

Issues Download #8 – Sexual Inequities

I have presented the world of sports as viewed from a politicized male perspective; witness now the politicized male perspective applied to the realms of sex, dating, and romance. By way of introduction to his techniques for bringing about *Intimate Connections* with the opposite sex, David Burns M.D. tells his story:

Occasionally I'd sit for hours in the student union trying to strike up conversations with women. Whenever I saw an attractive woman I would greet her with lame comments such as: "Oh, what's your name? Do you go to school here? I'm a medical student," and so on. Within a minute or two she would inevitably excuse herself by saying, "I'm just waiting here for my boyfriend, who will be along any minute." This was discouraging, but I'd nevertheless try again. And again. And again. I probably became one of the most rejected men in Northern California, since I accumulated as many as fifty to sixty rejections per week. Despite a success rate of approximately zero, I continued to pursue the opposite sex, figuring that maybe *somehow* I might soon learn the ropes.ⁱ

If those same women had used those same lines to pick *him* up, would Burns still judge them "lame"? Is it just coincidence that David Burns' "luck" with women changed at the same time as he was making the transition from medical *student* to medical *doctor*? "Have women any idea," asks Nancy Friday, "how it feels to be rejected again and again?"ⁱⁱ Who can doubt the connection between Man's drive for success and his desire to improve his "luck" with the ladies?

Certainly, technique and practice can improve one's success rate in *any* endeavor. With all due respect to Dr. Burns and his technique, however, what guy needs technique when he's got the letters "M.D." after his name? Further, why should a guy need "technique" in the first place? His female equivalent needs neither the technique, nor the M.D. If he were equally desired (for his *intrinsic* values), then he wouldn't need a technique or an M.D. either.

Last but not least among our eight representative men's issues is the issue of female sexual power which, from the politicized male perspective, appears vastly more effective and compelling than male sexual power. To complete our sexual-political picture, we need to understand this power: its magnitude, its effect on men, and its effect upon our world.

Any number of indicators might leave the male feeling doubtful as to the effectiveness of his masculine allure upon the fairer sex. For example, he may conclude that the combined flesh lust toward men of all the women in America is sufficient to sustain only *one* magazine, directed at women, featuring erotic images of men. Despite its fame, *Playgirl* is a small-scale publication boasting fewer subscribers than either *Mother Earth News* or *Workbench*. What's more, fully half its subscribers are men.ⁱⁱⁱ

The heterosexuality of women could not possibly be as socially suppressed as is the homosexuality of men; yet gay men find enough beauty in the flesh of men to allow gay erotica to flourish. And the heterosexual desires of men have made erotic imagery of women into a *multibillion*-dollar industry. But the *heterosexual* desires of women would seem to be only *half* sufficient to keep one low-circulation magazine afloat. *Viva*, the only other magazine to attempt to sell imagery of male beauty to women, sank.^{iv} While women support over a dozen fashion magazines, featuring all the female skin the law will allow if they are to be sold in grocery stores, women do not spend enough money on erotic imagery of men to sustain a mere two women's magazines featuring *male* beauty as their selling point.

Are these not plain facts as viewed from where the male is standing?

To the average boy it appears obvious that the *enormous* degree to which pornography, prostitution, strip clubs, phone sex, and the sex trade in general sells more to men than to women could only reflect the degree to which male sexual desires toward women must vastly exceed female sexual desires toward men. In which direction does money more often flow as it changes hands between men and women? Women now make money of their own, but the direction in which money more often flows has not changed in equal measure.

Then as now: woman + nothing = man + family-supporting wage. Consider the two sides of this equation; don't they suggest a certain imbalance in sexual power based on gender? The basic courtship

ritual (men pursue and persist, while women attract and resist) reflects this imbalance and would seem to indicate that only women have an allure that is powerful enough to affect and compel their opposite sex into *active* pursuit.

We see that when couples fight, the man is often banished from the woman's bed. His punishment is to suffer deprivation of her. We've no reason to believe she suffers deprivation of him. A man's erect penis is an unambiguous sign of his arousal. What can a man look to as an unambiguous sign of *her* arousal? The gifts he gives and money he spends, in exchange for "sexual favors," are also concrete unambiguous indicators of his desire. Though they may *pay* for it, in receiving her "gift," men are to believe that they "get lucky."

According to lesbian author Pat Califia's observations of female heterosexuality, "The dynamic has to be: you do this awful thing to me that only you enjoy, so in return I expect summer vacations in Europe, diamond rings, and my own car."^v If he lacks money and lacks even the *potential* to make money, a man may wonder if he is left with anything at all that a woman desires.

So long as money enters the equation—if he is paying for his date, or paying a prostitute, or even paying his wife's mortgage—a man has no way of knowing *for certain* whether he is truly *innately* desired or not. For *many* reasons, women's feelings toward men may appear rather, ambiguous.

Both sexes have sought to "sabotage" the other's confidence in an effort to keep the opposite sex out of "its territory." Remember *The Rules* (1995) by Ellen Fein and Sherrie Schneider? It was a massive #1 *New York Times* Bestseller. "The Rules" include "Don't meet him halfway or go Dutch on a date," "Don't talk to a man first and don't ask him to dance," "Don't call him and rarely return his calls." *The Rules* may be summed up: never give a man any reason to believe that he is desired and thus desirable. Keep him feeling as sexually insecure and inferior as possible. That way he'll feel maximally lucky, grateful, and indebted for any attention/affection he is given.

As *The Rules* clearly indicate, a woman will feel *humiliated* to have "thrown herself" at a man. Her "feminine pride" is wounded in making her desires known. And yet, as previously pointed out, in initiating contact, subjecting his "pickup line" to her judgment, pursuing and paying her way, men "throw themselves" at women as a matter of course. If *The Rules* dictate that women are to be neither "easy" nor "cheap," what else then can they be but difficult and expensive?

Isn't the word "cute"—women's universally preferred term for male attractiveness—a rather tepid adjective? "Cute" describes *nothing* a man aspires to be. If a man weren't so starving for *any* affirmation of desirability, his pride would have him reject "cute" as an insult. But men have little of the sexual confidence that sustains a woman's sexual pride. We hear that we're lousy in bed, we don't last long enough, women fake their orgasms with us, women are much better at cunnilingus than we are, and "Women need men like fish need bicycles." There's really not a whole lot for a man to base his sexual confidence and/or pride upon.

Taken all together, the perception that feminine sexual attractiveness is, at the very least, more commonplace, effective, and compelling than is masculine sexual attractiveness, appears self-evident to most males from the start. Author Thomas Ellis:

The high school culture has been etched upon us forever. Guys have to try, girls do not. We have to approach them, they have to reject us. We have to impress them, and they have to remain unimpressed. Women are more desirable to men than men to women. They don't return our calls. They don't have time for us until next week. Then they cancel or don't show up. They can be late to meet us because their time is more valuable than ours. We have to pay. In a daily ritual we are called upon to sacrifice our own self-worth for theirs.^{vi}

Men, of course, seek after success partly for its intrinsic rewards. Nevertheless, the question remains: how much of this adolescent sexual powerlessness will later transform into the male drive to perform, achieve, and succeed motivated, in large part, by a desire to even out the sexual playing field and gain some measure of equality in the sexual/romantic arena?

Men generally have something boys don't have, a career. And with it, they add extrinsic value to themselves. *Clearly*, one of men's major motivators in seeking after money is to have something that

women want as much as women have what men want. With *sufficient* extrinsic values (paycheck, job title, military rank) men will gain leverage out of granting or withholding “commitment” (i.e., financial security) sufficient to match the leverage women—perhaps even beautiful women—wield out of granting or withholding sex.

Gaining that leverage is a man’s best, most surefire way to pursue relations with women from an equal position of strength that allows him to pursue, yet keep his pride.

When two women have dinner together, does the one who’s making more money pickup the check? Men don’t pay because they make more money; men make more money because they must pay. The boys’ ability and willingness to support a woman’s fantasies of “*Better Homes And Gardens*”—still far and away the largest selling woman’s magazine in the world^{vii}—is symbolized in the act of paying her way. As mothers warn their daughters, “Why should a man buy the cow when he can have the milk for free?” so articles in *Cosmopolitan* speak for many women when they offer advice such as, “Make love the old-fashioned way. Make him *earn* it!”^{viii}

Warren Farrell has identified a list of nine conditions to be met before the average woman is willing to consent to sex with a man.^{ix} These are generalizations, of course, but see if they don’t ring true.

- 1) He must be sexually attractive. He doesn’t necessarily have to be “handsome,” but he must have sex appeal.
- 2) He must be single. More often than men, women will cross a man off their list if he has a girlfriend, is engaged, or married.
- 3) He must be someone she can respect. If he wants to cross the street to avoid some young toughs, or if she regards his reaction to mis-placing a twenty-dollar bill to be excessive (“I don’t understand it. It was right here a moment ago. Where could it have gone?”) her eyes roll, the silent buzzer sounds and, whether he knows it or not, he’s “out.” Should he be judged insecure, weak, lazy, cheap, timid . . . he is unlikely to wind up in her bed.
- 4) He must be someone with whom she feels some measure of intellectual connection. If she regards the gothic poems of Poe and Byron the height of romanticism and he regards them the height of indulgence, he’ll probably spend the night alone. Should the dinner conversation reveal a fundamental conflict in their opinions, it is far more likely to be a sexual deal breaker for her than for him.
- 5) He must be someone with whom she feels some emotional connection. If she’s an animal lover and he is not, or she worships Princess Diana and he doesn’t get it . . . well, then he doesn’t get it.
- 6.a) He must meet her standards for status and 6.b) He must meet her standards for successfulness. A man who makes a high wage might still fail this two-sided requirement. A plumber may be successful and well paid, but that may not help him if his date does not want to marry a “plumber.”
- 7) He must initiate the first date. He must subject his “pick-up line” to her judgment. He must get her phone number and—assuming it’s her *real* number—keep calling till he reaches her directly (The Rule is: “Don’t call him and rarely return his calls”). He must present her with a date option she regards as adequate. He may satisfy all other require-ments, but if he doesn’t do what it takes to make the first date happen, what chance has he got?
- 8) He must pay her way. Women may deny it, but no matter what else he might have going for him, his failure to pick up the check is *very* apt to be a fatal error. As one 33-year-old female TV producer put it, “If you offer [to pay] and they accept, then it’s over.”^x
- 9) He must initiate sexually. He must initiate the first kiss, the first handholding, etc. Even if he’s met every condition up to this point, if, for any reason, he can’t handle “putting the moves on her,” he’s history. As actress Lucy Liu put it, “I like to be the girl, you know? I’m not going to make the first move, and if he’s waiting around for that, then it’s literally never going to happen.”^{xi} In some cases (he’ll never know which), his taking her “no” to mean “no” may also cost him sex and/or love.

Meanwhile, in the same manner of generalization as the above, her *first* requirement—sexual attractiveness—is his *only* requirement. When men complain that they can't get laid, they mean they can't get their one requirement met. When women complain that they can't get laid, they mean they can't get all nine of their requirements met.

I submit that the disparity between his one requirement and her nine is a fairly clear measure of the disparity in male vs. female sexual power.

A minority of men at the top do more than their fair share of the mat-ing and marrying (leaving other males shut out). The same holds true in nature. “Almost all females mate and reproduce, but many fewer males do, the percentage varying with the species,” asserts Marry Bat-ten, author of *Sexual Strategies*. “Why don't more males mate? It isn't for lack of interest. Either they are killed off or prevented from mating by their rivals or they are rejected by females.”^{xii}

A system of mating involving one male, multiple females, is known as polygyny. David M. Buss:

Even in a mildly polygynous mating system like our own, where some men acquire multiple partners through serial marriage and affairs and others are left mateless, competition among men and selection by women of men who are high in status and resources are ultimately responsible for the evolution in males of risk-taking traits that lead to successful mating at the expense of a long life. Because the reproductive stakes are higher for men than for women, more men than women risk being shut out of mating entirely. Bachelors who are mateless for life are more numerous than spinsters in every society. In America in 1988, for example, 43 percent of men but only 29 percent of women had never been married by the age of twenty-nine. By the age of thirty-four, 25 percent of men but only 16 percent of women had never been married.^{xiii}

Because fewer men possess the combination of looks, personality, and status that add up to sexual/matrimonial desirability, fewer men than women mate. And the discrepancy is not slight. If 25 percent of men but only 16 percent of women never marry, then rejected males outnumber rejected females by over 50 percent.

In fact, according to recent human DNA analysis, 67 percent of our human ancestors were female—only 33 percent were male.^{xiv} In other words, “More men than women get squeezed out of the mating game,” explains genetic researcher Jason Wilder of the University of Arizona. “As a result, twice as many women as men passed their genes to the next generation.”^{xv} Historically, if about 80 percent of women managed to breed, then only about 40 percent—*less than half* of all men—were elite enough, or lucky enough, to do the same! If we opened our hearts to men, the predominantly male experience of being “squeezed out of the mating game,” would surely rate the same societal empathy accorded any number of women's issues.

To have mate-appeal equal to that of his own female equivalent, a man must possess both *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* values. This truth is clearly observable in the fact that *every* male “sex symbol” is also a “*success* symbol.” Though chased by hordes of female fans, even a beautiful Adonis like basketball superstar Magic Johnson knows what it's like to be rendered a “success object.” Katie Roiphe: “As Magic describes it, these women wanted to talk about salaries as a kind of foreplay. ‘I sometimes felt,’ Magic wrote good-naturedly, ‘that it was not me that they were excited by but my checkbook.’”^{xvi} If men were not quite so “good-natured” regarding their inequities, if men spoke out, we'd have a better sense that It All Balances Out.

Could romance novel cover model Fabio be the sole exception? Could he be *so* beautiful that he is desired for his intrinsic values alone? Steven Rhoads:

Fabio is a handsome male model with enormous shoulders and a rug-ged face. Men can see why women would find him attractive. What men don't understand is how his money and the power it brings can add to his *physical* attractiveness. But one columnist covering a Fabio appearance tells her female readers—“Lest the sex appeal of Fabio escape you, repeat ‘multimillionaire’ to yourself.”^{xvii} [Emphasis in the original]

Every romance novel features a handsome/powerful man known to ro-mance novel publishers and naturalists alike as the “Alpha Male.” And *every* male sex symbol is also a *success* symbol. A man's wealth/status adds to his physical/romantic attractiveness. Sex appeal and success appeal are inexorably linked within the female sexual psyche.

“Women’s orgasm frequency increases with the income of their partner,” states researcher Dr Thomas Pollet of Newcastle University.^{xviii} To reach this conclusion one need only ask vast numbers of married women to self-report their frequency of orgasm during sex. The difference in the orgasmic level of one woman vs. another directly correlates with their husband’s level of income. “There were of course, several factors involved in such differences but, said Pollet, money was one of the main ones.”^{xix} No wonder Magic Johnson’s bed partners used talk of salaries as a kind of foreplay.

Even decades later, I can *still* remember the names of all those Playboy “Playmates” I obsessed over. However much women may desire the celebrity male, men desire “Miss April” *every* bit as much. Yet she brings to the table only what she was born with. She doesn’t bring wealth; she *spends* wealth. Beauty *alone* turns *any* woman into a celebrity.

Recently in the news, we had Natalie Dylan, a fairly ordinary looking 22-year-old Women’s Studies student from San Diego selling her virginity to the highest bidder. According to various Internet sources, the highest bid reached was an absurd 3.7 million dollars!^{xx} Along with myriad other cultural indicators, the sums top prostitutes command make it clear that female beauty/sexuality is far and away the most powerful and the most expensive drug on earth.

Most men will agree; making love to a beautiful woman is just about the greatest physical/emotional ecstasy this earthly reality has to offer. Men are embarrassed to admit to it but, for the promise of experiencing that ecstasy, a man can be made to do just about *anything*.

Take away every last bit of the beautiful celebrity female’s celeb-ri-ty status, and her sexual and marital appeal diminish only a little. Take away every last bit of the beautiful celebrity male’s celebrity status, and his sexual appeal—and even more especially, his marital appeal—plummets. Put him in a Burger King uniform and regardless of his intrinsic values, his sexual/marital appeal is *gone*.

Knowing, for example, that only women’s bodies can be “rented” for hundreds or even thousands of dollars an hour, how could women *not* assume that their bodies are worth more than men’s? Men commonly overhear women speak of their sexual “*favours*” as something they *give* to a man. Only “Mr. Right” with both intrinsic *and* extrinsic values is “eligible” enough to meet her many conditions, receive her “gift”¹ ^{xxi} and thus “get lucky.”

Unlike his female equivalent, a man is in no position to expect someone to whom he feels attraction, who’s single, and someone he respects and with whom he feels an intellectual and emotional compatibility and who meets his status/success requirements, to ask him out, pay his way, and keep initiating sexually until he gives in. Such expectations are quite literally beyond the imaginings of men, and yet a woman with no more than ordinary physical attractiveness will surely recognize these nine conditions as among the most *minimal* of her *requirements*. Men have all these same wants, but men are not empowered to turn such wants into *requirements*.

A woman may scope out some guy to whom she’s attracted and hope to be “swept off her feet” and offered lifetime protection and financial support, but a man will have lesser hopes. When a man gazes upon a beautiful woman and desires sex with her, it’s not that he “*only* wants to get laid.” He only *aspires* to getting laid because that’s as high as his low expectations take him.

In the sexual realm, men are *far* less than equal.

What is the source of female sexual power? How does it work and what force of influence does it ply in our world?

Women’s greater average sexual power derives from a mix of biologically induced quantitative and qualitative differences in male vs. female sex drives, plus various cultural factors. The quantitative difference results in what Dr. Michael Bonaventura has dubbed the “libido gap.”^{xxii}

¹ For example, renowned “sexpert,” Dr. Turndorf, aka, “Dr. Love” advises women to regard “sex as a loving *gift* to our men” [Emphasis in the original]

Simply put, we may each have a steaming bowl of soup to offer the other, but if you're starving and I'm only mildly hungry, then I'll operate from a stronger bargaining position. If men desire women's bodies more than women desire men's bodies . . . same thing.

Amid the many ambiguities two facts are asserted. One: "Perhaps the biggest difference between the male and female brain is that men have a sexual pursuit area that is 2.5 times larger than the one in the female brain."^{xxiii} Two: testosterone is largely responsible for fueling sex drives in both men and women, and men have, on average, about 10 to 15 times as much of the stuff coursing through their veins.

It will sway all but the most resistant that when women have that hormone administered to them, their sex drives soar accordingly. If a woman's low libido can be so effectively treated with a testosterone patch, how can her low libido be ascribed to sexual suppression under "patriarchy"? In discussing the perils of "testosterone replacement therapy," a *Newsweek* article states, "the surges of biochemical desire can leave patients reeling. One woman unwittingly doubled her dosage and had to excuse herself every few hours just to seek relief."^{xxiv} We men know the feeling.

Regarding the libidinous effects of testosterone treatments, Joan Sewell quotes Max Valerio, a transsexual born Anita Valerio:

My sex drive went up after about a week and a half. And I thought I had a high sex drive before! And when people told me I would have a higher sex drive, I thought, "Well, how high could that be?" . . . It's like another world . . . Suddenly you understand why men tend to be more interested in pornography, why there's prostitution . . . of course!^{xxv}

Of course!

In her book *I'd Rather Eat Chocolate: Learning to Love My Low Libido*, Joan Sewell recounts her endless endeavors to bolster what everyone insists is her "psychologically induced" lack of sexual desire. She tries "sexpert" advice, sexual techniques and strategies, porno-graphy, sexual meditation, "sensitive focusing," sexual spirituality, whipped cream—none of it has any effect.

Even so, the "experts" keep telling her it's all in her head, yet the doctors transforming Anita Valerio into Max Valerio know perfectly well that testosterone is the key to libido. "They simply took it for granted," says Sewell, "that there was a direct correlation between high testosterone levels and higher libido."^{xxvi} Finally, Sewell must come to grips with reality. "Probably the most profound thing I've learned from my experiences and my research is that there is a very significant biological difference in the sex drives of men and women, and in my view, this natural limit to our sexual appetites should be acknowledged and respected."^{xxvii}

Every now and then, women's magazines run articles helping sexually disinterested women feel better by reminding them that their "disappointment in sex" is commonplace. Susan Jacoby, October 1996 issue of *Glamour* magazine:

Nora, a medical student, doesn't like discussing her disappointment in sex. "I never mention it to the men I sleep with," she says. "What would they think if they knew that, on my list of enjoyable activities, sex ranks somewhere between eating yogurt and studying for exams? You have to understand: It's not that I hate sex, but if sex weren't so much a part of dating, and if I didn't want babies someday, I'd probably be perfectly happy not to do it." . . . Even today when sexual pleasure is assumed to be attainable by everyone—and when an unprecedented amount of sexual information is readily available—women like Nora are far more common than is generally recognized.

According to the book *Sex in America*, "women repeatedly claim in arenas like magazine articles that they find nude men unerotic, not particularly exciting."^{xxviii}

Molly Haskell, writing in *Lear's* magazine, captured the woman's view of most male nudity when she explained that naked men in movies are curiously unstimulating to most women: "But the truth is that most of us women are not that eager to see male stars in the altogether. [William] Baldwin's brother Alec shows too much of his birthday suit in *Prelude to a Kiss* and Richard Gere's seminude thrashing and prancing in *Sommersby* are about as erotic as his self-consciously lusty smile." Holly Brubach, writing about mail-order catalogues in the *New York Times Magazine*, made a similar point. She spoke of International Male, for example, with its suggestively posed and scantily clothed models. "For me and for most of the women I know, an excursion through this catalogue is uneventful: Here's a guy with a neck like a tree trunk; there's

one with nice legs. So what?”^{xxxix}

“She’s got *legs*, she knows how to use them,” scream ZZ Top in a tes-tosterone-fueled frenzy. In contrast, Jules Asner, the beautiful anchor of *E! News Daily*, comments: “We went to this nude beach, and there were all these naked men, the female body is a beautiful thing, but seeing 50 naked men was just . . . ough.”^{xxx} In fact, says actress Shannon Elizabeth, “A man’s naked body isn’t always the prettiest thing to look at, even when he’s in good shape.”^{xxxi}

According to data collected and analyzed by online dating service OkCupid, men are “surprisingly charitable . . . the majority of women have been rated about ‘medium.’” Nothing surprising about it, most people will, of course, be average. Yet, “women rate an incredible 80% of guys as worse-looking than medium.”^{xxxii} If that’s true, then it would seem that the vast majority of men are essentially “ugly” in the eyes of women. Perhaps we’re in need of a second opinion?

“Several times a day I would retrieve a magazine and masturbate while fantasizing about those huge adult penises” recounts gay author Gary Griffin. Beheld by someone with a testosterone driven *sex* drive, the mere *image* of male beauty printed onto a piece of paper is enough to be intoxicating. Describing his sexual awakening: “I came to love, understand, and appreciate the beauty of the male body,” says Griffin. “I had absolutely no attraction to the opposite sex.”^{xxxiii}

Men also have legs, longer and with better calf development, but I don’t hear women screaming about them. Men are larger, stronger, more muscular, less bottom heavy. If beauty is in the eye of the beholder, then perhaps men don’t lack beauty as much as men lack an opposite *sex* to fully appreciate, and *value* it?

To procreate, males *must* reach levels of sexual arousal sufficient to sustain erection and achieve orgasm/ejaculation. Because females can procreate whether they are libidinous or not, many are not. The “libido gap” shows itself clearly in any number of clinical studies.

One from 1994 concludes, “High school girls are less comfortable with their sexual experiences than are their male counterparts . . . while 81 percent of the sexually active boys said that ‘sex is a pleasurable experience,’ only 59 percent of the girls said they felt that way”^{xxxiv} The *Janus Report on Sexual Behavior* by Sam S. Janus, Ph.D., and Cynthia L. Janus, M.D., offers the results of nearly 3,000 surveys. When asked “How much below maximum sexual potential are you?” not less than 24 percent of women answered *100 percent*.^{xxxv} And according to a massive survey published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 32 percent of women “lacked interest in sex,” 26 percent were “unable to achieve orgasm” and 23 percent reported “sex not pleasurable” (in men the results were 15%, 8%, 8%).^{xxxvi} “One out of three women said they were uninterested in sex,” report the authors of *Sex in America*.^{xxxvii}

These same clinical findings also suggest that about a third of women have fully functional sex drives, which suggests that libidinous women are very commonplace. Add to that a certain characteristically feminine emotional/verbal effusiveness—together with her virtually unlimited *capacity* for sex—and, upon encountering such a woman, the “myth” of low female libido is apt to be replaced with an unshakable conviction: *They want it just as much as we do!* But women’s lesser *average* sex drive is not a myth, it’s a matter of degree.

Anita Valerio believed her sex drive was set at utmost but Max Valerio knows better. Woman’s sex drive could average a *lot* less than Man’s and still allow for a *lot* of female lust, enough to mislead men and women into believing that male and female lust are a match. Yet the culture-wide effect of such a mismatch in libido would certainly contribute to female sexual power.

At the risk of *way* oversimplifying, at this juncture, I’ll offer a cursory glance at a few of the complex *qualitative* differences most commonly observed:

1) Female sexuality is not as “self-starting.” The “Sleeping Beauty” parable derives from the observation of female sexuality being “asleep” until a man “awakens” it with a kiss. Evidence suggests that ejaculating into a woman’s vagina transfers testosterone and increases her libido. Thus it is commonly observed that, deprived of sex, men become *increasingly* desirous; women become *decreasingly* desirous. According to my research, supermodel Caprice spoke for many women when she said: “If you’ve been

used to sleeping with someone regularly then it can be difficult, but it's dead easy to forget about it if you haven't had sex for a month or two."^{xxxviii}

2) With women, there is desire *for* him, but, perhaps the greater desire is the desire to *be* desired by him. The desire to *be* desired is compelling to be sure, but is it as compelling as the desire itself? So long as her man remains in good standing, she *loves* fulfilling his sexual fantasies. The moment he falls out of favor, however, she may now take *no* interest in fulfilling *his* fantasies.

3) It seems clear that female sexuality includes an extra measure of ambivalence, reluctance, and reticence rarely found in male sexuality. The simple fact that females get pregnant and males do not has doubtless led to evolved differences in male vs. female sexual psychology.

Throughout human evolution, each copulation potentially used up one of her precious few pregnancies, each one fraught with potential hazard and vast investment in childcare. So it served Woman to be less sexually addicted and more sexually selective. For this reason, even if a woman has a strong libido, it may nevertheless be tempered by an equally strong capacity to say "no."

Dissident feminist and author of *Sexual Personae*, Camille Paglia knows full well that female sexual power is grounded in biology. Not one to mince words, says she: "If middle class feminists think they conduct their love lives perfectly rationally, without any instinctual influences from biology, they are imbeciles."^{xxxix}

Films of the mating behavior of most other species—a staple of public television in America—demonstrate that the female chooses. Males pursue, show off, brawl, scuffle, and make general fools of themselves for love. A major failing of most feminist ideology is its dumb, ungenerous stereotyping of men as tyrants and abusers, when in fact—as I know full well from my own mortifying lesbian experience—men are tormented by women's flirtatiousness and hemming and hawing, their manipulations and changeableness, their humiliating rejections.

Cock teasing is a universal reality. It is part of women's merciless testing and cold-eyed comparison shopping for potential mates. Men will do anything to win the favor of women. Women literally size up men—"What can you show me?"—in bed and out.^{xl}

"To some extent, males tend to be what females want them to be," asserts naturalist Mary Batten. "This means that enormous responsibility and power reside in the preferences of females. . . . Some scientists believe that female choice directs male behavior. 'Males are a breeding experiment run by females—a proving ground from which females can cull winning genes,' says evolutionary anthropologist John Har-tung."^{xli}

In addition to Natural Selection, biologists recognize Sexual Selection as a powerful mechanism of evolution. Because females do indeed do the choosing (some "throw themselves" at the men they choose, others need only display a "green light" to compel the men they choose into active pursuit), in a very real sense females are empowered to literally breed the male of the species to their liking.

Known as secondary sexual characteristics (everything from the peacock's tail to humpback whale song), only males possess them because only males must compete for female sexual "favors." However burdensome it may be to its owner, a peacock either grows his excessively extravagant tail or peahens won't select him for breeding.

Is Man's financial generosity a secondary sexual characteristic in humans?

To all the above we now add the *socialized* repression of female sexuality. I will assert that it has been predominantly the matri-sensus, not the patriarchy, that has suppressed women's sexuality, and it has done so purposefully. Nadine Strossen:

In her book *Swept Away*, sex researcher Carol Cassell writes: "Sex has historically been a commodity. It's a valuable source of power . . . Sexual power is . . . the female commodity." In the same vein, author Nancy Friday has said that "women have always derived power from withholding sex." Former porn star Veronica Vera: "A dominant patriarchy? Wake up folks. . . . it never existed in the bedroom."^{xlii}

From a masculist perspective, patriarchy is the male status hierarchy resulting from men everywhere set in fierce competition to rise high enough to have and to be what women in general, and beautiful women in particular, are sexually empowered to demand of them.

Historically, Woman has maximized her innate sexual power by taking her lesser, more ambivalent sex drive and suppressing it further through socialized sisterhood pressures. Like any commodity, the sexual commodity has value according to the laws of supply and demand. Decrease supply, intensify demand. Intensify demand and the value of the commodity increases accordingly. To function effectively, a large percentage of women (a *consensus* of women) must play along with this “sexual cartel.” So, women who would give their “sexual favors” away too freely are kept in line with taunts of “slut” and the omnipresent threat of being shut out of the tightly bonded female collective—the *matrisensus*.

“I could live without penetration, which loomed like Hell itself with its threat of ostracization from The Group,” says Nancy Friday, recalling The Rules from before *The Rules* was written. “I applied my competitive spirit to outdistancing everyone in the Nice Girl Rules, which said No Competition and No Sex; try as I may, I cannot recall anyone ever saying The Rules out loud or suggesting that breaking the antisex rules would automatically eliminate you from The Group. But they existed more strictly than any perimeters I’ve known since.”^{xliii}

The Sexual Cartel is a prime example of *matrisensus* in action. The Rules applied to women but the consequences applied to both sexes and played a *very* significant role in sculpting our world.

All this begs the question, has the “sexual revolution” rendered this analysis an anachronism that no longer fits the world as it is now?

From cover to cover, the book *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey* affirms the old adage: The more things change, the more they stay the same. To my knowledge, *Sex in America* is far and away the most comprehensive, rigorous, and scientifically constructed sexual survey in history. Far from offering sensationalism guaranteed to sell books, the authors’ findings seem quite *unprovocative*.

As expected, it’s true that the average American of today has had more sexual partners than the average American of 50 years ago. But why is that? The authors identify three factors: “earlier first intercourse, later marriage, and more frequent divorce” as the factors accounting for higher average numbers of sex partners.^{xliv} Because we devote a larger percentage of our longer lives in search of a partner, we end up having more partners.

As for the “sexual revolution”: “This period was not, we find, a sexual revolution, a time of frequent sex with many partners for all.”^{xlv} The authors’ findings “give no support to the idea of a promiscuous society or of a dramatic sexual revolution reflected in huge numbers of people with multiple casual sex partners.”^{xlvi} According to Midge Decter, the problem with the sexual revolution, “the problem of her having been left to the operations of her own lust is that young girls do not lust in any way that gives proper drive or guidance to action. . . . Her ‘lust,’ insofar as it is proper at all to use that term, is for an image of herself as erotically aroused.”^{xlvii} Effective precautions against disease and pregnancy exist, but “Clearly, sex isn’t what women really want,” says Nancy Friday. “If so, they would be responsible and have more of it.”^{xlviii} “The sexual revolution is largely built upon the mis-apprehension that each sex has an equal appetite and is equally receptive,” says Anne Moir. “It will be seen as a mere blip of social fashion in the history of our evolutionary selves.”^{xlix}

According to *Sex in America*, in *action*, it was more myth than blip and we are left with no reason to believe that birth control has rendered the women of today significantly more “promiscuous” than women of the past.

When we report that more than 80 percent of adult Americans age eighteen to fifty-nine had zero or one sexual partner in the past year, the figure might sound ludicrous to some young people who know that they and their friends have more than one partner in a year. But the figure really reflects the fact that most Americans in that broad age range are married and are faithful . . . We find only 3 percent of adults had five or more partners in the past year. Half of all adult Americans had three or fewer partners over their lifetimes . . . only one-third of Americans aged eighteen to fifty-nine have sex with a partner as often as twice a week. . . . a third have sex with a partner a few times a month, and the rest have sex with a partner a few times a year or have no sexual partners at all.¹

Though men tend to brag and exaggerate their erotic effect upon women, sports writer Tony Kornheiser is refreshingly honest. “I’m between 45 and 49,” says Kornheiser, “and the truth is that men my age, especially the married ones, can’t even remember the last time they had sex. We’d have a better chance pinpointing the last time we took a chain saw and cut off the legs of the dining room table.”^{li} According to *Sex in America*, Kornheiser is about right.

By and large, sexual abundance is available only to the few and then, mostly, to the young. But, apparently, he’s got one thing wrong. Though (from a male perspective) the rate of sex within marriage may be rather underwhelming, nevertheless, the authors of *Sex in America* insist that married people enjoy a far higher incidence of sexual inter-course than single people. Half the married engage in sex a few times a month, but only a quarter of singles do as well. Though 25 percent of single people are limited to sex a few times a year, the same is true of only 10 percent of married people.^{lii} So, Mr. Kornheiser, whatever your experience of sexual starvation may be, odds are you’re still doing better than if you were single!

The authors of *Sex in America* say their results hold firm regardless of race or religion, or the region of this country they study, or other countries across the globe. Marriage is the great leveler. Marriage (i.e., Woman?) regulates sex.

And marriage, we find, regulates sexual behavior with remarkable pre-cision. No matter what they did before they wed, no matter how many partners they had, the sexual lives of married people are similar. Despite the popular myth that there is a great deal of adultery in marriage, our data and other reliable studies do not find it. Instead, a vast majority are faithful while the marriage is intact.^{liii}

Does this mean the standard characterization of men as unfaithful adulterers might be unfairly exaggerated?

“A large minority of males suffer reproductive oblivion, having no sex at all, or very little,” author and sex researcher Steve Moxon confirms. This, Moxon believes, would extend to a majority of males if not for the custom of marriage. But, “A majority of males have no option of sex outside of marriage, and their marriages themselves may well be sexless.”^{liv} If the situation is so bad for males, why then don’t more males complain? “Unlike females, males cannot complain, however legitimately, without reducing both their social standing and appeal to females.”^{lv} Confidence is one of the single most attractive features a man can have and a vital component of male sex appeal. Complaining men are not confident men. FemalePower compels men to remain “strong and *silent*.”

From the masculist standpoint, if adult sex is largely limited to sex within the *matrisensus* institution of *matrimony*, then sex is largely limited to sex that’s paid for by breadwinning husbands. The “sexual cartel,” a system that fulfills female desires for protector/providers over male desires for sexual quantity and variety, is still in effect (bolstered by Woman’s Moral Authority to define “promiscuity” and “adultery” in the worst way). This *matrisensus* prohibition against sexual quantity/variety is a prohibition that Woman will tend to profit from more and suffer less than Man.

A cursory glance through men’s magazines will attest that the single greatest gnawing craving desire to be found within the average male psyche is frequent sex with multiple partners. Who could doubt that? Speaking of *Sex in America*: “the rates we find are so modest, at best, that they confound our expectations.”^{lvi} If sexual reality really is as paltry as the data indicates, it is *not* because that’s how men want it.

To view a world of sex the way *men* want it, one need only look to the gay male community, where sexual partners commonly number in the hundreds (by contrast, within the lesbian community, there is talk of “lesbian bed death” referring to the frequency with which sex tends to die out in lesbian relationships). Joan Sewell:

Gay men or straight men, it doesn’t matter. Most want to get to the sex. Except gay men get more sex. Probably because they’re with other men . . . and . . . ta-da! . . . around people with similar sex drives—that is, not women. Oh, but we so like to minimize any differences. And it’s not just a little difference between men’s and women’s sex drives. It’s big.^{lvii}

Within marriage, desires come closest to equalizing, but even within marriage, women act as the primary sexual limiters. David M. Buss:

One of the most prominent changes within marriage over time occurs in the realm of sex. The study of newlywed couples showed that with each passing year, men increasingly complain that their wives withhold sex. Although only 14 percent of men complain that their newlywed brides have refused to have sex during the first year of marriage, 43 percent, or three times as many, of the men express this feeling four years later. Women's complaints that their husbands refuse to have sex with them increase from 4 percent in the first year to 18 percent in the fifth year. Both men and women increasingly charge their partners with refusing sex, although more than twice as many men as women voice this complaint.^{lviii}

A friend of mine is wont to say: "Heaven is the place where you finally get all the sex you've always wanted. Otherwise, it just wouldn't be heaven." Truer words were never spoken. How do you get a young Palestinian male to strap on explosives with which to blow himself and anyone nearby to bits? Simple, "promise 72 hours—virginal beings with black eyes and alabaster skin—to attend the martyr's desires in paradise."^{lix} *Seventy-two* hot babes attending to my desires? Where's the ripcord? I'll pull it right now!

Are female suicide bombers promised 72 hot hunks? Of course not. Female suicide bombers are promised they'll "become the purest and most beautiful form of angel at the highest level possible in heaven."^{lx} To get a woman to do whatever you want her to do, you must reach her where *her* priorities are invested: beauty, grace, and goodness. You *could* promise 72 hot hunks, but for that, the average woman could hardly be induced to cross the street. As German author Esther Vilar puts it, "A woman would be bored to tears with an all-male harem. This has always been the case and will remain so."^{lxi}

To men, *paradise* is a place in which sex happens the way men would want it to happen; but here on *earth*, sex happens only to the extent that women allow. If ours truly is a patriarchal paradise of male power and privilege, why then does the sexual world bear so little resemblance to being the way men would so fervently want it to be?

The *point* is: however subjective, covert, and indirect in nature it may be, with a little sussing out, FemalePower is *revealed*. Female-Power is *real*.

Let's take one last look at the mechanics of female sexual power. If, at any given moment, about *one-third* of the female population are lustfully and straightforwardly "on the make" while *two-thirds* of the male population are lustfully and straightforwardly "on the make," then the female out looking for sex is more apt to experience an economy of sexual plenty while the male out looking for sex is more apt to experience an economy of sexual scarcity. Under the circumstances, men are left with little choice but to initiate most social/sexual encounters with women. Men thus accept the strategic disadvantage that goes with initiating which, in turn, further increases female sexual power.

It's like this: you have a need to sell your watch and in so doing you get to choose between two scenarios. Will you choose: A) you approach someone saying: "Isn't this a great watch; how much will you give me for this watch?" Or will you choose: B) someone approaches *you* saying: "That's a great watch; how much will you take for that watch?" The strategic advantage inherent in option "B" is obvious. When you approach someone, you must take what you can get from someone who may or may not have any interest in what you've got. The potential for humiliation is clear. When someone approaches you their interest is plain to see and you bargain the price *up*, not down. Women generally choose option "B"—being approached—because it allows women to avoid the humiliation that comes of *direct* rejection and allows women to operate from a position of relative strength and strategic advantage. Men choose option "A" because option "B" is generally not available to them.

Historically, in choosing a rich man over a poor man, a woman had her children's future to consider. If she was born into a poor family, her beauty "sold" to a rich man may well have been her family's *only* way out of poverty. In withholding sexually, Woman did what she had to do. I'm not assigning blame; I'm trying to hold Woman *accountable*. I'm not saying what Woman did was "wrong." Arguably, in largely limiting sex to within the bounds of matrimony, Woman has acted as the driving force in forming families, the bedrock of human society. And, while a world of wall-to-wall sex is indeed the male's most fervent *craving*, the trick here is found in the old adage: Be careful what you wish for; you may get it. Just

because sexual smorgasbord is the world as men *crave* it doesn't mean it is the world in which men are *happiest*. Men are equally romantic and equally as invested in the safety, security, and sacredness of monogamy as women are.

There's no need for judgment. In maximizing the powers she has in compensation for powers she lacked, Woman has done exactly what Man has done. But, as Man is accountable for his power, so Woman must be accountable for hers—a FemalePower we all *know* to be real even if we don't *officially* know it.

Joke: A little boy is taunting a little girl on the playground. He points to himself and says, "I have one of these and you don't." The little girl runs home crying. But the next day when the little boy taunts her again saying, "I have one of these and you don't," the little girl replies, "I asked my mother and she said that with one of *these*, I can get all of *those* I want." Note: No one needs to have this joke explained to them; no one believes the little boy can make the reverse claim.

So, why go to such lengths to "prove" Female Sexual Power (FSP) when this power is already *universally* recognized? Though widely recognized, FSP is as widely denied. The need to believe that men are *always* powerful and women are *always* powerless victims informs the official version of gender reality in *all* contexts. To maintain that fantasy, against an ocean of contrary evidence, we may even hear that women have a *stronger* sex drive, are *greater* users of pornography, and are *more* sexually frustrated than men. Within humans there is an irrational yet very powerful impulse to believe that women are *the* victims in *all* things.

So, *for what it's worth*, the effort to "prove" it is an effort to cut through denial and raise FSP to the level of the *officially* known. When Woman comes to the bargaining table saying, "I have *nothing*," Man will be emboldened to say: "That's wrong! Your powers are no less real than mine. I invite you to own your power and be accountable." If Woman is officially offered the *gift* of accountability, perhaps she'll accept the gift: "Yes, I did A B & C, and X Y & Z were the outcomes. I'll step into my power and take responsibility for my equal part in the molding of our world." *Now* we have a gender system rendered more functional and more negotiable for being rendered more deeply honest, fair, fact-based, rational, and *true*.

Woman's sexual power is only one of *many* avenues by which Woman plied her influence. In fact, in many ways, FSP has only served as conduit for an even greater power—Emotional Intimacy power.

"Why are so many men so dependent on women?" asks author Marvin Allen.

Perhaps the most obvious answer is sex. Nature has given men a bounty of testosterone, the hormone that creates physical desire. Men have from ten to fifteen times as much of this potent androgen as women, which is one of the reasons they have such a strong sex drive. Most men are willing to go to great lengths to satisfy that drive, especially in their teens, twenties, and thirties when their hormones are at peak levels. Said a friend of mine, "I don't think women realize what a strong force sex is in a man's life. When I was in my twenties, there was really nothing worth doing other than sex. If you had given me a choice between being a celibate millionaire and being poor with lots of sex, there would have been no contest. I would have chosen sex."^{xii}

Sex *is* the most *obvious* answer. Yet I believe that FSP leads into something of even greater leverage. Once in bed, a woman may introduce a man to a level of emotional intimacy the woman experiences with her girlfriends but the man experiences nowhere else.

To those deluded enough to believe men are the non-sentimental, non-romantic sex, the truth can be unsettling. Former President Ronald Reagan's "maudlin love letters reveal a little too much of his softer side," says *Chicago Sun-Times* columnist Paige Smoron.

The letters are moving, tender---and *profoundly disturbing*. We're not just talking about the nicknames here, which are plenty creepy: Nancy Pants, Senator, Momie Poo, First Mommie, "peewee powerhouse." . . . One note in the book was scribbled on White House stationery. "I love you," he writes, *nine times*. He finishes, "And besides that---I love you." Yes, it's sweet. But this was written in the Oval Office? . . . He wrote this letter after a fight: "it is true that sometimes Mr. Reagan loses his temper and slams a door but that's because he can't cry, or stamp his foot---(he really isn't the type). But mad or glad, Mr. Reagan is head over heels in

love with Mrs. Reagan and can't even imagine a world without her." I have heard that powerful men want to be dominated at home. But nobody told me how often they refer to themselves in the third person.^{lxiii}

A "real" man "can't cry" or get emotional needs met from other men.

Smoron is clearly shocked at what a mush-ball the "macho" man is on the inside. Well, the more "macho" the man the more dependent and "mushy" he's apt to be with regard to his one and *only* source of *deep* emotional intimacy, solace and support. The more dependent he is; the more power his one source of intimacy will have over him.

If the powerful man is dominated at home, perhaps he's not so powerful after all. For women whose primary parent is usually same-sex and whose deepest love and intimacy is usually same-sex, the extreme starry-eyed level of men's opposite-sex love/dependency may be hard to fathom. Within "patriarchy," this extreme need often brings elite males to their knees. Of course, Nancy also loved Ronald but, as always, it's a matter of degree. And, significantly, he was Governor of California and then President of the United States and, like it or not, much of her feeling toward him was surely based on that. Can you imagine "Madame President" having *this* level of goo-goo-eyed dependency on the "First Gentleman"? Neither can I.

It's always been this way. "Let's not forget about Edward, the duke of Windsor. The greatest romantic figure of the '30s, here's a guy who gives up the throne for a pinched looking American divorcee. In his abdication speech, he said eloquently, 'I have found it impossible to carry the heavy burden of responsibility and to discharge my duties as king as I would wish to do without the help and support of the woman I love.'" He too wrote gooey letters. "To his paramour, Wallis Simpson: 'Oh! 'Make ooh' to think you'll hold this piece of paper,' calling her 'Pooky demus' and" so on.^{lxiv}

He felt this way toward her not because she was either particularly young or particularly beautiful, but because she brought a vital depth of emotional intimacy to him, perhaps for the first time in his life. Once experienced, many men will cling to this intimacy, this emotional lifeline quite literally as if their life depended on it.

Psychologist Herb Goldberg describes only in the bleakest terms the inner lives of men who have no such female companionship. "Without a close relationship with a woman, most heterosexual men's personal lives are painfully empty and present an unknowing danger to their well-being. Intense hunger and deprivation of personal contact build in them, and they become prone to extreme and self-destructive behaviors and decisions in their pursuit of satisfaction and relief from their isolation and need for close contact."^{lxv} Through relationship with a woman a man gains access to the world of women. Through marriage, men gain deeper, more permanent access.

It's called *matrimony*, not *patrimony*, because marriage is an essentially *matrisensus* realm. It is the world of women. If a man gets shut out, he will be deprived of any real depth of physical or emotional intimacy, companionship, love, home, family, and parenting. Many will experience this deprivation as akin to an emotional *death sentence*.

This is why "Males pursue, show off, brawl, scuffle, and make general fools of themselves for love." This is why men without a close relationship with a woman are "prone to extreme and self-destructive behaviors." This is why black men—doubly prejudiced against all their lives—prejudiced against for being black and prejudiced against for being *male*—are prone to extreme, illegal, and often *failed* efforts to achieve eligibility in the eyes of their sisterhood and why so many end up homeless and/or imprisoned. Overall, it seems to me that as financially dependent as women were in the 1950s, that's how sexually and emotionally dependent men *still are*.

If the men of the 1950s, in large numbers, had decided that relatively low status, low earning women were deserving of mass rejection, the societal uproar would have been unimaginable. The "shotgun marriage," together with prohibition against divorce, would have expanded as necessary to protect financially dependent women. In the new millennium women in large numbers have decided that relatively low status, low earning men have been rendered "unmarriageable." The societal uproar is nonexistent.

Along with her *far* greater Sexual Power and Emotional Intimacy power, Woman wields a *vastly* greater *power* to draw caring, concern, and compassion upon herself. When will we grasp that there are

many *kinds* of power and while men may have more than their share of some modes of power, men have less than their share of other modes of power. When will we grasp the true *balance* of power?

Female sexual power is primal. It predates the patriarchal powers men have created for themselves in reaction to it. In fact it predates human-ity itself.

During a Yale University conducted experiment in which monkeys were taught to use tokens to pay for grapes and other de-lectables, behavioral economist Keith Chen observed a male monkey using his tokens to pay a female monkey for sex.^{lxvi} *Science News* and *National Geographic* have recently reported on naturalists' observations of male chimpanzees in the wild offering meat they've hunted in exchange for sex. "Wild male chimps that share meat with females double their chances of having sex with those females."^{lxvii} The "world's oldest profession" is even older than we know.

"Despite our civilized and sophisticated veneer," says author John Moore, "we are still, like all other creatures, basically motivated by sexual energy."^{lxviii} Like Moore, I believe that the "urge to merge" is a fundamental driving force, in the natural world *and* in the human world. Women's control over breeding thus gives women enormous though officially unrecognized power. But Camille Paglia knows the truth of the matter: "[W]omen's sexual powers are enormous. All cultures have seen it. Men know it. Women know it. The only people who don't know it are feminists."^{lxix}

One of my goals is to show that the male quest for power is, in large part, a reaction to unacknowledged female powers. Whether he knows it or not, Man's single-minded quest for success is a quest for *equality*. It is an effort to compensate for being male and gain confidence in his areas of greatest insecurity.

I know this because I feel it deep within myself.

"Arrows" #3: The Erotic Arena

"Arrows" come in many forms. A few days after a fight with the girl I lost my virginity to, I called trying to reconnect with her. Her mother answered the phone and told me she had moved in with some other guy. That's right; my girlfriend hadn't just begun dating some other guy. In the span of one week, she had *moved in* with another guy. This particular arrow pierced my head as well as my heart.

I guess I got my male naiveté busted. It had always been clear that boys experienced an absolute sexual craving desire for girls that was only ambiguously returned. Of course, any reasonably attractive fe-male with a little nerve can walk into a bar and be desired, drink for free, dance with the guys, and go home with them as she pleases. But, like other boys, I'd been raised on imagery of Humphrey Bogart and Captain Kirk. I had internalized the assumption that, when push came to shove, as a man I would prevail. When my girlfriend's mother told me the news, however, I had to realize that in the sexual arena I was, shall we say, outmatched.

Not only did I feel the expected heartache of lost love, I also felt great pangs of amorphous fear. Being male, I had no idea what it meant to be "sexy." From my heterosexual male perspective, men's bodies seemed sexually *repulsive*. So it came as no surprise when, among the messages boys receive, there is the message that girls will merely "consent" or "submit" to sex—yet *I* found that message *devastating*. Sexually, in my *maleness*, I felt utterly *powerless*.

For a male, sexual/emotional breakthrough with an attractive female is something rather extraordinary. It's no wonder males think of sex in terms of "conquest." But for girls, more often operating within a sexual economy of plenty, the social/sexual doors swing open. My girlfriend was a young beauty with a body worth a thousand dollars an hour. What male would stand in the way of that incredibly valued body moving in with him? Encountering little sexual ambivalence, resistance, or reticence; for her, access to moving in with a member of the opposite sex was never more than a phone call away.

What did I have to match that?

The truths of male vulnerability are profoundly rejected. I risk ridicule and dismissal revealing my own vulnerability in order to lead by example. I reveal these rejected truths because these male vulner-

ability truths are the *only* truths that allow for *empathy* interpretations of males, male attitudes and male behaviors.

Though it was way back in high school, I can still remember the phrase sewn onto the backpack of a girl with far more sexual confidence than I. The “arrow” read, “girls rule, boys drool.” I was reminded of it recently when I saw a pretty girl flaunting the same slogan on her jean jacket. Then, as now, I resent women consciously wielding this power, without being responsible for it, and without even having to officially acknowledge its existence, let alone have it entered into the larger political equation. If sexual power could be measured as objectively as wages, then its imbalance could not be so easily denied and ignored. Further, if the personal were the political for men as it is for women, then men’s personal experience feeling sexually inferior, dirty, inadequate, ugly, and rejected would rate the same credibility, high profile, and empathy accorded any number of women’s issues.

In the exaggerated language of feminism, women are “sex objects.” Women are “meat.” In the exaggerated language of masculism, men are of the sex that’s “ugly” and “shunned.” If the masculist rhetoric is inflammatory self-pity, the feminist rhetoric is no better. If, on the other hand, the feminist rhetoric is judged true and valid from the female perspective politicized, then the equal/opposite masculist rhetoric must be judged true and valid from the male perspective politicized.

The point is that masculist rhetoric can do whatever feminist rhetoric can do. All that remains is for these equal/opposite perspectives to receive equal treatment in the halls of politics, legislature, academia, the courts, and the media.

Sexual inequities are men’s issues because men experience inequality in the realms of beauty and sexual power. On a personal level each man internalizes this inequality in his own way. On a societal level the ramifications are profound. We may perceive “patriarchy” in a whole new light when we visualize a hierarchy of men created out of fierce competition with each other in their efforts to have and to be what the *matrisensus* is sexually/emotionally empowered to demand of them.

ⁱ Burns, David D. M.D., *Intimate Connections: The Clinically Proven Program for Making Close Friends and Finding a Loving Partner* (New York: Signet/Penguin, 1985) p.Xvi.

ⁱⁱ Friday, Nancy, *The Power Of Beauty: A Cultural Memoir of Beauty and Desire* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996) p.264.

ⁱⁱⁱ Farrell, Warren, Ph.D., *Why Men Are the Way They Are: The Male-Female Dynamic* (New York: Berkley Books, 1986) p.83.

^{iv} Moir, Anne and Jessel, David, *Brain Sex: The Real Difference Between Men and Women* (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991) p.106. “Two magazines designed primarily for a female readership conducted an intriguing survey, after featuring nude, male centerfolds. *Playgirl* and *Viva* discovered that their women readers were not particularly interested in the centerfold. *Viva* dropped the feature. *Playgirl* continued it, its readership including a high proportion of homosexual men.”

^v Califia, Pat, "Dildo Envy and Other Phallic Adventures," an essay in Giles, Fiona (editor), *Dick For a Day: What Would You Do If You Had One?* (New York: Villard, 1997) p.97.

^{vi} Ellis, Thomas, *The Rantings of a Single Male: Losing Patience with Feminism, Political Correctness... and Basically Everything* (Austin, TX: Rannenberg Publishing, 2005) p.8.

^{vii} Park, Ken, *The World Almanac* (World Almanac, 2006) p.272.

^{viii} Quoted off the cover of the September 1984 issue of *Cosmopolitan*.

^{ix} Farrell, Warren, Ph.D., *Why Men Are the Way They Are: The Male-Female Dynamic* (New York: Berkley Books, 1986) p.13.

^x Kammer, Jack, *If Men Have All the Power, How Come Women Make the Rules?* (2nd Edition, Jack Kammer, 2002) p.120.

^{xi} Maxim Online, retrieved April 2005.

^{xii} Batten, Mary, *Sexual Strategies: How Females Choose Their Mates* (New York: Tarcher/Putnam, 1992) p.4.

^{xiii} Buss, David M., *The Evolution of Desire: Strategies of Human Mating* (Revised Edition 4, Basic Books, 2003) p.201.

^{xiv} Baumeister, Roy F., *Is There Anything Good About Men?: How Cultures Flourish By Exploiting Men* (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2010) p.63-64.

^{xv} See <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2004/09/040920063537.htm>

^{xvi} Roiphe, Katie, *Last Night in Paradise: Sex and Morals at the Century's End* (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1997) p.77.

^{xvii} Rhoads, Steven E., *Taking Sex Differences Seriously* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2004) p.64.

- xviii “Wealthy men give women more orgasms,” *The Sunday Times*, January 18, 2009, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/science/article5537017.ece>, “**Scientists have found that the pleasure women get from making love is directly linked to the size of their partner’s bank balance.**”
- xix Ibid.
- xx See, for example, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Natalie_Dylan
- A recent women’s studies graduate from Sacramento State, Dylan planned to use the money to finance a Master’s degree in family and marriage therapy. Dylan was inspired by her sister Avia, 23, who financed her own degree course working as a prostitute in the Moonlite Bunnyranch for just three weeks . . . Dylan retained the right to choose the winner of the auction regardless of who is the highest bidder. . . . With the increasing interest, the highest bid had reached, as of January 15, 2009, \$3.7 million . . . In late October 2009, she said that she would sell her virginity “in the next few days” to a single American man for \$1,000,000. She also said she had a book deal and a movie coming up.
- xxi Sewell, Joan, *I’d Rather Eat Chocolate: Learning to Love My Low Libido* (New York: Broadway Books, 2007) p.110. Quoting Dr. Jamie Turndorf, aka, “Dr. Love.”
- xxii Bonaventura, Dr. Michael, *Why Can’t a Woman Be More Like a Man? – A Woman’s Guide to Revitalizing Her Natural Sex Drive* (Texas: Summit Arlington, 1995)
- xxiii Brizendine, Louann, “Love, sex and the male brain,” Special to CNN, March 25, 2010, <http://www.cnn.com/2010/OPINION/03/23/brizendine.male.brain/index.html?iref=allsearch>
- xxiv *Newsweek*, May 29, 2000, p.53.
- xxv Sewell, Joan, *I’d Rather Eat Chocolate: Learning to Love My Low Libido* (New York: Broadway Books, 2007) p.115.
- xxvi Ibid., p.116.
- xxvii Ibid., p.200.
- xxviii Michael, Robert T., Gagnon, John H., Laumann, Edward O., and Kolata, Gina, *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey* (New York: Warner Books, 1994), p.145.
- xxix Ibid., p.148.
- xxx *MAXIM* magazine, November 2001, p.126.
- xxxi Actress Shannon Elizabeth, *Maxim* magazine, January, 2000.
- xxxii Rudder, Christian, “Your Looks and Your Inbox,” November 17, 2009 <http://blog.okcupid.com/index.php/your-looks-and-online-dating/>
- xxxiii Bullough, Bonnie, R.N., Ph.D., Bullough, Vern L., R.N., Ph.D., Fithian, Marilyn A., Ph.D., Hartman, William E., Ph.D., & Klein, Randy Sue, Ph.D., *Personal Stories of “How I Got Into Sex”*: Leading Researchers, Sex Therapists, Educators, Prostitutes, Sex Toy Designers, Sex Surrogates, Transsexuals, Criminologists, Clergy, and more . . . (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1997) Griffin, Garry, quoted from his essay, “Penis Power,” pp.194-5.
- xxxiv Friday, Nancy, *The Power Of Beauty: A Cultural Memoir of Beauty and Desire* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996) p.270.
- xxxv Janus, Samuel S., and Janus Cynthia L., *The Janus Report on Sexual Behavior* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1993) p.94.
- xxxvi *Chicago Sun-Times*, February 10, 1999, p.2.
- xxxvii Michael, Robert T., Gagnon, John H., Laumann, Edward O., and Kolata, Gina, *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey* (New York: Warner Books, 1994), p.126.
- xxxviii Bourret, Caprice, *British Maxim*, January 2002, p.130.
- xxxix Paglia, Camille, “No Law in the Arena,” *Vamps & Tramps* (New York: Vintage, 1994) p.35.
- xl Ibid., pp.30-31, 35.
- xli Batten, Mary, *Sexual Strategies: How Females Choose Their Mates* (New York: Tarcher/Putnam, 1992) p.22.
- xlii Strossen, Nadine, *Defending Pornography: Free Speech, Sex, and the Fight for Women’s Rights* (New York: New York University Press, 2000) p.151.
- xliii Friday, Nancy, *The Power Of Beauty: A Cultural Memoir of Beauty and Desire* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996) p.179.
- xliv Michael, Robert T., Gagnon, John H., Laumann, Edward O., and Kolata, Gina, *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey* (New York: Warner Books, 1994) p.100
- xlv Ibid., p.96.
- xlvi Ibid., p.105.
- xlvii Decter Midge, *The New Chastity* (New York: A Berkley Medallion Book/Berkley Publishing Corporation, 1973) p.92.
- xlviii Friday, Nancy, *The Power Of Beauty: A Cultural Memoir of Beauty and Desire* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996) p.323.
- xlix Moir, Anne and Jessel, David, *Brain Sex: The Real Difference Between Men and Women* (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991) p.107-108.
- ¹ Michael, Robert T., Gagnon, John H., Laumann, Edward O., and Kolata, Gina, *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey* (New York: Warner Books, 1994) pp.106, 114.
- ^{li} Kornheiser, Tony, “Someone Save My Life Tonight,” *Washington Post*, December 28, 1997. <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P2-754822.html>,
- ^{lii} Michael, Robert T., Gagnon, John H., Laumann, Edward O., and Kolata, Gina, *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey* (New York: Warner Books, 1994) p.119.
- ^{liii} Ibid., pp.88-9.

-
- liv Moxon, Steve, *The Woman Racket: The new science explaining how the sexes relate at work, at play and in society* (Charlottesville, VA: Imprint Academic Philosophy Documentation Center, 2008) p.51.
- lv *Ibid.*, p.54.
- lvi Michael, Robert T., Gagnon, John H., Laumann, Edward O., and Kolata, Gina, *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey* (New York: Warner Books, 1994) p.114.
- lvii Sewell, Joan, *I'd Rather Eat Chocolate: Learning to Love My Low Libido* (New York: Broadway Books, 2007) pp.113-4.
- lviii Buss, David M., *The Evolution of Desire: Strategies of Human Mating* (Revised Edition 4, Basic Books, 2003) p.187.
- lix Full quote: "The pressures of sexual frustration in this life and the lure sexual as well as spiritual rewards in the next are exploited as part of a cynical spiel by jihadist recruiters looking for boys and men to be suicide bombers. Hizbullah in Lebanon, Hamas and Islamic jihad among the Palestinians, and the various incarnations of Al Qaeda have all played on Muslim teaching that promise 72 houris—virginal beings with black eyes and alabaster skin—to attend the martyr's desires in paradise." *Newsweek*, December 12, 2005, p. 31.
- lx *Ibid.*, p.34.
- lxi Vilar, Esther, *The Manipulated Man* (N.Y.: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1972) p.25.
- lxii Allen, Marvin, *In the Company of Men: A New Approach to Healing for Husbands, Fathers, and Friends* (New York: Random House, 1993) pp.97-98.
- lxiii Smoron, Paige, "Planet Paige," "Private life best kept private," "Chat Room," "Showcase," *Chicago Sun-Times*, September 13, 2000, p.65.
- lxiv *Ibid.*, p.65.
- lxv Goldberg, Herb, *What Men Really Want* (NY: Signet/Penguin, 1991) p.13.
- lxvi Dubner, Stephen J. and Levitt, Steven D., "Monkey Business," *New York Times Magazine*, June 05, 2005.
- lxvii Wadhams, Nick, "Chimps Trade Meat for Sex -- And It Works," <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2009/04/090407-chimps-meat-sex.html>, April 7, 2009
- lxviii Moore, John H., *But What About Men?: After Women's Lib* (Bath: Ashgrove Press, 1989) p.5.
- lxix Paglia, Camille, *Sex, Art, and American Culture* (NY: Vintage, 1992) p.66.