate the male so called “strippers” such as the Chippendales.

Compare the reaction of men tense and drooling at a strip show, with the women at these so called “male strip shows”, who are howling laughing, rather than being excited at the men undressing.

We are well aware that in some of the less salubrious of these male strip events, the women even perform sex acts on some of the men, but again, this is more a case of “a dare”, and being “outrageous”, to try and act of character, throw off their inhibitions (of which most *real* women have got *thousands*, and hence could not even consider doing these things if they weren’t in a gang and drunk) than any genuine desire for sexual pleasure in the way that men do.

These male stripping events attended by huge armies of women are really celebrations of female “empowerment”, in that they can suddenly mock and to some extent really *abuse* men whom if they met alone in the street they mostly wouldn’t dare look in the eye.

So the reality we find is that women are not really much interested in muscular hunks, partly because such men would frighten them.

Neither are they particularly interested in sex *per se*, because as we have said, and will explore further later, *they are interested almost exclusively in having babies, they want the successful and intelligent man’s seed.*

Apart from that they are interested in the man as a provider and protector and to feel “loved” and “secure”, and this is proven by the fact the once a woman gets

financial independent, she can easily kick a man out of the relationship once she has the child she wants.

For just imagine were it the other way round?

Would any man kick a woman out of a family situation, whom he still sexually desires?

Not one in a million would, unless she had deeply offended him somehow, such as being unfaithful, or he had found someone he liked better to replace her with.

But women push men out of the family situation *all the time*, as long as they don't need him financially, once they have got the children they want.

In fact, his sexual demands can be just a nuisance to her, and explain at least in part why she is so happy to get rid of him.

So surely this must prove to all men and even boys, that *sex* is just not any where near the top of a woman's agenda *once she has got the children she wants*.

Thus, if a man is not pleasing a woman – *and it matters to her* – which quite frankly it did not much before the brainwashing from the “women's libbers” set in, and still does not to *most* women as we have said, all she has to do is tell him what she wants. But the fact that so many women *don't*, again suggests that it is really nowhere near as far up their list of priorities as it is for a man.

For example one lady on a phone-in chat show recently said “sex to me is no more of a pleasure than doing the ironing, it's just a chore that has to be done.”

And several others on the same chat show said that they had not had sex for many years, and they did not even care if they *never* had it again.

This is *not* therefore just the author's petty opinion or idea – this is what *women themselves* are saying.

But even for those who do claim to be more than moderately interested in sex, women's fantasies tend to revolve around *possessing a man they can't have*. But *not* to see what he is like with no clothes on as men do, but the feeling that *she*, egoistically speaking, would be able to *pull* and *possess* a man like Brad Pitt or whomever, who is desired *as they see it*, by so many millions of other women.

Though we do not here wish to teach how to seduce – because we believe, again based on long observation and experience, that it just does not have a “happy ending” for *anybody* to go round seducing women you don't intend to have a long-

term relationship with – we are going to point out that women’s desire for men is *very much* controlled by *how they see other women or society in general* regarding any particular man.

That is, for example, a handsome British TV actor called Robson Green is now drooled over by millions of British women. But he used to be an industrial labourer before being an actor and famous.

At one award ceremony, in his acceptance speech, the women audience were making suggestive cheers and rather shall we say “over-appreciative noises” towards him, and he called out to them “where were you all ten years ago (or whatever) when I wasn’t famous?”

He was just as handsome then, maybe more so, but *only a labourer*.

Even a non-famous man, if he is seen in the company of even one beautiful woman, that will guarantee others will be interested.

Women are in many cases complete fools for gossip, for *reputation*, for the opinions of their friends or peers regarding other men, and seem to be *in many cases* almost wholly unable to assess a man’s intrinsic worth using their own judgement and brain.

(apart from as we have said, the more *evolved* kinds of women).

So the reality of how important sex *per se* is to most women – given they already *own* the man in question – is that many if not the vast majority don’t consider it of much more importance than making a nice meal, and probably of far less importance than washing their hair, and making themselves feel “beautiful” again.

The sex act is important mainly to women *only* to the extent that, the man’s *total surrender to and blind passion for her* confirms to her this feeling of her own *specialness*, and of *possession and ownership*.

i.e. this creature she has, as it were, “captured”, that almost froths at the mouth to worship her body, she then feels *total power* over, and that is the *ego buzz* that many women are getting out of sex, which the vast majority of men have been so far too – shall we say, *preoccupied* – to notice.

In confirmation of the author’s view, in the famous sex guide, “The Joy of Sex”, which just like many other millions of Esther Vilar’s (see below) “manipulated men”, the author himself read over a quarter of a century ago in his youth, is stated that *this is what a woman is looking for in sex – a man’s total surrender to her*.

Clearly, this is about *power*, *about ownership*. And you know, women’s libbers like to continually chant the mantra “rape is about *power*”, but seem to have overlooked this inconsistency in women’s own attitude to sex.

Not to say that rape is ever right, and not a crime against women, but as we have pointed out in our other works, men get raped or shall we say *forcibly seduced* by women also, and not rarely, but on numerous occasions. But men in such circumstances are just supposed to think they are “lucky guys” if a woman “rapes” them, even if she ends up getting pregnant with a child he didn’t want to conceive, and likely ends up supporting and having his life made a misery on account of.

Just briefly again, on this, we will – as we omitted it in our recent work *The Innocent Persons Guide to Law* – explain a typical scenario that is happening nowadays of which the reader should be aware.

A man and a woman meet in a bar, night club, or a party, and the drink flows liberally. Then they wake up in bed together, not even remembering – or at least the *woman* may not remember – how they got there.

So she realises she is naked, has this strange man beside her, and most likely she has some obvious physical signs left upon her person that confirm they have had sex together.

She looks at him, still out cold and snoring, and thinks to herself – *how could she have done this!* And then she *may* feel outraged, it is a threat to her vanity, her sense of self, quite apart from the fear of venereal disease, AIDS and pregnancy (though of course she can take the famous “morning after pill” which *hopefully* will take care of that situation).

But it may well be the loss of *self-esteem* and possibly if others find out, *reputation*, she fears, and as she cannot imagine that she would have had sex with this guy of her own freewill, and cannot face and accept the reality of the foolish thing she has likely *voluntarily* done, *maybe* she then cries *rape*.

In this state of anxiety and horror, trying to evade the guilt of *her own mistake* she might sift through his pockets while asleep and find some kind of ID, which she can then report to the police or authorities, along with a *rape accusation*.

Such cases as almost exactly that have appeared in the media, especially regarding things like office parties, or the *very dangerous* “work conferences” that may take place at some hotel or other, and have male and female colleagues who otherwise never see each other except from 9 to 5, suddenly sleeping and spending their evenings in very close proximity, perhaps only a few doors away.

So we just thought it worthwhile pointing out for the sake of all concerned these *forms of “entrapment”* which may confront the modern *innocent* man and also indeed, the woman who is too careless with drink.

But as to women’s sex desire, in her ground breaking 1973 book, *The Manipulated Man*, Esther Vilar says that the average woman finds the idea of buying a new pair of red leather boots a far more exciting prospect than having sex with her boyfriend or husband, which again confirms what we have said.

And Esther Vilar was shown in a photo on the dust jacket of that book to be a very attractive looking woman, so she was clearly not talking out of lack of opportunities we can easily see.

Once again, in *modern* women’s constant purchasing of shoes, that they don’t really need for the purposes of walking or protecting their feet, it seems likely that also might be true.

Because the point is – which men should understand – that women want to *feel* and *look* sexy, but that is very far from meaning that they are all the time hungry for *sex*.

No.

What they really are hungry for in most cases, and this would include most of the prostitutes and porn models also is *attention*, for *love*.

They want *attention*, *love* and *affection* from men (apart from *money* also, obviously) whereas they see that men are crazy about and driven by sex.

Thus, most of the efforts of women to *appear* sexual are simply a means to get the attention and affection, and as we have said, often ultimately *possession* or ownership of men.

Like a young girl enjoys the feeling of possession of a horse or pony, e.g. *Black Beauty*, the adult woman wants the same feeling of possessing a sadly too often equally “dumb animal” – *an adult man*.

Thus they are trying to please men, give men what they seem to want, in order to get what *they* really want, which is generally to be cared about, to be loved, made to feel special, and so on.

Of course, there are also the lower motives in some women more than others in order to control, dominate, possess and exploit men.

These are the kind of women whom in real life appear to boys and men to be sexually hungry, but they are not dragging men into bed for the same physical thrills which are the reason men are so willingly cooperative in this being dragged into the bedroom process.

Do not believe it.

Just like men, they do get *some* pleasure from sex, but most women could get *by far* more *straightforward sexual pleasure* – i.e. physical sensations in the body – from stimulating themselves – as it generally takes them far longer than men to get aroused – than by the usually clumsy and quick efforts of men, with whom they are mismatched sexually *by nature*.

The latter is of course part of – though by no means all of course – the reason why many women turn to lesbianism. They can get better sex out of other women than they can out of men, because being women, they tend to understand one another’s bodies much better than any man.

Likewise, many women do not have a clue how to sexually excite men, how the male’s physical sex equipment functions and so on, and are generally taught by their men how to please them.

Also, since women’s primary mission in life is to have babies, it is not surprising their interest tends to dissipate as soon as they have children, unless and until of course they want *more* children.

Whereas men’s interest hardly ever goes away. They hunger for it unceasingly day after day, year after year, and it carries on like that for most men more or less until they die.

If the younger reader doubts that, or is horrified at the thought of men over sixty, seventy or in some cases even over eighty having a fairly strong sex desire, which for example, *Clockwork Orange* author *Anthony Burgess* confirmed regarding himself in one TV interview given in his mid-seventies, they had surely better started realising now, that this “problem” they have is not ever going to go away as long as they live.

So it should be clear by now, that the enormous *fact* that our society is currently refusing to accept is that *men have got a much more powerful, persistent and problematic sex desire than women*.

This is why women are so often furious and horrified that men have strayed. They just don't realise how strong this desire is in comparison to the one they have got themselves.

Millions of modern women of course, including psychologists like the one who has written about men's sex desire in the article – you know, without actually having experienced it *herself* – will argue the contrary, but they haven't experienced it, don't listen to what men really think and feel, and therefore just don't see it.

For if they *truly* realised what can be happening inside a man – that he is more or less powerless to do anything to prevent – when he sees a sex scene on TV, or a poster with a near naked woman on it, or a very sexily dressed woman *in real life* out in some public place such as a bar, street or office building – women in general would probably not dare to go out in public showing anything more than their eyes.

The *wiser* women who already have realised this, *already are* covering up, if you look carefully. But unfortunately, these *wiser* women are not leading their sisters to the same good sense; women in general are listening to the crazy “women's libbers” and Hollywood instead who give them the kind of “wise advice”– “if you've got it girl, *flaunt it.*”

(and don't worry too much about getting stalked or raped, because we'll invent some more draconian laws to protect you from men, which though we haven't bothered to tell you, will probably also scare most *decent* men away from *ever coming near you ever again*)

A book has been published lately, detailing an experiment in which a group of children were made to go into a room and take a kind of test with a number of questions, to which the answers were all words such as “grey”, “old”, “tired”, “weak” and so on – i.e. all things associated with *being old, feeble and infirm.*

The experimenters had placed a video camera in the corridor outside the test room, and they discovered that after the test, the subjects all walked out of the test room and along the corridor at only *seventy-percent* of the speed with which they had walked in.

That is to say, if we program peoples' minds with ideas, they start *even without realising it* to *act* on the basis of those ideas.

(of course the advertisers know this, which is why they spend countless *billions* on

TV and media advertising, though of course, as all *government and big-business friendly* psychologists will tell us, what we see on TV *or elsewhere* e.g. billboard signs, does not affect anyone's behaviour, *of course*).

i.e. in this case, all the dwelling induced by the test on such words as "old", "tired", "weak", etc, made them feel old, tired and weak and show this in their manner of walking.

There is of course a very "trendy" branch of psychology called "neuro-linguistic programming" which is concerned with these kinds of ideas, which firstly is under a lot of controversy, and secondly, we don't want to encourage people to get involved in, as we feel the far better way is to *deprogram* one's mind, rather than filling it with yet more "conditioning", using the kind of simple meditation *awareness* technique we have explained in our earlier work *How to Meditate*.

So leaving porn itself aside for the moment, based merely even on the above experiment, what do women think it is going to do to men when they are seeing women dressing and acting sexily all day long – in the office, the bar, the supermarket, the bill board signs, then on the TV and then around them even in the home?

A great many men have also reported or experienced the phenomenon of female neighbours doing sexually provocative things like sunbathing topless in the garden next door, or undressing in front of a window without curtains drawn.

In many women's desire to attract, control and enjoyment of tormenting men, many of these things are often done *deliberately*.

Which creates the doubt in a man's mind – is this display for *me* (or some other male in the vicinity they are interested in) or is she just an "absent minded exhibitionist"?

And we would have to admit, that *some* women really *are* so naïve and absent-minded, that they unwittingly put on these displays for men totally innocently, and *don't* actually have any hidden agenda to titillate or excite parties they may not even realise may be able to watch them.

But of course, many other women *do* carry out such acts deliberately, but of course quite likely *won't admit it*. That's what keeping men *tortured, tormented* and *fascinated* is all about after all, isn't it?

For example, Sharon Stone once said that her fame had given her "the ability to torture *a better class of men*"; and we all know how *she* got famous, don't we, based on that single sexually "shocking" incident in the *Basic Instinct* movie, as

well as a generally shameless willingness to exhibit herself in a sexual way.

And it is interesting to observe, is it not, that some incident – especially, but *not only* in a boy’s youth – of this “voyeurism”, the “peeping tom” syndrome – which simply could not have happened were women and girls to be far more careful in this respect, can lead to a lifelong obsession with this *voyeurism*, for which the modern porn industry can give plenty of opportunities to “revisit.”

And then of course – this is all quite without any actual porn whatsoever so far, please observe – there are all these attractive and sexily dressed women on TV who present the various programs, and star in “soap operas”, who easily can also become objects of sexual fantasy and even obsession for countless men.

And because these women of course can even become the subject of *stalking*, as possibly indeed was the *real* cause of the British *Jill Dando* murder – who knows? – it seems to the author that no sensible woman in her right mind would nowadays wish to appear on TV.

For it was *never* also pointed out regarding this case, that Jill Dando herself – who had a nice respectable image – appeared *just a few days earlier* on the cover of the major British TV guide read weekly by millions, *The Radio Times*, dressed head to foot in black leather, looking very provocatively like some kind of “sadoomasochistic fantasy goddess.”

It seems plausible that to some frustrated man obsessed with her – of whom quite likely there were thousands at the least – this piece of “hypnotically shocking titillation” might have been enough to “push them over the edge”, but we admit, we are only speculating.

We just find this an unusual coincidence, and we are pointing it out to warn *women in general*, and in particular the higher public profile ones, like celebrities, that to “play with their sexual image” in front of a possibly huge audience of *hungry, sexually deprived and depersonalized* men may lead to dangers they did not anticipate.

So the whole environment – even before we get started on the porn – is in fact *already* stimulating men to the point of shall we say “exploding”, a fact which this article more or less *totally overlooks*.

And then, as to the little scene in the *Friends* series drama the conclusion there is apparently that watching porn doesn’t make anybody *believe* that the lady in the bank or wherever is going to drag them into the vault and demand sex.

But firstly, there are a lot of mentally not very bright people, who are unable to distinguish even if soap opera characters are real people or not.

Then there are millions of inexperienced young people – they may be experienced in some cases with the females in their own peer group, but that doesn't then necessarily mean they understand the sexual behaviour of other or older women of whom they mostly have no experience – who may well believe under the suggestion of porn that women in general are like the porn women they see, who are "begging for it all the time", which real life experience suggests to older men, is very rarely the case, and even if it appears to be, is *not for the reasons they imagine*.

But what is clear, is that what we have in general due to *all* the sexual influences in the environment *including porn*, is an unwise "supercharging" of the male sex desire. A desire that just doesn't need any more help or energy than it already *naturally* has.

So what is the point of this discussion and argument we are presenting?

The point is, it is no good just putting *porn* in the dock, this is a much broader issue of the actual behaviour and the (often *false, misleading*) *representation* of the behaviour and attitudes of *women themselves* in the real environment and also the *media environment*, which includes mainly the TV, movie, advertising and non-porn magazine environments individually and collectively.

But *women and the media in general* don't want to take responsibility for this, because both parties seek to *hypnotise and control* men.

Women don't want to deal with the fact that *men's sex desire is far stronger and therefore far more problematic than their own*.

Because, women are using dressing and behaving sexily as a way to get more *power, attention* and even arguably *love* by their overt sexual displays, they want *the right* to drive men crazy with these ultimately we would argue *unwise* displays.

For example, many women of course are always dressing sexily – for example at work – in order to "catch a man."

But it really is not necessary.

If a woman is attractive, she can be very well covered up indeed and men will still see and admire her beauty – *but without getting pulled around by their nether regions everywhere she goes*. And if she is *not* attractive, dressing tartily is not

going to improve her chances much, except as regards not very bright or easily hypnotised men.

All women are really achieving with these provocative, competitive displays is “upping the ante” all the time.

i.e. one woman shows her leg up to the knee, so another woman who is trying to compete with her must show it up to the thigh. Then another one puts her cleavage on display to beat the other two, etc.

Just look at the way the Hollywood women try to outdo one another with dresses at the Oscars to appreciate this competitive phenomenon in its most wasteful and extravagant form, some of these ladies wearing dresses so expensive that their cost would feed a small village in some Third World country for a year.

But even in its less extravagant manifestation, this expensive peacock display of women all trying to “outsex” one another is a crazy game. It’s not a sensible way to find mates.

The sensible way is to just dress pleasantly but simply i.e. in pleasant but loose fitting garments, not emphasizing the sex attributes as if a woman were a tempting sweet inside a colourful silk wrapper, but instead learn to talk to members of the opposite sex as friends, and in fact *keep the sexual desire out of it in the early stages as much as possible*, because if the attraction is not *also* on the mental level, it’s not going to lead to any good or lasting relationship.

And if women try to get men by sexually enticing them – which is mainly what’s happening now – they are never going to find out if the mental affinity is there to the degree to make a relationship last.

Why?

Because sex is only happening a small fraction of the time in any relationship, and then they have to live together just as *people* for the other twenty-three hours or so of the day.

But if our method of finding a mate is to go into a crowded bar or nightclub or office building with hundreds or even thousands of others in it, all vying for attention, a competitive contest of these desperate and alluring displays is *the inevitable outcome*.

We can’t stop women flooding the environment with sexual signals and “mating displays”, if there are no ways of sensibly *assigning* to them their needs – i.e. to

find a mate, and where appropriate, suitable employment.

It is surely time for women to start “policing themselves” to some degree, i.e. stopping their own gender from all this “unfair advantage taking” in a competition for men and favours.

So we have in our other writings frequently quoted the famous psychological experiment of *Pavlov’s Dogs*.

In one sentence, briefly, for those who are not yet somehow aware of this experiment, as all modern humans *should* be, is that the Russian scientist, Pavlov, showed that any animal such as a dog could be made to salivate, i.e. *hunger*, at the mere *ringing of a bell*, after having been trained to associate the appearance of food with the ringing of the bell.

Likewise, men have been trained to *salivate*, to *hunger for sex* when women “ring the bell” of *sexual stimulation* in a thousand different ways in the environment.

Women learn new “tricks” of dress and behaviour every season – it’s called *fashion* – to keep men fascinated and hungry, salivating, and so women in general are sooner or later going to have to ask themselves long and hard:

Do they really want men to be animals, salivating at the ringing of a bell?

Because on the one hand it’s giving *some* women *power* – at the expense of other women, who behave more shall we say *decently* – but on the other hand, it’s causing men to be addicted to thoughts of women generally speaking, including porn, which as the article points out, both damages at least a sizeable proportion of men, if not all, and puts women in danger of molestation and attack.

If you don’t believe the latter – lately in England we had a fourteen year old boy rape *simultaneously* four *pre-teen* girls in a park. This sort of thing *never* happened in England before the advent of this computer and Internet porn.

That is – most people don’t have many ideas of their own, including ultimately even *your author* – they get it in something they hear of, read or see.

Little children see a cowboy movie and go round running in the streets being cowboys and Indians and “shooting” one another.

We teach young people “sex education” at an earlier age than is necessary or wise, and then guess what happens? – they start having sex.

Ideas, clearly lead to *experimentation*, the *desire* to *act out*. So whilst most “mature adults” can control themselves *most of the time*, if the *opportunity* arises – e.g. the office party, or some “friend” takes them to the “lap dance club” or whatever – they may start *acting out* these fantasies which until that point had seemed impossible.

And this of course is the case with porn itself. There is always this wide-eyed “wow” factor – which many women deliberately try to use on men to control them generally speaking, by their provocative dress and behaviour – and the feeling some new horizon is opening up.

But the initial “wow” feeling fades. Then we need to find *another* horizon, and yet another, and it goes on and on and on and of course never satisfies.

And indeed one further and very serious *illusion* that this Guardian article is also trying to foist upon the reader is that “real sex” with a real life woman *satisfies*, and is this absolute marvellous experience like we see in the movies, with people floating around in oceans of bliss.

It is *rarely* like that in real life we can definitely assure readers. Sex mostly just *promises* us what we can never actually ever fully get, because it is after all basically Nature’s technique of “tricking us” into having children.

After all, have you heard Mick Jagger’s song “*I can’t get no satisfaction*”? And we imagine that Mick Jagger has done even by that point far more than enough research to form that opinion upon.

i.e. from the evolutionary point of view, the goal of the sex act is not, and in a sense logically *cannot* ever before more than a brief, temporary satisfaction, because the “selfish-gene” wants to spread itself around as much as it can, or at least *to survive* in the next generation in an least *one* descendent, and probably most men would gladly father hundreds of children with women they desire *if only they could get away with it*, and thus the sex desire keeps popping up never satisfied, to encourage them to *unceasingly* carry on that “biological mission.”

But few men except for dictators, emperors, billionaires and rock stars *can* get away with such a thing, so then porn becomes *second best*.

Real life sex with women can be very disappointing, especially when one is used to “the same old body”, and start spotting faults with it one hadn’t noticed while the

clothes were on.

Or though we don’t wish to be crude or rude, women can have bad breath, make rude “unfeminine” noises, and so on during the act, which can very much dampen a man’s ardour, just as some of the most beautiful woman, like many men, can at times *snore*.

So not only *porn*, but the whole human environment is *deliberately* showing men an *illusion* of the idealised beauty of women, which only rarely is as great as made out, and thus men in general are deceived by some more or less unattainable ideal which they seek to find and worship in such a “goddess.”

Whereas what they should be looking for is *a beautiful human being*. In that togetherness and friendship there *is* satisfaction, and then sex is not the central thing, but merely *the icing on the cake*.

But not many men get that, they only get sex, which *alone* does not satisfy for long.

But in the absence of a proper relationship with a woman they want, men are left only with brief sexual encounters, and if even they cannot get that, then there is porn.

So we do not see *how* millions of men can *ever* give this up – *now it is so widely and easily available* – when not only is it basic to their nature to want to see and “mate with” the female body, but because their lives in general – even in many cases the married men or ones with “steady girlfriends” – are fairly devoid of satisfying deep relationships and “meaning” and increasingly controlled by “the powers that be”, there is little else except drugs and this quick “buzz” of pornographic release that life appears to offer them.

The only way that we can have a sane society in which men are not obsessed with sex, and *therefore porn*, is when

- a) women agree to stop tempting men as a means of control and treat them as human beings and not some kind of “animal” to be manipulated
- b) there are social structures in place such that men in general are not denied wives and also, not expected to go around bedding women from an early age to prove their “manhood” (note for example, that movies like the recent *Forty Year Old Virgin* act as further unwarranted attacks – disguised as “comedy” – on the idea that men should not have sex outside of stable relationships, which generally speaking take a long time to arrange)

Some might say – hang on, this is supposed to be about “men’s problem” with porn, isn’t it?

What are you seeming to blame women for? – surely this is for guys in the Guardian article like Vicar Si Jones to sort out, and women “psychology professors” – who have never had an erection or a male sex organ – to explain to everybody?

Not that we are saying that women psychology professors could not be of value, if they looked at things in a commonsense manner based on *facts*, on what men actually tell them about how they really think and feel, instead of *escaping into abstractions* that have little bearing or impact on reality, like some of the utterly meaningless and valueless “psychoanalytic gobbledygook” to be found in this Guardian article.

And what does Vicar Si Jones – a well meaning man we accept, though misguided – have to offer to the problem of porn addiction?

He says “accountability” is the key. He says “Make your computer *accountable*, let other people check what you’ve been looking at.”

So just *who* are men supposed to ask to “check their computers”?

Their wives?

Most men are using porn because either

- a) they don’t *have* wives or girlfriends giving them sex
- b) their wives aren’t interested in sex much now they have had children (and many men are easily turned off by “stretch marks” and so on, including the very little reported fact that most women are very “loose” in their genital region after normal childbirth, which is no doubt why *some women* – aside from the squeamish avoidance of the pain of labour sometimes also – are having *Caesarean section* births, almost as a “fashion” to keep their sexual orifice tighter, and therefore more exciting to the male)
- c) their wives or girlfriends aren’t as pretty or as sexually interested or *cooperative* and adventurous as the porn women *appear* to be. For example, women in general can use the withholding or giving of sex as a means to torment or control men, in some cases, their wives (after they have got the children *they want* in particular), denying them sex altogether, but the men are too ashamed to tell anyone about this. Likely *millions* of men worldwide are in this situation of the wife “closing up shop” and unless they are prepared to be rapists, which is not a very sensible route, they just have to live with it.

d) they are probably having to carry out the porn use in secret from their girlfriends or wives anyway, who probably fear it or hate it, so are the last people they are going to tell.

So just who on earth else can men get to check what they are up to?

It is of course a wholly undignified and humiliating thing to expect a man to do anyway, to have some other person monitor his sexual behaviour, whether out of control or not.

It’s *his* problem to deal with it *as a man*, and in this commentary here, we are not therefore going to go so far as to tell any man to *give up* porn use or arguably “addiction”, though neither are we saying it is a good thing.

What we will do however is give some *insights* which may *help him decided what to do for himself*.

And the first insight is what we have just been saying –

i.e. that porn use or arguably “abuse” is not going to cease in the mass of men, as long as it is *freely available*.

That means society has *eventually* to stop people making it – but *not* by as usually the cowardly authorities always do – focussing the attention on the *male victim* of porn, i.e. *the user, the addict* – but rather on *the suppliers, the creators*.

And moreover, porn itself is just one aspect of a far broader picture, which is in reality *the needlessly sexually provocative behaviour of modern Western women*.

But we are not suggesting *banning* porn at this point in time, as we feel that is currently unrealistic and impossible.

What we are saying, is that women themselves have got to start acting responsibly, which can only come about when the society is reorganised in a fairly fundamental way, so that women can get all they need without dressingly tartily, or taking their clothes off for magazines, videos and even theatre plays.

That is to say, quite simply, *if all women* refused to take their clothes off for pornography altogether – even in “respectable” Hollywood movies – tomorrow morning when they awoke, that would be the end of the porn *industry* altogether (except for what was already available, which would obviously be *plenty, but there would be no new, exciting porn*).

But moreover, men are only so *seeking* of porn, because the desire to hunt for it is

being *triggered* – as we shall explain shortly – by countless signals in the broader social and business environment that *all* men, porn users or not, are daily confronted by – the TV movies and dramas with naked women and sex scenes, the sexy pop videos, adverts, and soap opera stars who look like they are ordinary real life women and girls, but are continually jumping into bed with every other cast member, and so on, which if they behaved that way in real life would likely result in weekly homicides.

So an entirely illusory picture of what real women are like is created in the media, and women in real life try to play along with it, making themselves seem like they are just as alluring and available as we see on screen, but if we try asking the vast majority of them to go to bed with us without a long and painful session of chasing and dating, all we will likely get is a slapped face.

(of course, there are *easy* women, who *will* have sex with almost any man, but we are assuming that whoever is reading this, is not interested in such women).

So most or all of this overt sexual behaviour of women is “make-believe” (i.e. what they are trying to *make* men *believe*) and illusion, and we are suggesting that if we take all these sexual signals out of the daily environment of men, they just are *not* going to obsess on sex as they now do, and therefore not also be already *primed* and *hungering* to seek it out at all possible opportunities, as men are now.

And however unrealistic it might seem right now, if this is not done voluntarily, or in the final analysis *even forcibly*, then otherwise, *the vast majority of existing male users* (who will likely never read this) *will never stop using porn*.

As long as *the key* is there, more and more men will enter that room full of naked women and be so fascinated they can never get out again.

The few people who can get out of that room and *permanently* stay out, we might term “saints” – i.e. men so rare, they likely don’t exist – though we are going to try to give some advice further along in this commentary, that should help those who are not thus “supermen” to have an at least better than average chance of doing so, should they truly *wish* to.

But as we have explained in our works on kundalini, even “saints” will generally have some kind of a moderate or limited sex life, because *total celibacy* is not good for most men, but since many people do not accept the kundalini explanation of biological development and evolution which we have explained in some of our other works, we will concentrate on telling the reader of this work what they hopefully *can* accept and use.

We are made, by all this stimulation we have discussed, to see sex as the main goal of life, as if nature hadn’t given us a strong enough desire already.

The Guardian article rightly points out that we are increasingly being made to accept that porn use is something we should see as *normal*.

But it was never there to any significant degree before the last fifty years, except as a privileged pursuit of the upper classes and rich.

It was of course in any case impossible before the invention of the camera, except in the form of art or drawings, which few people had the requisite ability to produce or money to afford to purchase.

So the other question that the article does not ask is – just why is all this pornography there in the first place?

At least ninety-nine percent of the end users of porn are not themselves *producers*, so who is producing it and why?

Obviously a great deal of it is being produced by gangster type people, just as the prostitution is in many cases run by the gangsters.

The motive in both cases is *lots of easy money*.

The travelling circus or fairground comes to town, and the circus or fair is composed of people who for one reason or another do not fit into *ordinary society*, they are usually some sort of subculture like roving gypsies or whatever.

They give the people “thrills and spills” – dancing girls or acrobats in skimpy costumers, jugglers, trapeze artists, and offer “tests of skill” and gambling games to try their ability or luck to “win the prize.”

They see how easily excited are the “squares” whom they easily fleece of their hard earned money, to get a bit of relief from their mostly square and tedious lives.

Likewise the porn sellers.

They know what a prison the average man is living in, and how it is almost child’s play to lure him into what at first seems like a paradise – this room full of naked women who will do (in imagination at least) whatever he pleases – but he later discovers is a prison, and may in fact, depending on the laws of the country he is in, cause him to end up in *real* prison for using it.

But this level of temptation – the paradise, the huge room full of naked women – *men in general cannot resist.*

The Western men who do not use porn, are mostly only *not* doing so out of *fear* of one kind or another.

The fear will usually be *their wives or live-in girlfriends will find out*, and that will embarrass them or threaten their relationship.

Or it could simply be they grew up in a very religious or rather repressed manner, and there is a kind of powerful inhibiting force that would not allow them to even consider such a thing.

Of course, some men are controlled so thoroughly by the women in their lives, they are kept chasing around, busy mowing the lawn, vacuuming the floor, washing the dishes, cleaning the toilet, decorating their home, fixing the car, taking the children to school, studying to get through the next academic hurdle and so on, that they just don't have *time or energy* to even think about porn, let alone seek it out.

But it *must* logically be *fear* in the majority of cases, because otherwise, how can we explain that there is this enormous room full of thousands of naked women, yet somehow a man – largely a mere sexual animal after all, unless he is nearly a “saint” – *chooses* not to go in there at least now and then?

And for those who say they never use porn, the question is then – what exactly *is* porn? – again, a question the article has almost completely overlooked.

Countless TV movies have sex scenes in them now, or scenes where women are undressing or naked, so that they may be eighty-five minutes *drama* and five minutes porn.

So where is the real difference between having naked women or sex scenes in a Hollywood movie or domestic TV drama production, and naked women in a so called “porn” magazine or video film?

There is obviously none whatsoever. It is just a matter of duration, or of “distribution.”

e.g. not that it's *a suggestion* – if we were to cut up a dozen Hollywood movies with such a scene or two in them e.g. *Basic Instinct*, and splice the bits together we might have a sixty minute “porn movie.”

So clearly therefore, many of these “respectable” TV dramas and “mainstream movies” produced by all countries are merely *part-time porn films* in disguise.

But let us go a step further.

Does “porn” require women to be undressed or naked?

Many men are apparently as excited or more so by a woman dressed as a schoolgirl, or a nurse or whatever, than the same woman when naked.

So if a man who claims to have never used “porn” has seen a woman somewhere dressed in a way that sexually excites him, and he uses that image for sexual purposes – either as an actual picture he gets somewhere, or else as a fantasy image in his mind, how is that so different than the man who seems to need pictures of naked women to excite him sufficiently to be able to have an orgasm?

The point is we are saying – there is no real justification for a man who pleasures himself watching or even *thinking about* the girl in the bikini in *Baywatch*, or whom he saw in the street, to imagine himself as any more “morally superior” to the man who uses so called “porn.”

We have *all* got this problem of *sex*. It is not fundamentally porn that is the problem but that *we don't know what to do with our sex desire*.

Briefly, 20th Century philosopher J Krishnamurti's advice on the subject was: “do it, or don't it, but *don't make a problem out of it*.”

We feel however, that was in itself not detailed enough, though a broader appreciation of his *whole philosophy* might well have been.

But the more we have got of this sex desire, the more of a problem it becomes.

And obviously if there are sexual signals coming at us from every direction all day long, quite apart from the porn we have to *intentionally* seek out – just like the kids taking the test in which all the words were “old”, “tired”, etc, who hobbled out of the test room walking like old men and women – we are going to have our minds constantly obsessing upon and seeking for sex.

So then unless we have *very cooperative* girlfriends or wives, we are going to have to at least sometimes go the DIY route, and now that getting porn has never been easier due to the Internet, that means most men *unless prevented by fear* are going to use porn *of some kind*.

But the point we are making here is that the desire to use porn does not come from

nowhere. It is *triggered* by the general saturation with sexual ideas and signals that is in the wider environment.

Let us give an example to illustrate the kind of processes involved.

Vivekananda in his classic book, *Raja Yoga*, well admired by ex-Beatle, George Harrison, amongst others, gave a story which is relevant here.

(the author incidentally is recalling all this *purely from memory*, as he usually does generally speaking, except on *serious material issues*, and therefore may make a few unintended slips on detail from time to time).

There was a princess confined in a high tower, whom a man who loved her had to somehow rescue.

The walls of the tower were too smooth to climb, and it was too high to merely throw a rope up, no one had such strength.

So what was to be done?

The clever suitor first found a scarab beetle and smeared some honey on its horns. Then he tied a long piece of thread to the beetle, and set it pointing towards the top of the tower, so it kept crawling upwards trying to get to the honey, which of course it never could.

When the beetle got to the top of the tower with the thread, the princess took hold of the thread, and to the bottom end of the thread the prince attached some string.

Then the princess pulled the string up, and to the bottom of the string the suitor then attached some stout cord. Finally, in the same way, to the cord was attached a rope, and then the prince was able to climb up the rope to the top of the tower and rescue the princess (or if you are a feminist, no doubt you will claim the princess – who clearly had thought up the whole plan *herself* – abseiled down the side of the tower to rescue the prince).

But exactly the same process can be used to *haul us in* to negative effect.

For example, we are on our computer, on some Internet web page about electronics or music or something, and *unexpectedly* up pops a dating ad, a picture of a pretty girl. We look at her and feel *the magnetic pull*, the urge to know more.

Then we click on the image and then we are on a dating site, which doesn't worry us too much, because it is “respectable.” We are only looking at girls here after all,

just like the ones we see in the street or at college or work.

Then next we see that the dating site has got some *adult dating* adverts on it for a *different site*. This time, when we reach the next site, there are pictures of part clothed or even naked women, and then under the spell of desire, we click again.

And so on, and on it goes. The *adult* dating site leads us to a porn site, and then with a few clicks we could end up anywhere in the darker zones of Internet porn.

Thus millions have been lured into using porn who had *no conscious intent to use it*, and likely did not use it ever before.

Just as they say six or so email links can reach everyone on the Internet, probably in six mouse clicks we could reach some of the darkest porn on the Internet from something totally innocent and harmless like a sport or music appreciation site.

So obviously the only way to stop this cycle is to *never click the first link*.

But what man is able to resist this, except out of *fear*?

When so many millions are either lonely, don't have a sex partner, or don't have a cooperative sex partner even if married on in a relationship.

But actually, the *real* first click is not on the computer or web page at all – it is *the trigger in the environment*, “the Setup” of having women tempting men left, right and centre, in one way or another as they go about their daily business, or watch ordinary TV.

Once they see the dating ad on the Internet they are already “primed” to click that button – from which point “the Sting” commences, as we are gradually reeled further and further in – because long before we have ever switched our PC on, we have been made to obsess on the idea that life isn't worth living without a woman and sex.

And to a large extent, for most men this is probably true, and is not wrong, as we are biological animals in search of a mate and to pass on our “selfish genes.”

But the point is – do we get the woman and sex we need *with dignity, without being enslaved*?

So then the next question is – OK – so men are addicted to porn. But why should anyone care?

Some of the men in this Guardian article said *they* had a problem with porn, but they are only some of the people in this one particular article. What about all the other men like *Moby* who say "porn is great"?

After all, with *every* pleasure, whether it's alcohol or gambling or whatever, there are always those *few* who ruin their lives with it, and can't keep a "healthy moderation" like most of the rest do.

The man at the end of the Guardian article however we feel lets the side down, when he more or less tells us (reading between the lines) "hey, hang on, think of this... Real relationships in the real world with real women are tough. They require guts, etc., and you guys who use porn just can't hack it. Do you really on your death bed want to say 'hey, I wished I had visited a few more porn sites and fiddled with myself a bit more?'"

And of course, your current author has said "fiddled with oneself" but the article author uses the *w* word, which is commonly used as an insult to describe this behaviour, that the author is not therefore going to quote, because he feels it is needlessly and wrongly insulting to men.

After all, nearly all men, and apparently nowadays most women either regularly or occasionally sexually stimulate themselves.

So this gentlemen journalist is more or less saying "hey, the guys who do that are perverts, and they are failures who can't get a woman."

But most *everyone* is doing this behaviour whether they can "get a woman" or not, because even if he has a woman, she may not be in the mood, he may want some kind of sexual thrill she can't give him, and he may be lamenting the fact she is not half as attractive as she used to be (many women let themselves go, especially after having children) or she is too tired, or "has a headache", or is angry with him for one reason or another and is denying him sex to "teach him a lesson."

And on the other hand if a good, honest woman, who is normally kind, does not want sex at some particular moment, then surely it is much kinder to *her*, and fairer to *her*, for a man to satisfy himself by the DIY route.

But despite all efforts at propaganda to the contrary, most educated men still feel porn is a shameful thing to be indulging in, and therefore won't admit their use of it, and if they do feel ashamed, then *the very last thing they want to do* is get

somebody else inspecting their computer, “policing them”, to try and humiliate them into stopping it, as the vicar in the article suggested.

So we are not going to *moralise* here, but we are going to point out a few *facts*.

Firstly, it is argued in the article (*not by your author*), that men use porn because they can’t get a satisfying relationship with a girl or woman in the real world, which as we have said, is not at all necessarily the case.

For as men who have read the author’s previous work, *A Men’s Liberation Guide to Women* will know – if they don’t already from first-hand experience – relationships between the sexes are currently an absolute minefield, and at an all time low.

Getting a girlfriend or wife gives a feeling of *pride*, of *I am a winner*.

But it could also most likely mean *the end of freedom as he once knew it, and never will again*.

Most husbands are – whether they admit it or not – slaves and lapdogs to the modern demanding and bossy Western women, who have been influenced to this dominant position by the feminist extremists.

And men, due to their sexual obsession, and by inadequate male role models, are left sexually and emotionally dependent on the female who typically eventually “captures” or “entraps” them.

But we don’t hear about this “conspiracy of silence” because men don’t complain much about their state of slavery, or like to admit that is the reality of their sad lives, which would make them look to their peers and the world in general as pitiable fools and mugs; but rather they proudly assure us how much they “love their wife” and so on.

However, the men who aren’t willing to be enslaved, or have run away from, or been kicked out of such a state of slavery – due likely to being too uncooperative or incompetent a slave – get described with the *w* word by the enslaved rest, even though likely the latter’s wives are denying them sex, some or even all of the time, and this consequent state of married near-eunuchism, they are proud of.

Again, the women’s libber types go on unceasingly about things like the middle-ages “chastity belt” as an example of how men have always enslaved women. But what of the fate of the outwardly “happily married man” whose colleagues and peers imagine (falsely) therefore is getting regular and satisfying sex, when in

actual fact his wife may be denying him access to her body altogether, and threaten to cry rape if he steps out of line?

Has she not placed a kind of “chastity belt” on him also?

And this is not any longer *the middle ages*, and it appears women can not only deny their husbands sex, they can now more or less have sex with whomever they please, whether men like it or not (which of course mostly men *don't*).

And after all – *who benefits* from this demonisation of the single male who “can’t get” a girlfriend or wife, or rather *refuses* to enter the enslaving relationships the rest of men have got that are typically *all that is on offer*?

(i.e. where is the *true friendship* between men and women, where is the *true love*?)

Who benefits is – all the women who want to enslave men, by seeing to it that – with such movies as *Forty Year Old Virgin*, etc. – any man who hasn’t either got a steady girlfriend or is married (i.e. likely enslaved) is made to feel a loser, is humiliated.

So all this *true, reality-based psychology* we feel we are offering here, the article on “men and porn” which looks so plausible and well presented, like a mini-academic thesis, more or less completely ignores.

i.e. it ignores the far broader picture of destruction of the male identity and the needlessly sexual behaviour of women (almost entirely for their own benefit, but as we have explained earlier, misguidedly so).

But even in the minds of the producers of porn, this background of “sexual liberation for men” is part of that, which is why many – apart of course obviously from the money – wish to portray it as an utterly blameless activity.

That is to say, if women deny to a man sex, use it to control him like a dog, without some kind of porn a man may feel powerless to get sexual relief in a way that satisfies him, which for men – as they are primarily visual about sex in a way that women are not – will involve seeing some images of sexually alluring women, probably at least partially naked.

It has been pointed out in the article also that there is a growing tendency to use the more hard and sadomasochistic forms of porn.

There are two reasons for this.

Firstly again, because men in general are really pretty much abused creatures to begin with, mainly through poor, inconsistent, negligent and cruel child rearing, and also because of the prevailing demonisation and disempowerment of men generally in terms of jobs, conjugal rights and just a general needlessly competitive and hostile environment.

The recent *Spiderman* movies depicted in some part the sort of humiliation the average youth is subjected to nowadays – bullied, rejected by women who probably don’t deserve him anyway, and so on – but unfortunately, unlike Spiderman, he does not get to wake up one morning with “superpowers.”

So as we have explained in our other writings, the abused person, the dominated person, gets to feel a little relief or “pleasure” by fantasizing or if possible even carrying out abusive actions on the hate figure, so that for example, a man who has been made to feel inferior and humiliated by women may take great pleasure in seeing images of them beaten or humiliated, just as women *individually or collectively* have in one way or another previously done to him.

So where is this desire coming from *at its ultimate root*?

We have explained it in psychological terms in our other recent work *The Innocent Person’s Guide to the Law*, so we are not going to duplicate that material again here.

However, we can say in a general way that it is the abuse or disrespect of men that has created this “psychic backlash” against women, and of course, many men also hypnotically are driven back to fantasies of submission which they have somehow acquired at some earlier time.

Equally, as there are many women carrying around the same desire to enjoy seeing the infliction of pain on someone else, many are only too happy to play the sadistic dominant role, and those who do it professionally can of course laugh all the way to the bank that they can have such a fulfilling career and make enormous amounts of easy money at men’s expense.

But on the other hand, how many men would really like to see a woman they actually *respect* – like for instance *their own mother* – beaten and abused in the way that the women in the sadomasochistic sex are?

Very few, obviously, unless they themselves were very badly treated by their own

mother, which of course is *a good number*.

And so this is a message to *women*, which tells them – if they behave in such a way as to earn men’s *respect*, by refusing to do things like posing nude, dressing and acting generally whorishly, and so on, this desire amongst men to see them humiliated and beaten in some way will disappear.

The truth is that most men *hate* women to at least some degree.

Of course, the men who are very submissive by nature, and are willing to be total slaves of women won’t feel this.

But the majority of men alive who feel *disempowered* to some degree or other, will feel at least *some* of this hate, like the men who were part of the men’s club we mentioned in our recent work on Law, who all started cheering and applauding when some drunken member of their circle started smacking a stripper’s bottom (wholly illegally, and without consent) at a party we mentioned, *though they would not have done it themselves*.

That is to say *it’s there* in virtually every man, the desire for some *vengeance* on what at least some women at some stage in their lives have done to humiliate them.

And thus is the *entrée* to the world of sadomasochism.

The serious sadomasochism addicts of course, are relatively few in numbers, just as there are countless millions of users of cannabis who are more or less “ordinary people”, but comparatively few users of cocaine, though of course that situation is getting worse in both cases as more and more availability draws more and more people in.

But let us draw to a close, what is perhaps getting a little too theoretical, and address the situation for an individual porn or sex addict.

We are not here condemning anyone who uses porn, especially in the case of those who have no other choice for whatever reason, married or not.

If someone is happy with their use of porn, feels they have got it “under control” that is as far as the author is concerned their own business, and he is not going to take some authoritarian or puritanical stance.

However, neither is he saying *porn is a good thing* or giving *permission* to do it, because it is totally up to the individual to do what they think fit with their own

bodies, but rather he intends to give some *information* which may help them decide.

If someone does want to give up porn – which taking in the much *broader* definition the author has given, i.e. including use of sex scenes in TV movies, or even “glamorous pictures” in what would be regarded as a “non-porn” magazine – we will now offer a few suggestions and ideas.

Firstly, it is necessary to see that porn use is a *habit*, which concept the author has explained in detail in his other work *How to Meditate*.

So here, we will just say, as everyone knows, habits once formed are hard to break.

They become “hardwired” into the brain, just as most computer users can load or unload a web page or a program, but don’t necessarily know how to “tweak” or reprogram *the operating system*.

Likewise, the habit, such as porn use, in time gets to be not accessible to our conscious will.

So very few of us can tomorrow morning decide we will stop doing such and such a habit e.g. drinking, gambling, porn, or whatever, and expect to overcome it by such a feeble conscious intention.

That is, our conscious will is typically found to be feeble *in comparison to habit*.

So to change a habit will take time.

The habit can only be changed generally speaking by *introducing a stronger new one* that “trumps” it, such as when in cards we overrule a queen with a king, or a king with an ace.

But to successfully build ourselves a stronger card in terms of *habit* will take time, as if we were slowly weaving a tapestry.

That is, the author suggests that men who are addicted to porn instead develop *as a lesser evil*, their *fantasy life*.

So that in fact, even if a man ends up in a prison cell, with no porn available, he could still have sexual satisfaction without needing the physical presence or image of a woman.

We suggest men learn to think up a fantasy that works for each one as an individual, and each time they consider going to porn, decide instead to use the

fantasy.

We may not always succeed, especially at first, but each time we successfully manage to have sexual pleasure without the porn images, the power of the force pulling us back to the porn will diminish (though it may not *seem* so at first, because “the fight is on”- habits tend to try *harder* to keep us when they are under threat, but if we persevere we *can* beat them, the author assures you *he has done so*).

If it’s internet porn, which is probably the most problematic, then we need to take steps to remove the triggers, like for example using software to block all the popup and advertising images for dating and so on which may *lure us* in, so that these triggers becomes less and less part of our awareness.

In the end, we will generally have to construct an attitude like a once excellent British soccer player called Jimmy Greaves, who unfortunately was also an alcoholic.

He beat the addiction totally in the end, but only *by never ever going into another bar*.

Fortunately, as far as we are aware, he was and is happily married, which helped make it easier for him to stay out of such bars.

He knew that *just one drink* would be enough to start the process which left him as he explained – sometimes waking up in some back alley surrounded by dustbins.

(and gamblers likewise know *just one bet* is enough to draw them back into a “gambling orgy” once again).

So it might take weeks, months or even a few years to *fully* break the habit, but it can be done *if we want to do it*.

And as we pointed out, *here* lies the difficulty.

For just *why* should a man not want to go in that room full of naked women, as long as it still exists?

Some will not use porn due to religious reasons or whatever. So if they can do that, good luck to them, they don’t have a problem.

But *why* should the average man, who is without a regular sex partner, or whose partner no longer excites him or is uncooperative, not go into that room, where so

many thousands of women which he otherwise couldn't have are so freely available and “willing”?

Well, firstly, our opinion is that many men will never find such a motivation, and the only thing that will stop them is if the *opportunity* is taken away.

The author is not going to “prophecy” – he doesn't claim such an ability – but he is going to guess that sooner or later, the crimes against women could get to such a level (and don't forget we have huge *trafficking* of women for prostitution, so arguably we're *there* already) and maybe even for other reasons to do with the Internet, where the authorities will decide to “pull the plug” on the Internet in general, or at least police it so heavily that finding porn will become more or less impossible.

For those who think that's impossible, all the authorities have to do is close down the ISPs – which may seem unthinkable now, but in the future who knows? – or force them to have as many full time employees as possible to keep tracking down and blocking the IP addresses of the porn sites, until in the end the porn site creators will give up out of frustration, due to no longer being able to make any significant money out of it.

We don't see it happening for quite some time, but then the whole future of humans on the planet in general is uncertain right now, so it's hard to make any hard and fast predictions of any kind.

But even if it gets to the extent – and we feel this is the more *likely* route – of making examples out of people viewing porn, using one of the usual zero tolerance draconian laws the Western governments are introducing daily nowadays, they will start hounding end users of porn, so that all those except for the most reckless addicts will be too scared to download it any more.

There may be a few people who are so highly computer skilled they can keep dodging the authorities almost indefinitely, using mazes of proxy servers and all the rest of it, but that won't be *the mass* of Internet users, so when the mass audience is not longer available to the creators and distributors of porn, there won't be any money in it for them anymore, and thus they won't bother.

And when the same pressures are applied to the *licensed* sex shops and so on – which we believe in time they will be *due to the threat against women* (once it starts to affect the *Western* women like it is already affecting the Eastern European women) – porn will then be back to being an “underground” minority interest once again.

We won't pretend that we can assess the full technical details of how the authorities will be able to shut Internet porn down, and are quite sure that many Internet users know far more about this subject than we do, but the point we are making rather, is that at present we believe the main reason the Internet is flooded with porn is because *the authorities want things that way*.

The authorities at present are not generally acting in the best interests of the people at large.

For example, in England, there is now an official plan to create seventeen major new casinos, including one “supercasino” – whatever that might mean – and there is supposedly an “unofficial plan” some journalist has uncovered, said to be accredited to the *deputy prime minister, John Prescott* (a man who once lashed out and *punched* a citizen who threw an egg at him, in a country where “taking the law into your own hands” is illegal and an arrestable offence if any *ordinary citizen* does it) to create around *one thousand* casinos, in a relatively small country like England, which is less than one third of the size of Texas, one single American state.

This is the most outrageous act of irresponsibility to a country's citizens, many of whom are heavily in debt already, and as we know, most of the newly created gambling addicts thereby will undoubtedly be *men*.

So likewise, the government is *currently* unconcerned at the absolute flooding of the Internet with porn, but that will all change when enough women howl about being raped and having their children molested, and some no doubt Nobel Prize winning scientists puts – rightly or wrongly, logic won't necessarily come into it – two and two together, and “proves” that porn and sex crime are heavily interrelated.

That is to say, likely *ninety percent or more* of men can use porn without going out and raping some *real woman*, but what about the other ten percent?

And when ordinary women also finally figure out *or decide* that men who are looking at all these women, who are in most cases have more shapely bodies than they do, are driven to have affairs and so on under the pressure of all this ultimately unnatural (i.e. it's not there in Nature, except in the artificially manufactured media environment) material, they will all be against it *en masse* in a way that currently they have been conned out of being.

For example, there are numerous cases of men who have met and had sex with any number of women off the Internet – which we should warn the reader incidentally can be very dangerous to an *innocent man*, e.g. there is a sadistic boyfriend hanging around or whatever, whom the lady chat partner did not tell him about – though we should point out that getting an *attractive woman* to have sex with by this route is not likely very easy, but then a lot of men will go very far down the beauty roster in their desperation for sex with a female of any kind (and quite likely get some awful disease in the process, as “protection” in sex is still shockingly rarely used in these kinds of encounters it appears).

So to imagine such a man has not also been feeding on a diet of porn seems unlikely. And thus, whether it is proven or not, if women start to *believe* these two matters are connected *porn will be shut down whether men like it or not*.

But we were addressing the situation of the male porn user who *does* want to give up.

And we should also point out therefore that as we said, *motive* is going to be the key.

If a man is “happy” in his addiction, whether it’s drink, drugs, sex or anything else, he is *never* going to give up voluntarily.

But even the man who wants to, will not generally find it easy, as the Guardian article said.

Yet as we have pointed out, though the Guardian article looks really “helpful”, well written and with “expert views” in it, again this issue of *motive for giving up the addiction* is hardly even touched on.

The article does cite the phenomenon of men feeling disgusted with themselves *after* using porn, but this does not generally stop them going back, any more than it stops a woman who is being beaten or abused by her man from coming back for more of the same.

In most cases, just a technique of trying to create a new (non-porn use) habit of satisfying oneself sexually to superimpose on the old one as we have suggested, will not generally *be carried through* because *the motivation* is not there.

As we have explained in our other work *A Men’s Liberation Guide to Women, 4th Edition* (all the author’s works by the way are completely free, and currently

available at <http://www.geocities.com/thmlplx/> should the torrents for them go unseeded) the only true means to beat any addiction is by *an underlying change in the addict’s whole life*.

For example, take a gambling addict who is a single person, who has lots of free time on his hands.

If he gets a job that keeps him busy ten hours a day or more – e.g. like a self-employed builder or painter and decorator – he simply won’t have *time* for gambling marathons, and spending long hours in betting shops or casinos.

(yes, of course, we know that a determined gambler will always find ways, but he stands *a better chance* of cutting his gambling the more “his hands are not idle” and thus he has less time for “the devil’s work.”)

We find in the lives of addicts such as gamblers, and no doubt this applies to many porn addicts too, there is some big gaping hole.

A man who has a wife and family to take care of and *devote himself to* is far less likely to get hooked on porn than a man who is jobless and without a girlfriend or those family responsibilities.

Again, the Guardian article does not much look at this, this problem of *addiction being a problem of a man’s (or woman’s) whole life scenario*.

Even if a man does not have a family, and cannot easily get into that situation, finding a job or career he *loves* doing can help raise the self-esteem that would help him overcome not merely porn addiction, but the broader problem of too much preoccupation with sex *per se*.

But of course, to find such satisfying and creative work is not easy in our capitalist system, which has replaced so much of our *honest* work – such as farming work, that kept men in touch with Nature – with stressful mental work, and ambitious pursuits such as “climbing the corporate ladder”, which are more often than not frustration producing (and therefore demanding ever more *escapes* and *pain killers* like alcohol, drugs, gambling and sex) than satisfying, fulfilling forms of labour.

Krishnamurti points this out in his classic set of talks to young people published as the book *Life Ahead*.

That is, if men (and women) do not find their *vocation* in life – and understand, we are not talking doctors and priests only, it could be a cook, carpenter, painter or

whatever, as long as there is *love of what one does* – they live dull, uncreative, mentally crippling lives, which will naturally lead to the need for escapes which can easily turn into addictions.

But changing our lives – which may be the only *real and lasting* way to beat *every addiction* – in this way is not easy. For if we always feel frustrated slaves in our work and life experience generally – e.g. even in our relationships with our girlfriends or wives, as is quite often the case also – we will still seek the *freedom* which paradoxically we feel our addiction at least *temporarily* gives us.

Obviously, the current disempowerment of males worldwide which we have described in some of our various books – not that women are *really* being “empowered” as they believe, it is largely an illusion that they are slowly waking up to – is obviously creating this sense of “imprisonment” which again leads to the desire to escape in these addictive ways like porn, drugs or gambling.

But even though men may not be able to find their ideal job, we should point out that in the case of sex or porn addiction, we are dealing with *sexual energy*, which is fundamentally *creative energy*.

And thus, we may dissipate our sex energy by *transmuting it* into creative energy, and by this we do not necessarily mean any kind of artistic work such as creative writing, music or whatever.

We mean creative in terms of e.g. building a house, DIY, or painting and decorating, or inventing some new useful device, or even educating our children by giving them our time and attention.

But it could also be playing music or creating art of some kind.

One explanation for this is that men are seeking *beauty* in their pursuit of women.

But if a man is a *true artist*, that is, he is *creative* and can write songs, compose music, or paint art that *satisfies him* and which he finds beautiful, clearly his need for the beauty of women is substantially diminished.

That is one reason that when you get a very creative man like Beethoven or Jimi Hendrix, or a creative sporting genius like George Best, or poet like Byron or whomever, all the women flock to such a man, because in a sense *he is more beautiful than they are*, and thus the “power dynamic” has changed.

Such high talent however is rare in the “creative arts” but as we have said, a man can still get great satisfaction out of something like carpentry or restoring a car engine, or building his own house out of brick or logs with his bare hands, which

acts to *sublimate* this sexual energy.

We should note also that we must be careful with the creative “artistic” solution. Because suppose for example we write a novel, and we write in some romantic or sex scenes.

That is *not* going to diminish our desire, but rather increase it.

And moreover, as we have explained in one of our books on kundalini, intense mental work such as hard study can act as a form of meditative concentration, and thus stir the kundalini, which in turn can stir an even *stronger* sex desire.

Thus we find many intellectual, “creative” and sensitive people are prime candidates to be sex or porn addicts, because this kundalini is thereby (and indeed intrinsically) more active in them.

(for those who have read the author’s recent *Kundalini – A Personal Experience*, we will briefly point out that the author himself had at times to control his *kundalini enhanced* sex desire forcibly for several weeks on end, which was not easy for him by any means – Gopi Krishna recommended that the non-damaging level of sex activity for the average man would be two to three times a week or a fortnight under normal circumstances).

This phenomenon of enhanced sex desire however is easily observable in writers, artists, musicians and so on in general.

Their sex desire would be far less, if they worked with their hands more, did more hill walking and sport, instead of being so cerebral and emotionally excited all the time.

For example, the deliberate pursuit of emotionally exciting states by actors is only going to unbalance their brains, and thus make them also tense and prone to constantly seeking relief via sex, which we can see in the private lives (not very private, due to our modern media) of people such as for example Charlie Chaplin, and Michael Douglas – treated for “sex addiction” – and countless others, including the many rock stars who have bedded hundreds or thousands of women.

We might say it was merely *opportunity* that caused their sex addiction, or even debate if one could call it addiction at all, but living such an unbalanced and “melodramatic” life, will lead to such *enhanced desires*, whether the opportunity to fulfil them with a partner is there or not, because any mental *unbalance* will tend to create a state of tension that will seek constant *escape*.

The stress of overwork – especially as we have said *mental* overwork – will

likewise create this desire to escape, so that those who rightly fear drugs, alcohol and gambling, will be left only with *sex* as their sole sedative and escape.

So we are not merely theorising here.

We are explaining *porn addiction* like sex over-activity in general is a problem of *one's whole life*.

A man who works long hours on a farm all day long, tending the animals and fixing stone walls and planting seeds and so on, and feeling at peace with nature, is not likely going to have this kind of sex addiction problem, he is probably going to be *too tired*, but also hopefully *satisfied* and *at peace with himself* relatively speaking to *obsessively demand* sexual fulfilment.

But just imagine – suppose even after such a farmer's hard, honest and fulfilling day of labour, he finds his wife opens the door to him naked, or in some enticing underwear and high heels, beckoning him with her index finger, as not only the porn images, but *relationship or sex counselling or therapy* would have us think is a good idea.

He might then at least *try* to make a sexual effort he otherwise likely would never have considered, but rather would have just said "where's my dinner, wife?"

So women should realise that such behaviours towards the already over-sexually stimulated and focussed average man are utter *madness*.

She is not giving him his *reward* as she imagines, she's just bringing him one day closer to exhaustion, debilitation and death.

But this is the sort of thing modern Western women are doing in their millions, and they think that passes for "love" and "happiness."

Whereas what we are saying, is that aside from a more moderate and natural sex life, the only real happiness for anyone is by being *at peace with themselves, balanced in their psyche*, which may be assisted dramatically by finding an occupation they love doing, even though it may pay less money.

But if that cannot be arranged – for a man to gain greater satisfaction in life from his work and perhaps relationships with a wife and family – and don't assume please as we have explained in our *Men's Liberation Guide* that merely having a girlfriend or wife will produce such satisfaction, indeed it is currently more likely to produce the opposite, just *more* enslavement – what else might he try?

He must, in order to have this *motivation* to given up *any* addiction including porn, find some sort of a *cause* that means something to him.

Why?

Because just how can a man whose life is otherwise empty – no real meaningful relationships or work or other activities that give him a feeling of contentment or purpose – resist trying to blot out this pain with habits like drugs, drink, gambling and currently note – *easiest and cheapest of all* – porn?

We don’t see how he can. It’s just *cause* and *effect*.

Ask a man to study five or six long hard years to become say a lawyer or a doctor.

Why should he do it?

Because he wants to be a success, to be respected by society?

But what if he doesn’t care about society’s standards of “success”?

Each man must find his own *carrot*, or motive, with which to “beat himself” into following a course of action.

So without finding such a cause, a “carrot”, a motive, we submit we can’t see how any man who is already addicted – as opposed to one who has *never* indulged in porn, who can therefore think he is “holier than thou” but hasn’t understood what would happen if *he also* were to enter that room full of naked women, and not be able to get out again – can otherwise stop.

So what *could* that motive be?

It could be a religious or spiritual cause. He could give it up for “the betterment of mankind” to show his fellows this is not the way to go, to objectify women as pieces of meat to be drooled over.

But that is probably a too remote and “high blown” goal for the vast majority of men.

So a man could also find a woman he loves as the motive (whether or not in fact, she fully *deserves* it, we just have to *make her* an ideal, as Don Quixote did, even if she may not fully live up to it in reality, as likely no woman will).

He could then resist this mighty lure of porn or even prostitution *for her sake* and

that of any children he may have, or they might eventually have.

As we have said, it may be hard to find a woman whom we really (once we get to know her better, and our original fantasies of her dissolve) believe deserves such undying devotion, but we should rather think of her as someone whom *we are going to show the true meaning of love to*.

Then she might actually *become* our ideal, by seeing the true pureness of love *in us*.

Are we still being too ambitious for the average man?

We are not fully sure, but we submit, unless the authorities eventually *remove and ban* all this porn from the environment, which we believe will happen *eventually*, however remote it seems now, probably mainly *for the protection of women*, most men will not otherwise *without finding such an ideal or "cause"* to follow, *ever* be able to give it up.

For a man who has not got any great will of his own, it would be better if he is really out of control, that he *did* let a *hopefully good* woman organise his life, so he is kept too busy doing DIY and so on to fall into all these kinds of addictions like gambling and porn, even though generally speaking we feel it is best if man was "captain of his own ship, master of his own destiny."

And for the same reason of man being *his own master*, we would not advise going to these "sex addicts anonymous groups" or whatever, which may in fact, not actually *help* him give up at all, but on the contrary may merely *validate* his activity, give him a feeling of normality, so that all the members *talk* about giving up their addiction, but in practice *seldom* do.

e.g. at the *Alcoholics Anonymous* meetings, they say "I'm Joe, I'm an alcoholic" and they give him a round of applause for "confessing"; when what they should really be doing is (not that it should be done in public at all) having someone get up *only* when he has been clear of booze for a year or whatever saying "I'm Joe, I *used* to be an alcoholic, but *I'm not now*."

But we see, if they did it *that way round*, that would make all the men who haven't yet given up feel *guilty*, instead of *good* that he was a hopeless alcoholic too, and thus, they like to keep doing it the way it is now.

So if the porn addict goes to these kinds of meetings or "therapists" *as is being encouraged*, it may look sensible and like "wise submission to help" but we would guess in most cases is really just an act of self-humiliation and exhibitionism which

has no guarantee in it whatsoever that this will help sort out an addiction, but rather will just get the so called “therapist” paid at our expense (and do remember our vicar *is* such a paid “therapist” of sorts also).

Rather, the problem of addiction is in the final analysis a problem of *loss of self-respect* and *dignity* in any case, as the damning last line of the Guardian article *proves*, with its accusation of:

“are you just going to be a w***** for the rest of your life?”

So really, this Guardian article looks helpful and “pro-men” does it not, but on closer scrutiny, we find it is “naming and shaming” and humiliating men who use porn, and finally bullying them with an insult as if this was a sensible way to deal with someone who has got a problem that ultimately isn’t their fault, and they can’t control.

We do not condemn *all therapists* however, if they could give some what we feel to be wise advice, as detailed here.

That is firstly as a *true* treatment strategy for the millions of men addicted to porn and *sex in general*:

- a) acknowledging that *the whole social environment must be changed* including women taking responsibility for their sexual behaviour, and the media taking responsibility for the unnecessary and destructive constant hypnosis and teasing of men to crank their desire up to a level they can’t handle which may result in porn or sex addiction. Therapists should confess and *protest* their relative powerlessness due to the environment working continually and shamelessly against them.
- b) an understanding that all addictions are a *whole life* problem, and thus if males are overworked, bullied, dehumanized, abused and not allowed to live natural, creative and satisfying lives – with a wife and family if they desire it – they will be driven to addictive escapes like porn, and even in their anger to the less salubrious *vengeful* sadomasochistic varieties of it i.e. we can see these varieties are about *dehumanization of both genders* – men and women treating themselves and one another as *animals*.
- c) the mechanism of habit must be understood, such that those who are sufficiently *motivated* (by having a cause of some kind) can over time – possibly in two to six months in most cases – thereby substitute a less damaging “non-porn” method of sexually satisfying themselves
- d) the hypocritical “stigma” attached to porn use *in particular* in a “holier than thou” way, and self-stimulation in general, should be removed, as the latter is more or less a universal behaviour, and the former is also universal depending on how one defines “porn” – e.g. is “getting off” on a *Baywatch*

girl in a bikini or a “newspaper page three girl”, or ogling and fantasizing about the girl in the office, also not porn in its essence? – i.e. the use of images of women whom one is not in real life sexual relationship with.

- e) it must be recognised that marital or conjugal sex in itself is not generally speaking a paradise to be hungered after by every man and woman alive, but is frequently disappointing, and should not really be considered any more or less important than having a satisfying meal – *enjoyable while we do it, but quickly forgotten, and not long satisfying in most cases.*
- f) as most men will not overcome this problem without *help*, ultimately the “help” that should be given, is not dragging these men out into public and embarrassing them in some “group therapy” situation or interview article, but by in the final analysis removing all opportunities for addiction from the environment. We believe however, that this will only happen when women and governments see how this widespread sex obsession due only partly, as we have explained, to the unprecedented availability of porn, will grow to the degree where women will be fearing sexual attack, betrayal or enforced prostitution to an unacceptable level, which we would guess is already the case in a good number of countries in the world, such as parts of Eastern Europe and Asia, but will sooner or later happen also in the wider West.

Finally, as we see that male sex addiction, as with all the other male addictions to drink, gambling and drugs, is very much also an issue of male *disempowerment* – the *whole life* issue we have discussed – we want to mention one *vitaly important* issue that men themselves overlook, and is almost criminally ignored by all these “therapists”, “support groups” and our vicar friend from the article.

And that is, men have been taught by the media propaganda that their sperm, their *seed* is of little value, is unimportant.

Feminist influenced and even thoughtless non-feminist women say on the TV – “oh men can make bucket loads of this stuff in a single session – enough to impregnate nearly all the women in the world.”

What a thoughtless, and utterly degrading and in some cases – for those women who *know* the real truth – callous and cunning *lie*.

For without men’s seed – *no woman could ever have a child.*

So to the men reading this – *do you not see what an enormous power thereby you have got?*

We men are supposed to be eternally grateful that a woman would even look at us – and though the author does not wish to be vain, he feels he must say in his defence lest the motive here be assumed “self-rescuing”, that he has had had *many*

female admirers, he can assure you.

Even greater, we are made to believe that to get the woman in bed we have maybe even for years desired, will be the most marvellous experience imaginable without which we cannot ever be fulfilled on any level as human beings.

But the truth is that is also mostly a lie.

Look at rock stars and actors who have the most sought-after women – e.g. currently Jennifer Aniston or whomever – and what do we see? They *tire* of her, they leave her for someone else, just as did Dudley Moore and Rod Stewart split from even great beauties, and don’t imagine this is always the woman’s choice, as just as likely – especially in the case of these big celebrities like Brad Pitt or whomever – *it is not*.

Because the truth is – which porn it itself proves – *no woman*, no matter how beautiful can *ever* fully satisfy a man’s sex desire.

In terms of porn, that is also proven, because the producers must keep making more and more, serving up more enticing “fresh meat” to bare their assets for the camera, because men sooner or later *always* become bored with what they have seen before.

So that proves to us also that the only *real* reason we would stay with a woman is *love, companionship* and *friendship* rather than merely sex.

Though, as we have said, we are still going to have sex now and then, just like dinner, because we get hungry now and then, and the hunger must be satisfied and then goes away.

So the real challenge in any man’s life who seeks a *true* satisfaction is not to try to find loads of sex, but hopefully first to find some kind of meaningful work, vocation or cause to devote himself to, and secondly to then try to find a woman whom he can love and be a true friend with.

Flooding the environment with sexual signals and porn is clearly going to work *against* this true satisfaction of finding a proper relationship with a woman which men might otherwise achieve.

But as we have explained in our other works, unless a man can find himself a *Katie Holmes* type, it is not currently going to be easy, as we have all been placed into an unduly competitive and bullying society, which tends to encourage bad behaviour,

and tries to wreck the relationships of people who actually want to treat one another decently and with respect, which in the final analysis benefits *no one*.

e.g. Hugh Hefner, creator of Playboy magazine has bedded thousands of starlets.

Whilst the thought of bedding thousands of women will be enticing to any man, would you really want to be *him*?

No – every man wishes only *their own identity*.

And let us in any case think of the likes of Mr Hefner for a moment.

He may have bedded thousands of *easy* women.

But can he, or even a billionaire or king ever get the love and acceptance of one genuinely good and (reasonably) beautiful woman?

For example, just as the Emperor Crassus out of the Spartacus movie could not get the *love* of Spartacus's woman.

We would wish to point out another *motivation* as earlier suggested.

Quality women *do not want* sex obsessed men. They want men who are accomplished, sensitive, creative, understanding, capable of hard (but not excessive) work, and above all *caring* and *in control of themselves*, which if we think about it, those last two qualities are utterly interconnected.

For how can a drug or sex or gambling addict be truly *a caring person*?

He won't consciously *mean to*, but nevertheless will continually be compulsively driven to do things which will harm or hurt her in one way or another, if only by squandering their money.

And in the case of the sex addict how can he give any plausible claim that he will be faithful?

And in the case of the porn addict, his obvious lack of satisfaction in her, will clearly hurt and threaten her, should she become aware of it, which likely sooner or later, however much he may hide it, she eventually will.

But as we said, the seed of a man, especially in the current society, is the greatest possession he has and which cannot be taken away from him by any legal means, just as a woman cannot be made to have sex by any legal means.

This is *the logical reason* why men should not have sex outside of stable relationships (at least, where there is any likelihood the woman will get pregnant).

Because if you *give your seed away* thinking that it is valueless, and that *sex with a girl or woman* is the greatest thing that could ever happen to you, *as the propaganda has told you*, you will lose all power.

In this world, that is not – again despite all propaganda – a “man’s world” at all, but rather as any Westerner can see is being changed everyday more in favour of women in all kinds of ways, it remains the *only* real negotiating lever a man has got left.

So even if you are a poor man, perhaps with only a mediocre job, or even no job at all, *if you are a quality human being genetically speaking* – i.e. you are *intelligent, creative, artistic, good looking, athletic* or in fact remarkable in any way – you have got *real power* as regards women, but *if and only if you use it wisely*.

Consider the seed of an Einstein or a Newton, or a Beethoven or in modern times a musician like Jimi Hendrix, or great sporting hero like Pele, Maradona or George Best in football.

What woman would *if they could get it* not want the seed of such men, knowing that they could have a brilliant child by getting *that seed*?

And thus do we see millions of women attracted to such men.

(incidentally, for those who have read the author’s works on kundalini, this is another “gift” of *kundalini*, that women are attracted to kundalini awake men, even if they are not that good looking or old, which the ancient Hindu scripture on kundalini commentated on by Gopi Krishna, *Panchastavi*, details)

So we are suggesting here that men should use this perhaps single truly significant power a modern Western man has: he should use this “leverage” *however long it may take* – remembering modern women under the influence of the feminists or their misguided friends can *act* very tough and hard as “negotiators” – to develop a mutually respectful, non-abusive relationship with a suitable woman, if the life of a family man is what he seeks.

For otherwise, he may merely be tricked or seduced out of his seed – she gets the child she wants, but then he is “cast out into the wilderness” and denied any significant role in either her life or his child’s future.

The author has seen this happen to many men all around him during his life, so do not *for one second* think that this could not happen to you.

You may be young, and not seek a family as yet, but if so, just remember that thought for the future, and whatever you may do, *do not be tricked into fathering a child before you are ready*.

Likewise we can see that those who voluntarily donate their sperm for a few pounds, dollars or rupees are really fools, who do not realise that they are being thereby cheated of their real human rights as men, and also that they are thereby causing *their children* to be born into situations which for all they know may be abusive, or even as some kind of organised scam to produce child sex slaves or whatever.

But then, men must realise also – even talented, intelligent, handsome and athletic ones, who may already be well aware of their “pulling power” – that if they seek to actually have *a lasting relationship* with women, rather than just persuading her into a brief encounter in bed, they must become self-controlled and trustworthy (therefore at least relatively speaking *addiction free*) and therefore *caring* human beings, if a quality, intelligent and attractive woman is ever to accept them on that level.

So perhaps we shall now leave the reader with the departing thought and motivation any man might consider:– in that if he makes himself *worthy* like Spartacus, and if he makes the stoic and “spartan” effort to free himself of the dependency on porn – and in fact over-frequent sex activity in general – not only will his self-respect and feeling of self-mastery, health, intelligence and creativity (as per the *kundalini yoga explanation* given in some of the author’s other works) likely improve, but he may even find that some formerly unattainable lady of quality will see this new-found discipline and therefore healthy magnetism in him, and respect and accept him, consider him a worthy friend, and perhaps ultimately seek to be his partner and wife.

MEN AND PORN

THE GUARDIAN, Saturday November 8, 2003

(an article by Edward Marriott)

Pornography is ubiquitous, more profitable, more acceptable than ever. We argue about the effects on women participants but scant attention is given to the millions of mainly male users.

What does porn do to men? Edward Marriott investigates.

There's an episode of Friends - *The One With The Free Porn* - in which Chandler and Joey discover they have tuned into a porn channel. And it's free. They leave the TV on, afraid switching off will mean no more pornography. By the end of the episode, Chandler is seeing the world through "porn-tinted spectacles." "I was just at the bank," he complains, "and the teller didn't ask me to go do it with her in the vault."

Joey, bewildered, reports a similar reaction from the pizza-delivery girl.

"You know what," decides Chandler, "we have to turn off the porn."

As a society, however, we are further from turning off the porn than we have ever been.

Pornography is everywhere - it masquerades as "gentlemen's entertainment" in the form of clubs such as Spearmint Rhino, it infiltrates advertising and it will soon be available in our back pockets, thanks to a deal by adult entertainment giant Private Media Group to beam porn to UK mobile phones.

In its hardcore form, pornography is now accessed in the UK by an estimated 33% of all internet users. Since the British Board of Film Classification relaxed its guidelines in 2000, hardcore video pornography now makes up between 13% and 17% of censors' viewing, compared with just 1% three years ago, a rate of growth that is being cited as a causal factor in the recent bankruptcy of Penthouse, at one time the very apotheosis of porno chic but in recent years little more risqué than Loaded.

In the US, with the pornography industry bringing in up to \$15bn (£8.9bn) annually, people spend more on porn every year than they do on movie tickets and all the performing arts combined. Each year, in Los Angeles alone, more than 10,000 hardcore pornographic films are made, against an annual Hollywood average of just 400 movies.

Pornography is not only bigger business than ever before, it is also more acceptable, more fashionable, more of a statement of cool. From pieces "in praise of porn" in the normally sober Prospect magazine, to such programmes as *Pornography: The Musical*

on Channel 4 last month, to Victoria Coren and Charlie Skelton's book, published last year, about making a porn film, to the news that Val Kilmer is to play the part of pornography actor John Holmes in a new mainstream movie, there is a widespread sense that anyone who suggests pornography might have any kind of adverse effect is laughably out of touch.

Coren and Skelton, former *Erotic Review* film critics, focus on their flip comic narrative, scarcely troubling themselves with any deeper issues. "In all our years of watching porn," they write, in a rare moment of analysis that doesn't get developed any further, "we have never properly resolved what we think about how, why and whether it is degrading to women. We suspect that it might be. We suspect that pornography might be degrading to everybody."

With pornography, it seems as if the sheer scale of the phenomenon has, in time-honoured capitalist fashion, conferred its own respectability; as a result, serious analysis is hard to come by.

Only occasionally, amid porn-disguised-as-documentary that distinguishes much of Channel 5's late-night output, is there broadcasting that gives any kind of insight.

Channel 4's documentary *Hardcore*, shown two years ago, told the story of Felicity, a single mother from Essex who travelled to Los Angeles hoping to make a career in pornography. Arriving excited, and clear about what she would not do - anal sex, double-vaginal penetration - she ended up being coerced into playing a submissive role and agreeing to anal sex. Felicity - the vicissitudes of whose own troubled relationship with her father were mirrored by the cruelty of the men with whom she ended up working - eventually escaped back to the UK.

Hardcore offered a rare, unadorned look at the inside of the industry, as did *Pornography: The Musical*, albeit in a more surreal form, with actors interrupting sex to break into song.

Yet what about the millions who consume pornography, the men - for they are, despite pornographers' claims about growing numbers of female fans, mostly men - who habitually use it?

How are they affected?

Is pornography, as most these days claim, a harmless masturbatory diversion?

That episode of *Friends*, albeit with tongue in cheek, suggested a heavy diet of porn might encourage men inappropriately to expect sex.

Is that true?

And what about more profound effects?

How does it affect relationships?

Is it addictive?

Does it encourage rape, paedophilia, sexual murder?

Surely tough questions need to be asked.

First, though, some definitions.

According to the Shorter Oxford Dictionary, the word “pornography” dates to 1864, when it described “the life, manners, etc of prostitutes or their patrons. More recently, it has come to signify material, in the words of *Chambers*, “intended to arouse sexual excitement.”

Its most common themes, however, are power and submission.

By contrast, “erotica”, which is pretty hard to find now, carries additional connotations of “amorousness” and is far less concerned with control and domination.

No, it is pornography plain and simple, from teen magazines such as *Front* to venerable “wrist mags” such as *Playboy*, to the almost daily bombardment of teaser pornographic emails, that confronts all of us on a ceaseless basis.

The received wisdom, pushed hard by such mass-market magazines as *Loaded* and *FHM*, is that men derive a pretty uncomplicated enjoyment from pornography.

That, certainly, is the argument put forward by such proponents as David Baddiel, A A Gill, who has directed his own pornographic film, and the musician *Moby*, who once said in an interview, “I like pornography - who doesn’t? I don’t really trust men who claim to not be interested in porn. We’re biologically programmed to respond to the sight of people having sex.”

Danny Plunkett, then features editor of *Loaded*, takes an equally relaxed view: “We know that a lot of people enjoy it and take it with a pinch of salt. We certainly don’t view it as dangerous.”

But is it as simple as this?

One of my best friends is a man for whom pornography has apparently never held even the slimmest interest. Moby may choose to distrust him, but his sex life otherwise has always seemed to me perfectly robust. He is, however, so much in the minority as to seem almost an oddity.

For most men, at some point in their lives, pornography has held a strong appeal and, before any examination of its effects, this fact has to be addressed.

Like many men, I first saw pornography during puberty. At boarding school, dog-eared copies of *Mayfair* and *Knave* were stowed behind toilet cisterns; this borrow-and-return library system was considered absolutely normal, seldom commented upon and either never discovered by the masters or tacitly permitted. Long before my first sexual relationship, porn was my sex education.

No doubt (though we'd never have admitted it then) my friends and I were driven to use porn through loneliness: being away from home, we longed for love, closeness, unquestioning acceptance.

The women over whom we masturbated - the surrogate mothers, if you like - seemed to be offering this but, of course, they were never going to provide it. The untruths it taught me on top of this disappointment - that women are always available, that sex is about what a man can do to a woman - I am only now, more than two decades on, finally succeeding in unlearning.

From men everywhere come similar stories.

Nick Samuels, 46, an electrical contractor from Epping - now, with a wife and four children, the very image of respectable fatherhood - says he first discovered the power of pornographic images at the age of 16, when he found a copy of *Mayfair* in his father's garage. "I can even remember the picture. There was a woman walking topless past a building site and the builders were ogling her from the scaffolding. It was pretty soft stuff, but it heightened my senses and kicked off my interest in pornography. Before long, I was reading *Whitehouse* and then, through a friend at my squash club, I was introduced to hardcore videos."

Si Jones, a 39-year-old north London vicar who regularly counsels men trying to "come off" pornography, admits that, for him, too, it was his introduction to sex. "As a teenager, I watched porn films with my friends at the weekend. It was just what you did. It was cool, naughty and everyone was doing it."

Set against today's habit of solitary internet masturbation, Jones's collegiate introduction to porn seems peculiarly sociable.

Today, boys no longer clandestinely circulate magazines after school; nor do they need to rummage through their fathers' cupboards in search of titillating material. Access to internet pornography has never been easier, its users never younger, and the heaviest demand, according to research published in the New York Times, is for "deviant" material including paedophilia, bondage, sadomasochism and sex acts with various animals.

At its most basic level, pornography answers natural human curiosity. Adolescent boys want to know what sex is about, and porn certainly demonstrates the mechanics.

David Morgan, consultant clinical psychologist and psychoanalyst at the Portman Clinic in London, which specialises in problems relating to sexuality and violence, describes this phase as "transitional, like a rehearsal for the real thing. The problem with pornography begins when, instead of being a temporary stop on the way to full sexual relations, it becomes a full-time place of residence."

Morgan's experience of counselling men addicted to porn has convinced him that "the more time you spend in this fantasy world, the more difficult it becomes to make the transition to reality. Just like drugs, pornography provides a quick fix, a masturbatory universe people can get stuck in. This can result in their not being able to involve anyone else."

For most men, the way pornography objectifies sex strikes a visceral emotional chord.

Psychotherapists Michael Thompson and Dan Kindlon, in their book *Raising Cain: Protecting The Emotional Life Of Boys*, suggest that objectification, for boys, starts early.

"By adolescence, a boy wakes up most mornings with an erection. This can happen whether he is in a good or bad mood, whether it is a school day or a weekend ... Boys enjoy their own physical gadgetry. But the feeling isn't always, 'Look what I can do!' The feeling is often, 'Look what it can do!' - again, a reflection of the way a boy views his instrument of sexuality as just that: *an object*. What people might not realise when they justly criticise men for objectifying sex - viewing sex as something you do, rather than part of a relationship - is that the first experience of objectification of sexuality in a boy's life comes from his experience of his own body, having this penis that makes its own demands."

But the roots go back further still. Research has shown that boy babies are treated more harshly than their female counterparts and, as they grow up, boys are taught that success is achieved through competition.

In order to deal with this harsh masculine world, boys can learn not to trust their own feelings and not to express their emotions. They become suspicious of other men, with whom they're in competition, after all, and as a result they often feel lonely and isolated. Yet men, as much as women, hunger for intimacy.

For many males, locked into a life in which self-esteem has grown intrinsically entwined with performance, sex assumes an almost unsustainable freight of demands and needs.

Not only does the act itself become almost the only means through which many men can feel intimate and close, but it is also the way in which they find validation. And sex itself, of course, cannot possibly satisfy such demands.

It is into this troubled scenario that porn finds such easy access.

For in pornography, unlike in real life, there is no criticism, real or imagined, of male performance. Women are always, in the words of the average internet site, "hot and ready", eager to please.

In real life, by contrast, men find women are anything but: they have higher job status, they demand that they be sexually satisfied, and they are increasingly opting to combine career and motherhood.

Men, say psychologists, also feel threatened by the "emotional power" they perceive women wielding over them.

Unable to feel alive except when in relationships with women, they are at the same time painfully aware that their only salvation from isolation comes in being sexually acceptable to women.

This sense of neediness can provoke intense anger that, all too often, finds expression in porn.

Unlike real life, the pornographic world is a place in which men find their authority unchallenged and in which women are their willing, even grateful servants.

"The illusion is created," as one male writer on pornography puts it, "that women are really in their rightful place and that there is, after all, no real and serious challenge to male authority."

Seen in this light, the patently ridiculous pornography scenario of the pretty female flat-hunter (or hitch-hiker, driver with broken-down car, or any number of similar such vulnerable roles) who is happy to let herself be gang-banged by a group of overweight, hairy-shouldered couch potatoes makes perfect psychological sense.

The porn industry, of course, dismisses such talk, yet occasionally comes a glimmer of authenticity.

Bill Margold, one of the industry's longest-serving film performers, was interviewed in 1991 by psychoanalyst Robert Stoller for his book *Porn: Myths For The Twentieth Century*.

Margold made no attempt to gloss over the realities.

“My whole reason for being in this industry is to satisfy the desire of the men in the world who basically don't care much for women and want to see the men in my industry getting even with the women they couldn't have when they were growing up. So we come on a woman's face or brutalise her sexually: we're getting even for lost dreams.”

As well as “eroticising male supremacy”, in the words of anti-porn campaigner John Stoltenberg, pornography also attempts to assuage other male fears, in particular that of *erection failure*.

According to psychoanalytical thinking, pornography answers men's fetishistic need for visual proof of phallic potency.

Lynne Segal, professor of psychology and gender studies at Birkbeck College, University of London, writes: “Men's specific fears of impotence, feeding off infantile castration anxiety, generate hostility towards women. Through pornography, real women can be avoided, male anxiety soothed and delusions of phallic prowess indulged, by intimations of the rock-hard, larger-than-life male organ.”

Pornography, in other words, is a lie.

It peddles falsehoods about men, women and human relationships.

In the name of titillation, it seduces vulnerable, lonely men - and a small number of women - with the promise of intimacy, and delivers only a transitory masturbatory fix.

Increasingly, though, men are starting to be open about the effect pornography has had upon them.

David McLeod, a marketing executive, explains the cycle: “I'm drawn to porn when I'm lonely, particularly when I'm single and sexually frustrated. But I can easily get disgusted with myself. After watching a video two or three times, I'll throw it away and vow never to watch another again. But my resolve never lasts very long.”

He has, he says, “seen pretty much everything. I’ve even seen pictures of men being buggered by a pig. But once you start going down that slope, you get very quickly jaded.”

Like many men, McLeod is torn.

Quick to claim that porn has “no harmful effects”, he is also happy to acknowledge the contradictory fact that it is “deadening”.

Andy Philips, a Leeds art dealer and, at 38, a father for the first time, says there have been times when he has been “a very heavy user”.

His initial reaction, like that of many of the men to whom I spoke, is studiedly jokey: “I love porn.”

Yet, as he grows more contemplative, he admits: “I’ve always used it secretly, never as part of a relationship. It’s always been like the other woman on the side. It’s something to do with being naughty, I guess.”

Again and again, despite now being married, he is drawn back. “You can easily get too much of it. It’s deadening, nullifying, gratuitous, unsatisfying. At one point I was single for three years and I used a lot of porn then. After a while, it made me feel worse. I’d feel disgusted with myself and have a huge purge.”

Extended exposure to pornography can have a whole raft of effects.

By the time Nick Samuels had reached his mid-20s, it was altering his view of what he wanted from a sexual relationship. “I used to watch porn with one of my girlfriends, and I started to want to try things I’d seen in the films: anal sex, or threesomes.”

Sometimes, he says, this was OK – “She was an easy-going person.” At other times, “it shocked her”.

Married for 15 years, he admits he has carried the same sexual expectations into the marital bedroom. “There’s been real friction over this: my wife simply isn’t that kind of person. And it’s only now, after all these years, that I’m beginning to move on from it. Porn is like alcoholism: it clings to you like a leech.”

Psychoanalyst Estela Welldon, author of the classic text *Mother, Madonna, Whore*, has treated couples for whom such scenarios spiralled out of control. “A lot of men involve their partners in the use of porn. Typically, they will say, ‘Don’t you want a better sex life?’ I have seen cases in which first the woman has been subjected to porn and then they have used their own children for pornographic purposes.”

When couples use porn together - a growing trend, if anecdotal evidence is anything to go by - there is, says Welldon, “an illusory sense that they are getting closer together. Then they film themselves having sex and feel outside themselves. This dehumanising aspect is an important part of pornography. It dehumanises the other person, the relationship, and any intimacy.”

Even when in a loving sexual relationship, men who have used porn say that, all too often, they see their partner through a kind of “pornographic filter”.

This effect is summed up eloquently by US sociologist Harry Brod, in Segal’s essay *Sweet Sorrows, Painful Pleasures*: “There have been too many times when I have guiltily resorted to impersonal fantasy because the genuine love I felt for a woman wasn’t enough to convert feelings into performance. And in those sorry, secret moments, I have resented deeply my lifelong indoctrination into the aesthetic of the centrefold.”

Running like a watermark through all pornography use, according to Morgan at the Portman Clinic, is the desire for control.

This need, he says, has its roots in early childhood. “A typical example might be a boy with fairly absent parents, either in emotional terms or in actual fact.” The boy, wishing his parents were more present - more within his control, as it were - can grow up wishing “to find something over which he can have control. Pornography fills that space.”

But the user of pornography is also psychologically on the run, Welldon adds. “People who use pornography feel dead inside, and they are trying to avoid being aware of that pain. There is a sense of liberation, which is temporary: that’s why pornography is so repetitive - you have to go back again and again.”

Lost in a world of pornographic fantasy, men can become less inclined, as well as increasingly less able, to form lasting relationships.

In part, this is due to the underlying message of pornography.

Ray Wyre, a specialist in sexual crime, says pornography “encourages transience, experimentation and moving between partners.” Morgan goes further: “Pornography does damage,” he says, “because it encourages people to make their home in shallow relationships.”

Jan Woolf believes it might also prevent a relationship getting started. A former special needs teacher, she lasted only six months in the job of BBFC censor in 2001.

During this time, she watched hundreds of hours of hardcore videos.

At the time, she was single. “If I’d been in the early stages of a relationship, it would have been very difficult, because I’d have been watching what I might have been expected to be doing, except it would never have been like that.”

She left the job because the porn was starting to make her feel “depressed - I wanted my lively mind back.”

The more powerful the sense of pre-existing internal distress, the more compelling becomes the pull towards pornography.

For John-Paul Day, a 50-year-old Edinburgh architect in his first “non-addictive” sexual relationship, the experience of being a small boy with a dying mother drove him to seek solace in masturbation.

He says he has been “addicted” to pornography his entire adult life.

“The thing about it is that, unlike real life, it is incredibly safe,” Day says. “I’m frightened of real sex, which is unscripted and unpredictable. And so I engage in pornography, which is totally under my control. But, of course, it also brings intense disappointment, precisely because it is not what I’m really searching for. It’s rather like a hungry person standing outside the window of a restaurant, thinking that they’re going to get fed.”

Day, who has attended meetings of *Sex Addicts Anonymous* for 12 years, says, “Pornography is central to my own sex addiction in as much as sex addiction has to do with the use of fantasy as a way of escaping from reality. Even in my fantasies about ‘real’ people, I am really transforming them into pieces of walking pornography. It is not the reality of who they are that I focus on, but the fantasy I project on to them.”

Like drugs and drink, pornography - as Day has realised - is an addictive substance.

Porn actor Kelly Cooke, one of the stars of *Pornography: The Musical*, says this applies on either side of the camera: “It got to the point where I considered having sex the way most people consider getting a hamburger. But when you try to give it up - that’s when you realise how addictive it is, both for consumers and performers. It’s a class A drug, and it’s hell coming off it.”

The cycle of addiction leads one way: towards ever harder material.

Morgan believes “all pornography ends up with S&M”.

The now-infamous Carnegie Mellon study of porn on the internet found that images of hardcore sex were in far less demand than more extreme material. Images of women engaging in acts of bestiality were hugely popular, the most frequently downloaded being of a brunette with - in the pornographer's trusty lexicon - "a huge horse cock in her tight pussy."

The mechanics of the pornographic search - craving, discovery of the "right" image, masturbation, relief - makes it, says Morgan, work like "a sort of drug, an antidepressant".

The myth about porn, as a witness told the 1983 Minneapolis city council public hearings on it, is that "it frees the libido and gives men an outlet for sexual expression."

This is truly a myth.

I have found pornography not only does not liberate men, but on the contrary is a source of bondage. Men masturbate to pornography only to become addicted to the fantasy.

There is no liberation for men in pornography.

It becomes a source of addiction, much like alcohol.

There is no temporary relief.

It is mood-altering. And reinforcing, ie, 'you want more' because 'you got relief'. It is this reinforcing characteristic that leads men to want the experience they have in pornographic fantasy to happen in "real life."

In its most severe form, this can lead to sexual crime, though the links between the two remain controversial and much argued-over.

Wyre, from his work with sex offenders, says:

"It is impossible not to believe pornography plays a part in sexual violence. As we constantly confront sex offenders about their behaviour, they display a wide range of distorted views that they then use to excuse their behaviour, justify their actions, blame the victim and minimise the effect of their offending. They seek to make their own behaviour seem normal, and interpret the behaviour of the victim as consent, rather than a survival strategy. Pornography legitimises these views."

One of the most extreme examples of this is Ted Bundy, the US serial sexual murderer executed for his crimes in January 1989.

The night before his death, he explained his addiction to pornography in a radio interview: “It happened in stages, gradually ... My experience with ... pornography that deals on a violent level with sexuality is that, once you become addicted to it, and I look at this as a kind of addiction like other kinds of addiction, I would keep looking for more potent, more explicit, more graphic kinds of material. Like an addiction, you keep craving something which is harder, harder, something which gives you a greater sense of excitement, until you reach the point where the pornography only goes so far ... It reaches that jumping-off point where you begin to wonder if, maybe, actually doing it will give you that which is beyond just reading about it or looking at it.”

Bundy, as damaged as he was, stopped short of blaming pornography for his actions, though it was, he believed, an intrinsic part of the picture.

“I tell you that I am not blaming pornography ... I take full responsibility for whatever I’ve done and all the things I’ve done ... I don’t want to infer that I was some helpless kind of victim. And yet we’re talking about an influence that is the influence of violent types of media and violent pornography, which was an indispensable link in the chain ... of events that led to behaviours, to the assaults, to the murders.”

In the understated words of Wyre, “the very least pornography does is make sexism sexy.”

The average man, of course, whatever his consumption of pornography, is no Bundy.

Yet for those who have become addicted, the road to a pornography-free life can be long and arduous. Si Jones advises accountability: “Make your computer accountable, let other people check what you’ve been looking at.”

And the alternative to pornography, says Morgan, is not always easy.

“Relationships are difficult. Intimacy, having a good relationship, loving your children, involves work. Pornography is fantasy in the place of reality. But it is just that: fantasy. Pornography is not real, and the only thing human beings get nourishment from is reality: real relationships. And, anyway, what do you want to say when you get to the end of your life? That you wish you’d spent more time wanking on the internet? I hardly think so.”