

5 - 7/96

Page 01 of 41 pages

EFFECTS OF THE CHASTITY BELT AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

May 1996, third edition, by Robert Pinkerton

PART ONE

The primary effect of the chastity belt, under any condition of usage from entirely serious to not serious at all and anything in between those two poles, is to make it impossible for the girl who wears one, while she is wearing it, to copulate, to masturbate, or to take the passive-receptive role in cunnilingus, full stop. That is obvious prima facia. This is accomplished by covering her external genitalia with a shield which bars entry into her vagina and also insulates her entire vulva from physical stimulation outside of that shield while it is in place. That shield is kept in place with a lock. The wearer may or may not have The Key. If the belt is used entirely seriously then either she does not, or her access thereto is very closely restricted. This situation is what is called a strict rule. Under a strict Rule of the Belt, all responsibility for the wearer's sexual conduct is entirely transferred to the Key-holder for the duration of aforesaid Rule of the Belt, and when it is taken entirely seriously the character of her chastity is transformed from autonomous to heteronomous; this initially highly abstract, hence the diametric opposite of obvious prima facia, but it is something essential for all parties to any use of the chastity belt always to remember.

PART TWO

The secondary effect of the chastity belt, under any -condition, of serious use, is to make the girl who wears one: while she is wearing it, radically dependent exclusively upon the holder of The key. Though not necessarily prima facia, that is obvious even upon shallow analysis.

A. A chastity belt must be removed before the girl who wears it is able to copulate, or to masturbate, or to receive oral stimulation of her genitals., Hence, with the possible exception of a girl whose breasts are exceptionally sensitive, the wearer is dependent upon the holder of the key for whether or not she shall experience orgasm at all; and if so when and how.

B.1. What: covers the female external genitalia ipso facto covers urinary meatus, All serious chastity belt designs provide for exit of the urine;

but even so, the external genitals should be cleansed after each urination. while the belt is locked in situ this cannot be done. For reasons of basic hygiene, if the belt cannot be removed for or immediately after each urination, it should be removed soon thereafter. Otherwise, residue of urine on the wearer's skin shall at least generate an odor embarrassing to her and possibly offensive to others; and accumulation of such residue can irritate her skin. In order further to prevent generation of an odor, when the belt is removed to permit the wearer to cleanse herself after a urination while it remained in situ, so also should the interior of the belt be cleansed, But ideally it is desirable, the better to promote the wearer's comfort, to release the belt before each urination when this is possible. This requires The Key.

SB.2 That a chastity belt covers the external genitals of the girl who wears it, complicates the problem of menstrual sanitation. The human female normally menstruates from three to five days out of every twenty-eight. The problem of sanitary protection usually is addressed by an absorbent (tampons [worn within the vagina] or external napkins) which should be changed immediately it becomes saturated; sometimes in the case of a girl with a light flow a flexible impermeable plastic cup, designed particularly for this purpose, is inserted deeply within the vagina in order temporarily to obstruct the flow until it is removed. But no matter what means of sanitary protection is used, all require frequent access to the girl's external genitals by the person - whether the girl herself or, where she wears the belt, the holder of The Key - responsible for addressing the problem. The holder of The Key shares responsibility with the wearer of the belt, for addressing this problem. And it must be addressed: Menstrual fluid is composed of, inter alia, blood, albumen, and other by-products of human body chemistry resembling ammonia in their skin-irritant effect. If it dries on the skin it causes vexatious irritation at the very least. Its odor is disagreeable and embarrassing. Most women find it necessary for their comfort to bathe even more frequently during this time of the month, than they usually do. Performance of the Key-holder's share of responsibility for addressing this problem, contributes significantly to the wearers comfort while she is under the rule of the Belt. Address to this problem requires The Key.

SB.3 When a female human being is sexually aroused she secretes a lubricant to facilitate sexual intercourse. When this lubricant is fresh its odor is

pleasant: It should be as it signals imminent readiness to copulate, However, when this lubricant is stale its odor is not so pleasant; and, depending on the individual woman, the dry residue thereof may be a skin irritant, As with urination and menstruation, this requires cleansing of the girl's external genitals; which, in its turn, requires The Key when she is wearing a chastity belt.

SB.4.a A chastity belt in the Florentine* pattern or in the pattern of Cluny museum item #6598 (1) does not cover the anus. All other serious known patterns do cover: the wearer's anus while in situ, With or without provision to allow exit of feces. Any chastity belt which covers the wearer's anus without provision to allow far exit of feces while it is in situ, must be removed' whenever she needs to defecate, full stop. This requires The Key.

SB.4.b The problem of any chastity belt which covers the anus of the girl who wears it but at the same time purports to provide for the exit of feces, is to bar entry with minimal to nil constriction of exit: To enforce one-way traffic by preventing wrong way traffic. But even assuming a satisfactory solution to this problem, passage of fecal matter leaves residue on the skin surrounding the anus. This residue irritates the skin and emits a disagreeable odor. If the chastity belt which is used is so constructed that it bars access of the wearer's hand with lavatory paper for the necessary cleansing, then the belt must be removed -- ideally before defecation when this is possible, or as

* The Florentine pattern of chastity belt is distinguished by the ending of the shield at the wearer's perineum: Two straps or chains attach to the perineal end of the shield, diverge over the wearer's buttocks, and attach to the girdle of the belt at points equidistant from the center line of her back. This pattern is called Florentine because its earliest known specimen is the Bracile Florentinarum illustrated in Keyser von Eichstadt's [1405 C.E.] Bellefortis A more recent example hereof is the adolescent girl's masturbation shield which is item #40133 in the 1904 C.E. catalog of the French firm, Maison Mathieu Contemporary examples of this pattern are the Tollyboy TM Chaperon , catalog number-F/B-100, and La Ceinture's "Classic." A Florentine chastity belt resembles a male athletic supporter or "jockstrap."

1. Illustrated as Plate VII of Eric John Dingwall's *The Girdle of Chastity* in both the London (Routledge: 1931) and the New York (Clarion: 1959) ed.

2, Dingwall, op, cit., Plate I,

soon as possible afterwards -- to permit this cleansing to be done. Further, notwithstanding any maker's claims at or as to a solution to this problem, some deposit of fecal matter on the exit barrier of such a chastity belt in situ while its wearer defecates, must be considered inevitable; therefore while the belt is off for the wearer to cleanse herself after defecation, so also should the interior of the belt be cleansed at the same time. As in all other cases, removal requires The Key.

SB.5 It may be possible, depending upon the metal whereof a chastity belt is constructed and the material with which its interior is upholstered, for the girl who wears one to wear it while she bathes or takes a shower. Nonetheless if a chastity belt remains in place while its wearer bathes, she cannot clean herself as thoroughly as she could with the belt temporarily removed for this purpose; hence release of the belt for her bath promotes her comfort while she is under the Rule of the Belt. On the other hand, if the metal whereof a given belt is constructed is susceptible to corrosion, or if the upholstery is liable to retain moisture, then the belt absolutely must be removed for its wearer to bathe. As in all other cases of such necessity, removal requires The Key.

SB.6.a As SA through B.5 make apodictically clear, the wearer of a chastity belt and the holder of The Key must stay relatively close to one another.

SB.6.b To be stupid is absolutely certainly to know that which in fact is objectively inaccurate, false to facts. Popular cultural mythology misinforms us that the Crusaders knew the chastity belt. (While the chastity belt may have been invented at or before the time of the European Crusades in the Near East, not only is this not certainly known, but the preponderance of at least popularly accessible scholarly opinion inclines toward the negative".) That self-

* In the second chapter of Dingwall op. cit., "Historical Survey," it is implied that the idea was certainly "in the air" in literature as early as the XIIIth Century C.E.; but all there is to show for it that early is only fiction and poetry - hardly the best of references, especially in the absence of examples. (Book-jacket copy from the 1959 American edition describes the chastity belt as, "... a subject that has long been avoided by most sociologists.")

3. (From page 03) Illustration #6a opposite page 105 Of the Delta Paperback edition of Alex Comfort The Anxiety Makers (New York: 1969).

same vernacular mythology further misinforms us that these Crusaders were wont to force chastity belts upon their wives, to take The Keys with them, and thereupon to absent themselves for months(!) or even years(!!) at a time. This is probably entirely false; so many legends of this kind are. But if there is even the slightest truth to that legend -- say one to a handful of definitively authenticated cases -- that (or those) episode(s) would constitute only and nothing other than abuse of the woman (or women) involved: At the very least, such misconduct would subject its victim(s) to such a level of variable intensity irritation, with such unrelieved continuity so long as the belt(s) remained in situ, as to be cumulatively tantamount to outright pain; and to at least an equal level of embarrassment and/or humiliation as offensive odor accumulated. While that is the very least - most conservatively hypothecable -- detrimental consequence of such misconduct, the primitive metallurgy of that time would guarantee that the metal of such belts would become rough through corrosion -- by ambient moisture, by skin secretions of the wearer, etcetera. Added to that are the sequelae of skin irritations from uncleansed excretions. Added to that, with or without roughening of the metal of the belt(s) by corrosion, is the probability of abrasion by friction of a belt worn next to the skin if it were inappropriately upholstered or if the upholstery deteriorated and hence allowed the metal of the belt to come into unmediated continuous flush contact with the wearer's (or wearers') skin. Abrasion escalates into laceration: Were this to remain untreated -- or to be exacerbated -- infection

(Continued from page 04): On page 209 of her *A Distant Mirror: The Calamitous Fourteenth Century* (New York [Random House: 1978]), Barbara Tuchman sums it up thus: "... Often spoken of as if it were familiar, the chastity belt rests on only the faintest factual [emphasis supplied] support in the Middle Ages and was probably more of a literary conceit than an item of actual use."

Similarly, in his eleven-volume story of *Civilization*, the historian Will Durant does make mention of the chastity belt -- once -- not in Volume IV (*The Age of Faith*) which subsumes the Crusades, but rather in Volume VI (*The Reformation*) chapter XV, "Germany on the Eve of Luther."

So does Esar Levine, in his (New York [Panurge Press: 1931]) *Chastity Belts* argue consistently throughout his text for either the Renaissance or the Reformation as the time of actual, rather than merely theretofore literally-hypothecated, origin of the chastity belt.

But is controversy about the time or place of the origin of the chastity belt relevant to its use today?

would be the worst probable result; and untreated infection leads to septicaemia, which can be fatal. The Crusader myth can be accepted only by those who do not think its ramifications through. Unfortunately it is entrenched in popular mythology as the "correct" way to use a chastity belt, when in fact it is the diametric opposite of the correct way seriously to use one.

SB.6.e Since a girl or woman who wears a chastity belt needs more, and more closely continuous, care and attention than does she without a belt, that blithe neglect implied in the Crusader myth is in and of itself abusive. It is unfortunately all too easy to abuse a girl or woman who wears a chastity belt: En that degree of benevolent or neutral-valence indifference today popularly accepted as "supportiveness" far the independence of an emancipated woman in the case of u who wears a chastity belt, be abuse by neglect. However this makes the chastity belt a teacher of ?dependence par excellence, because it cannot e applied and then, as if forgotten, simply left in place.

SB. 6.d The closest existing approximation to a "chastity device" which can first be applied and then forgotten, those in charge trusting that it shall --function as it as intended to function, is the monstrous atrocity variously called "pharaonic 'circumcision'" or "Sudanese 'circumcision'" in that part of the world (northeastern and Central Africa) where it is customary: This - consists in first excising, cutting out, t victim's clitoris and part or all of her labia minora; then abrading then interior margins of the labia majora and sewing them together, occluding her vagina by the resultant cicatrice (an as-if "surgical" scar). (However this is something altogether different from infibulation notwithstanding popular -- and scholarly -- semantic laxity to the contrary.) Physiologically it is almost straight-across one-for-one equivalent to

* Infibulation and cicatrical cal occlusion-cum-clitoridectomy/nymphotomy i tori / are conflated in natural usage of at least English today to the point of identification-function of one as a synonym of the other and vice versa, to the extent that the former term is used almost exclusively to denote the hideous results of the latter, in feminist writing too numerous to cite, in some modern medical writing, and in discussion of "female circumcision" aimed at the general public. Esar Levine very carefully distinguishes between the two on page 187 of his op. cit. A. F. Niemoeller, whose Chastity Safeguards (Girard, Kansas [Haldeman-Julius: 1947] appears to be mostly a condensation of Levine with a few cases subsequent to Levine's publication date added, continues Levine's discussion and expands upon it for greater clarity still, ed. cit., P. 18 & p.25. Carl

amputating the penis of a male, leaving the testes intact. Psychologically it exceeds the damage done by many if not stern schemes of sex-negative upbringing of young girl-children. As it is customarily done to girl-children when they are quite young, while these are fully conscious, it terrifies its victims to an extent that endures into the rest of their lives. As it is usually done by operators ignorant of surgery, with traditional impromptu instruments, and in massively sanitary settings, it is not infrequently fatal or contributory to its victims' early deaths. However either "female 'circumcision'" so mis-called or childhood conditioning antipathetic to sexual activity results in the destruction -- from partially to wholly, from temporarily to permanently -- of its victim's sexuality; and not only is destruction not control, but rather it is the very opposite of control: It is tantamount to an admission by the perpetrator that he or she has been unable to impose such control, being then unwilling to tolerate its existence uncontrolled. As a chastity belt is an instrument of control, it is the opposite of "apply and forget." Its correct serious use requires close and continuing attention paid to the girl who wears it and care for the extra needs she incurs by wearing it, far as long as she is under the rule of the Pelt. For that care and attention she must depend exclusively upon the holder of The Key, because she cannot use its equivalent offered by anyone else who lacks The Key.

SB.7.a She is further dependent upon the holder of The Key that beforehand -- most usually -- she has known what he is doing in purchasing her belt. To the

(* continued from page 06): G;sta Widstrand, in the article, "Female Infibulation" (Studia Ethnographia Uppsaliensa vol. XX, Varia 1, page 95; published in English), calls attention to, demonstrates awareness of, and thereafter proceeds blithely to ignore, this distinction, thereby contributing further to the confusion he proposes to alleviate. Despite this, however, Widstrand deserves credit for pointing out that, semantically strictly, the term, "circumcision," applies exclusively to males.

This subsumes any scheme of indoctrinating girl-children that sexual activity is dangerous and/or repugnant; whether in and of itself or in its consequences or both; in order that the adult women into whom those girl-children grow,

4 Roger Sawyer, *slavery in the Twentieth Century*, London (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul: 1986), page 108 in Chapter 6, 'Exploitation of Western Woman of .

contrary of the mythology either of feminists or of sexual opportunists, a chastity belt does not need even to be uncomfortable to wear -- let alone an "instrument of torture" or an emblem of humiliation. Put the slightest serious thought about a chastity belt's function ought to be enough to convince anyone of average intelligence or higher, that it is an identity-linked garment. It must be made uniquely to the measure of the girl who will wear it, taking specifically her proportions, bone-structure and musculature into account in its construction. The more exact the fit -- neither too tight nor too loose by as little as even a centimeter either way -- the greater are both the security of a specific belt and its comfort for her who shall wear it. After fit, architecture, materials and workmanship are similarly important: All of these considerations affect both the security of a specific belt and its comfort for her who shall wear it. The holder of The Key should be on the one hand both patient enough and persistent enough to seek out nothing less than absolutely the best available at the time when the decision to use a chastity belt is taken, and on the other hand intelligent enough not to cut corners on its cost (And this subsumes declining to be satisfied in the long term with a short-term expedient).

SB.7.b In practice that is both serious and correct a chastity belt is from next to the skin -- it is its wearer's innermost lower undergarment -- and this / has ramifications: First is that not all metals may be placed next to human skin for any length of time at all, let alone the length of time during which a chastity belt may remain in situ in serious and correct practice. To cite a cannon example, nickel dermatitis is not at all uncommon in both sexes and in all races*; therefore nickel, whether as plating or as more than merely a trace (+ continued from page 07): shall as adult women be disinclined in general to copulate, making exception to that conditioned - not "natural" - disinclination-function only for their husbands. (While the husband of a woman who is a product of such childhood conditioning may indeed be able to trust her that she shall not copulate with another than he - which is, after all, the object of the exercise - it is problematic whether he can trust her that she shall copulate with him whether as frequently and/or as ardently as he might want.)

* No matter how well it were designed, then fitted, then constructed, a chastity-belt of nickel-plated metal would, in short order, become an instrument of torture worthy of the GRU when worn by a woman or girl susceptible to nickel dermatitis.

in an alloy, must be considered contraindicated for use in the construction of a chastity belt. Readers probably know of other similar allergies. Second is that corrosion roughens previously smooth metal surfaces and human bodily secretions, including but hardly limited to perspiration and urine, can corrode many common metals: Both in order to forefend that otherwise inevitable corrosion, and in order to protect the wearer's skin from abrasion whether by a corrosion-roughed surface or by simple friction or both, the interior of a chastity belt must be upholstered. This lining must be either both impermeable and readily amenable to cleansing (e.g.: Neoprene), or - less desirable but still acceptable in the absence of better -- removable and replaceable; it must also be resilient enough to cushion her body not only against compression but also against impact on the exterior of the belt, such as in a fall while the wearer is walking. Third, for reason both of the wearer's safety and of her comfort, any metal surface that may (notwithstanding upholstery, in order to make assurance doubly sure) come into flush contact with her skin -- especially as tightly as a chastity belt must fit and as long as a chastity belt may be required to remain in situ - must be polished exactly smooth and its edges and corners must be radiused, i.e.: Beveled round.

SB.7.e Leather may be acceptable as only upholstery for a chastity belt - although better is available -- but there are several reasons why it is unacceptable as a primary construction material: First is its porosity/permeability. It retains the wearer's bodily secretions and presently begins to take on a 11, hence embarrassing at least to the wearer; and it otherwise retains moisture for a long time, thereby becoming for that reason by itself uncomfortable to wear -- unless dried out by sustained applications of above-ambient heat, which impairs its strength as a material when frequently done -- both ramifications offsetting arguments as to its comfort because of softness and flexibility . Second, leather is biodegradable, which means that its strength as a material decreases over time; which means that its security decreases proportionately. Third, leather can be cut with such common objects as scissors, a knife, or a razor blade. While leather chastity belts have been sold in the recent past for parental use with pubescent and young adolescent girls to prevent masturbation', and re used in the Pennsylvania Dutch subculture in the United States earlier than that to preserve premarital virginity, both situations

strongly implied that the girls who wore them were under more or less continuous supervision. In any other context a leather chastity belt is only and nothing other than a toy or a theatrical prop to help suspension of disbelief for games of make-believe: The user of such ipso facto does not mean business.)

SB.7.c The girdle of a serious chastity belt should circle its wearer's body at one or the other of two levels: Either the waist at its narrowest, which is usually above the navel and below the rib-cage (e.g., inter alia: Cluny museum item #6599, the *Bracile Florentinarum*; or contemporary British, Tollyboy, or American, *La Ceinture de Chastete*, belts) or around the lower trunk between the iliac (superior) and trochanteric (inferior) pelvic crests, riding at a gentle angle sloping downward toward the front of the wearer's lower body to cover or lie just above the cleft of the buttocks in back and to cover or lie just above the pubic symphysis in front (e.g., inter alia: Cluny Museum #6598 or the Mathieu #40133 masturbation shield). Imitation of the pattern of a contemporary high-thigh bikini swimsuit bottom is not an acceptable design, even though belts for serious use (eg. inter alia: The Venetian Palazzo Ducale specimen ⁷) have, in the past, been made on that pattern: This design rides its wearer's body on the flare of the hips, below the navel and above the iliac pelvic crests; it therefore brings the weight of the belt, at least -- if it is only skin-tight rather than tighter still - to bear to compress flesh between the belt itself and the outside of her body and the iliac crestsoan the inside. It may be an imperceptible trifle when a few ounces of elastic cloth are what is riding her body; but it is the opposite of a trifle when more than twenty-four ounces of hard and inelastic metal, assuming in the first place that the compression is not exacerbated by the belt being tighter than skin-tight, ride at that level: At the very least it shortly begins to generate an ache which may start out at threshold level but intensifies cumulatively, and the tighter

5. (from page 09) Comfort, op. cit., illustration #7b, opposite page 120. The item pictured comes from the 1930 C.E. catalog of an unnamed English surgical instrument firm.

6. (from page 09) Henry W. Shoemaker: *Publications of the Pennsylvania Folk Lore Society #XII Thirteen Hundred Old Time Words*, Altoona (Times Tribune Press: 1930), page 21.

Nienoeller, op. cit., page 14.

PLoss, Bartels, & Bartels: *Woman in the Sexual Relation*, Ch. 1\$6.

7. Illustrated in Dingwall, op. cit., plate III.

the belt the more rapid the cumulative intensification of such discomfort. Such a design is equivalent to a false analogy in that it is the ill-advised transfer of a pattern which may work superlatively in one medium for one specific purpose, to another medium for a purpose only similar but not the same, whereby it partially defeats the new purpose since it was inapplicable from the first.

SC. The comfort of a chastity belt- at once taking in both the physical comfort of the belt itself to wear and wearer's non-physical personal comfort under the Rule of her Belt -- is a major, although indirect, contribution to its security in that it promotes the wearer's willingness to permit replacement after it is removed, to remain under the Rule of the Belt. In circumstances initially not consensual, the comfort of a belt in both aspects herein makes it easier to elicit retrospective consent. (Further, in a nonconsensual situation, affirmative discomfort provides additional stimulus for the wearer to seek means of escape. Furthermore such discomfort makes eliciting retrospective consent more difficult still.) In a serious situation fully consensual from the very beginning, both physical comfort of the belt itself and proper conduct on the part of the holder of The Key are prerequisites, neither sufficient in itself in the absence of the other but rather both absolutely necessary, fore eventuation of a fully favorable adjustment to the continuing presence of the belt in her life, and for her radical acquiescence in its influence on her behavior both overt and intrapsychic.

PART THREE

The tertiary effect of serious use of the chastity belt requires introduction; and, to the contrary of being immediately obvious, appears at first to be paradoxical. With which to begin, chastity is confinement of sexual activity within lawful boundaries. This leaves aside what the boundaries are, and the sources of their lawfulness; since diversity of norms and mores in this world -- both as to what is permitted vs. forbidden and as to postulated consequences of forbidden acts -- is as wide as is *Homo sapiens* as a species, and historically as deep. Nonetheless it is most common that each person is responsible for his or her own chastity, as autonomous chastity is the identifying property of the responsible agent in matters sexual. However, a girl who wears a chastity belt under strict rule has transferred responsibility for her chastity for the entire time she is

under the rule of the Belt, to the holder of The Key: In virtue of that transfer chastity is now heteronomous and she is excused from a responsibility which would still otherwise be hers if she had not transferred it - and which still bears upon her female peers who do not wear the belt. The tertiary effect of the chastity belt is the result of fully understanding that excused condition not only consciously but, more important, unconsciously. If it is manifest most clearly in a situation of authentic (i.e.: uncoerced; and her initiative in order to make Gift of The Key to another, subsumes plenary) consent going in, it also occurs in situations where the wearer's consent is either manipulated or nonexistent. A transgression is now no longer something she either shall or shall not do -- something she is able to (can) do but must not (is forbidden to) do -- but rather, as long as she remains under the rule of the Belt, something physically not possible for her to (she cannot) do. While the wearer is under the Rule of the Belt she is enabled to relax in degree wholly inaccessible to autonomously chaste young women because: She no longer needs to fear her own impulses. She no longer needs to stand in readiness to resist them. She no longer needs to repulse others who stimulate them. What is permissible is what she is able to do: In matters sexual, "can" and "may" become one in the same thing. By that same taken what is not permissible is now simply impossible: In matters sexual "cannot" and "may not" become one in the same thing for her, hence no longer any kind of threat. But beneath and behind that, now only the holder of The Key is now exclusively responsible for all consequences of any sexual activity whatsoever in which she takes part while she is under the rule of the Belt, since in his turn he is responsible for her having been able to take part in an sexual activity in the first place; because without his active assistance she could not have participated in the first place. So what is possible to her is ipso facto Permissible and vice versa, and what is impossible to her -- is impossible, full stop!

Conventionally (i.e. Not necessarily semantically strictly, perhaps, but certainly in natural usage of at least Western languages), a chaste woman is an inhibited woman: She is, inter alia, inwardly disinclined to copulate, making exception to that basic disinclination only for her lawful wedded husband or his equivalent. Much preparatory childhood conditioning which subtends this state of mind in adolescent and adult women as its final goal, aims at modesty, disinclination

to expose more than a minimum of flesh to a man's eyes. Other such preparatory conditioning aims at cultivating disinclination to discuss matters sexual at all, which can lead first to some shocking ignorance (justified" by equating ignorance with innocence and/or inexperience), which can lead in its turn to tragedy. Certainly much preparatory childhood conditioning aims at also disinclining girl-children even from masturbating! But inhibitions are behavior: Intrapyschic learned behavior. A woman chaste in young adulthood is made that way usually by childhood conditioning: Some things she may have been taught explicitly by authority-figures in her childhood, some things she may have picked up from peers, some things may have been -- as it were -- "in the air" when she was growing up, and some conditioning may have been fortuitous; but the sum of all of these that she has added up unconsciously, guides her overt behavior beneath consciousness and intentional violation. But as she is autonomously chaste -- "of character," or "at heart," or "in spirit" -- her husband can trust her that she shall not copulate with another than he, or before she is married her parents can trust her that she shall not copulate at all; but when such a woman finally is married, what is problematic about her is whether her husband can trust her to copulate with him whether as frequently and/or as ardently as he might wish. The husband can rely upon the inhibitions which make his wife but all too often at cost that they impair her licit sexual function as well as any illicit sexuality; for patterns of habit, overt or intrapsychic, have -- as it were -- "Lives of their own," and the less they are accessible to consciousness the less they are amenable to conscious control by anyone. This is, of course, far less material in environments where custom sanctions the husband taking his wife by force.

SB.2.a An inhibition is an external prohibition internalized (i.e.: Taken over and made part of one's own beliefs as to what is right and wrong, by whatever criteria whereon one assigns valuation of right and wrong): It is a predetermined "choice" to hold on rather than to let go, to hold in, to say -- and do -- "No." It is the unthinking habit of saying or doing, "No ."

SB.2.b The consequences of any act of sexual intercourse, illicit or licit -- be those consequences foreseen and intended or unforeseen and not intended, be those consequences desired or held undesirable -- are at least potentially graver for the female party to the act, than for the male: It is the female who

becomes pregnant when pregnancy results, with all sequelae and ramifications thereof. Given the interiority of so much of the female genitalia, when a sexually-transmissible infection is transmitted to her its symptoms take much to come to notice, whereby the disease has progressed further to her detriment before it is arrested by treatment. That excludes moral/legal consequences, which differ from People to People and from place to place. Put in any case the female party to an illicit act of intercourse must face those consequences, whatever they may be, alone and on her own. In the absence of a chastity device, she is trusted -- she may even be put on her honor! -- that she shall abstain from illicit sexual activity; hence her participation marks her as untrustworthy, sometimes dishonorable, often with overtones globally encompassing the rest of her person entirely outside of matters sexual: She is a responsible agent, and she is held responsible; being accountable, she is called to account -- in ways that can often be devastating and/or stigmatic and or both at once.

SB.2.c Most of at least Western culture, by public philosophy or vernacular ideology, denies - in the neurotic sense of "being 'in denial,'" i.e.: Emphatic affirmation of the nonexistence of a nonetheless obtrusive fact -- that children can be, and not unoften are, also sexual beings. Hence it is far more unusually than not, that children -- whether boys or girls - - lack licit and safe sexual outlets. Where by way of "back of the left hand" concession to reality there exists a more-or-less officially overlooked (a local denial canceling out the broader general denial) sexual outlet as a tolerated secondary channel of adjustment, a female loses at least such imponderable as "reputation" or "class standing" by participating.

SB.2.d It is common educational strategy to teach inhibitions first supererogatorily -- deliberately in excess of requirements, "overkill" -- overemphasizing the prohibition to be inculcated as globally-broad with unconditional blanket coverage. In the case of preparatory conditioning of girl-children to trustworthiness to autonomous chastity, the supererogatory goal is in advance kill the taste for sexual activity and its pleasures, full stop! Legitimizing exceptions -- most usually, marriage -- are taught only afterward, sometimes much later. If the supererogatory initial teaching both takes deep hold and is taken fully seriously, the target is annihilated or irredibly damaged, beyond power of any legitimating exception to restore. Put even if inculcation of the

prohibition is less than supererogatorily intense and/or taken less than supererogatorily seriously, if teaching of the legitimating exceptions takes less deeply than teaching of the prohibitions has done, it is probable that quality of performance of the prohibited act under circumstances of legitimating exception, shall leave something to be desired. In the case of female function and response in intercourse, the extreme of impairment is frigidity: This is as if

automatic resistance to sexual stimuli and inability to achieve orgasm at least in licit copulation. (Put supererogatorily strong sex-negative childhood conditioning is hardly the only aetiology of frigidity: Forcible rape can cause subsequent frigidity, as can cumulative abuse of a sexually generous woman by unworthy partners. The reason why is easy to see: The experiences have poisoned sexual activity for her by inextricably linking its intimations unconsciously with negative or dangerous overtones.)

SB.2.e In all too many cases these inhibitions in the adolescent or young adult woman are the result of sex-negative childhood conditioning -- that sexual activity is repugnant and/or dangerous whether in and of itself or in its consequences. This is accomplished by, inter alia, including but not limited to:

- i. Indoctrination which unconditionally disproportionately overemphasizes the potential detriments, the down-side risks, of sexual activity as counterposed to its pleasures and the conditions under which those pleasures are both legitimate and safe.
- ii. Verbally abusing or physically punishing or both, a girl-child for merely taking passive pleasure in being sexually stimulated perse, even though she does nothing further in response to being thus stimulated.
- iii. Verbally abusing or physically punishing or both, a girl-child who is found masturbating, for that masturbation.
- iv. Indoctrination that a "good" girl or young woman has minimal to sexual urge or desire. (Vernacular ideology during the Victorian period of recent Western history and intimidation by analogy with the Emperor's New Clothes. While this is no longer en vogue, it is by no means extinct.) A variation on this theme is the idea that a woman can be too sexual to be a "good" mother.
- v. Threatening a girl-child, whether the threat is of personal or

institutional origin, with catastrophic punishment for any sexual activity out of bounds, whether in this world (There are cultures in which a female transgressor of ambient norms of chastity is killed*.) or in a next world.

vi. Impeding correction of detrimental consequences of an act of intercourse, e.g. (including but not limited to): Prohibiting abortion or making access to it dauntingly difficult; prohibiting contraception or making access to it dauntingly difficult; prohibiting treatment of sexually-transmissible infections or making access to it dauntingly difficult.

vii. Any combination of any two or more variations on the above dismal themes.

All of the above, and worse still, is done in the the of holding the trustworthiness of women to autonomous chastity. Worse still, to the same end, clitoridectomy - an ugly word for a concept uglier still in practical fact -- is routine custom in many ethnic groups in Northeastern and Central Africa and in the Hijaz province of Saudi Arabia; in order physically to destroy -- as preparatory childhood conditioning to trustworthiness to autonomous chastity in adolescent and adult Western women aims at psychically destroying -- the seat of sexual desire: Instead of poisoning sexual appetite to death or to stunted and crippled growth, its physical site is annihilated -- traumatically, by ignorant operators using crude instruments, in locations that are the opposite of sterile to extremely young victims, without anesthesia! Argument in favor of the practice claims that its purpose is to correct hypertrophy, abnormal enlargement, of the clitoris. (Literal physical hypertrophy of the clitoris is not only rare also rarely encountered whether in gynecological professional literature or the pornography of anomalies.) Context supplies the correction that its actual purpose is to destroy sexual appetite before this bears active and to render its victims inorgasmic, full stop.⁸

* In such social environments a chastity belt is literally life-saving kindness.

8. Franziska P. Hosken, Ph. D.: The Hosken Report, Second Enlarged Edition: Genital and Sexual Mutilation of Females, Women's International Network (W.I.N.)News (Lexington, Massachusetts: 1979), pagination by chapter: "Medical Facts and Summary," p. 5; "History, pp. 9-10. Alien Edwardes: The Jewel in the Lotus, Chapter III ("Circumcision") S2.

SB.2.e Comparing the sum of preparatory techniques of childhood conditioning aimed at autonomous chastity in the adult woman that a girl-child shall become, and the inexcusable atrocity of clitoridectomy, is an analogy. The "Gestalt" School of psychotherapy -- Perls, Hefferline, Goodman, their epigones and successors in business -- hold that, on a theory of "out of sight, out of mind," one has (subjectively, psychically only) those parts of one's body whereof one is aware or conscious; and similarly one lacks those parts of one's body (again, subjectively only, psychically only, illusorily) whereof one is unconscious or unaware. By extension of that theory, then, it is possible to (still, subjectively only, psychically only, by burial under illusion or by conditioned refusal to acknowledge bodily signals originating thence) as if "amputate" part of one's body through repression or through conditioning to ignore that part. The debating tactic of reduction ad absurdum works by carrying an opponent's analogy past that point after which the comparison fails to be reasonable; but the analogy of "psychic clitoridectomy" (by conditioned linkage of intrinsically spontaneously pleasurable sensations to negative memories -- humiliation, threats, punishment, or more than one in combination -- that may or may not be consciously accessible or to fear of adverse consequences to come; in order to render the victim less susceptible to sexual stimulation by [to borrow a metaphor from electrical engineering] "increasing resistance of the wire" between clitoris and brain) and Literal physical excision, carries far indeed. Both originate from fear that a human female sexual appetite not thus weakened or crippled shall drive its possessor beyond the confines of her culture's zone of permissible sexual activity, to her detriment and prejudicial to the interests of others who have a legitimate stake in her chastity. Both procedures are done to girl-children "for their own good," in order to "help" the adult women into whom these shall grow, to stay within those confines. Hence, childhood conditioning whereby to create more or less obdurate sexual inhibitions (as the scar-tissue of the cicatrice of "pharaonic 'circumcision'" is more or less obdurate) in the adult woman and clitoridectomy aim, although by different means, at the same end, namely destroying or crippling much if not all of the sexuality of the girls victimized by either procedure. Not only is destruction not control, but rather it is the very opposite of control: It is a confession of failure, or of giving up hope at, control of something whose existence uncontrolled one is unwilling to tolerate.

SB.3.a But to the contrary of the immediately foregoing, the chastity belt is an instrument of control. When it is used fully in earnest under strict rule it is a reliable means of only control, without the baneful ramifications and sequelae that destruction entrains. And not only does strict rule not need to be harsh -- or even uncomfortable or inconvenient to the wearer -- but, where the circumstances of the belt are authentically consensual going in, then proper conduct of the holder of The Key, is conduct aimed at giving the non-physical aspects of the rule of the Belt a metaphorical "velvet Lining," whatever the material of the upholstery of the literal physical belt may be. Yet so is that also proper conduct on the part of the holder of The Key, in circumstances where the wearer's consent is manipulated or nonexistent, in aid of inducing formation of retrospective consent.

SB.3.b To the contrary of any physical or psychic mutilation of the wearer's genitals or sexuality, all that the chastity belt does; is only; to block access, and that only while it is in situ. To the contrary of any psychic equivalent of amputation or excision -- indeed, in the opposite direction therefrom -- a belt continually reminds the wearer of her genitals while she is wearing it: The girdle of a modern Florentine-style chastity belt, when it is correctly fitted, has an inner circumference of 24mm. +/- no more than 8mm less than the wearer's natural waist measurement; this has the effect of keeping her pelvic region engorged. At the same time, the shield gently but relentlessly presses against her labia majora. While on the one hand this preserves the wearer's sexual appetite while reserving it; this also means, on the other hand, that using a chastity belt in order flatly to prevent the wearer from masturbating for weeks or months or years at a time, is gravely abusive of her.

SB.3.c Again to the contrary of any physical mutilation of the wearer's genitals or any psychic equivalent thereof, either of which is at least semi-permanent in its baneful effects, the chastity belt is only temporary because removable although only by the holder of The Key. Contrary to the function of an internalized prohibition -- which engenders guilt feelings in response to accusation, by self or by another, of transgression, whether imagined or real and indifferent to degree of gravity -- the chastity belt is only a preventive which makes transgression impossible while it is in situ while its removal guarantees permissibility. Since an internalized prohibition means responsibility for

observing it, that responsibility acts as a tether inhibiting unreserved commitment; but since assumption of the belt incidentally transfers all responsibility exclusively to the holder of The Key, in the wearer's case the inner tether of observance of responsibility can be completely severed. It is no longer necessary.

SB.3.d When the wearer becomes unconsciously aware, as well as consciously aware, of this, then soon thereafter she shall discover for herself that, when a sexual stimulus from out of bounds enters her awareness, it is no longer necessary to become tense in order to resist it, which is the inhibitory response: She can -- also and at the same time may, and vice versa - relax against the interior of her belt; she can/may even savor the pleasure of being stimulated sexually, secure in the knowledge that in the special case of the wearer of a chastity belt under strict rule this is a thing safe to do, indifferent to the source of the stimulus; and over time this relaxation extinguishes the inhibitory response by letting it atrophy through disuse. That is the tertiary effect of the chastity belt when it is used seriously over any length of time; while this may be manifest the dearest and soonest where use of the belt is authentically consensual from the beginning, it also occurs where use of the belt is not consensual. Finally, then, to the contrary of physically damaging or psychically freezing the sexuality of the girl who wears it, all that a chastity belt does -- without excess and without detrimental ramifications and sequelae of excess enumerated supra -- is only externally to contain her sexual appetite while simultaneously barring those who would take illicit advantage of it.

SC. Nolens volens the wearer of a chastity belt that is used seriously, radically dependent exclusively upon the holder of The Key. As this is so it is inevitable that, later if not sooner, the holder of The Key shall become that.. most Significant of all Others in her life for at least the duration of the Rule of the Belt if not longer than that afterward. Therefore, where serious use of the belt is fully consensual from the beginning, the holder of The Key can promote more rapid and more even occurrence of that tertiary effect in several ways such as (including but not limited to:

SC.I.a The valence of that radical dependency (its quality of being positive or negative, here for the wearer) depends in large part upon his conduct toward her while she is thus dependent upon him. Because authentic consent to the serious

use of a chastity belt is an honorific gift to the holder of The Key (And the wearer's initiative in introducing the belt into a sexual relationship in order to make a Gift of The Key to the man with whom she shares bed, which is called the gift of Agnes of Navarre, is nothing less than that absolutely most honorific of all gifts bar none that a girl or woman can give to a man.), it shows due and proper gratitude On his part to make himself, although on his terms, as close as humanly possible to absolutely dependable to her. She needs his dependability in order to organize her life: It promotes her comfort while she is under the Rile of the Belt in the same way as does the physical comfort of the belt itself.

SC.I.a+ (Convention, at least in the West, assigns the status of most honorific of all gifts that a woman can give to a man, to her First Night, that act of intercourse which ends her virginity. Beyond question this is an honorific gift, requiring knowledge and trustworthiness on the part of him to whom it is given if it is not to be wasted. But where the First Night is ephemeral, the Gift of Agnes of Navarre is enduring. Natural usage of Western Languages has it that a female who takes part in an act of intercourse thereby "gives herself" to the male party to the act; but this is only figurative. However, when a girl or woman consents to serious use of a chastity belt, whether its introduction into an ongoing sexual relationship is by her initiative or by her authentically consensual response to that of her man, only then does she literally give herself to him. But just as not all men are fit to receive such a Gift, so also are not all women fitted to give it.)

SC.I.b The holder of The Key in a relationship characterized by its female party seriously wearing a chastity belt with authentic consent going in, must guide his conduct toward the wearer by holding dominant in his hierarchy (in manner of celestial navigation by a fixed star) the goal of keeping her too comfortable for the enduring good of any monumental impulse she may entertain toward revoking that consent (and this is part of what is meant by the metaphor of a "velvet lining" for the nonphysical Rule of her Belt). Conduct toward any other person is a medium which carries its own subliminal message whose content is valuation in which the emitter holds that other: So ideally his conduct toward her, especially while he attends to those extra needs of hers which wearing the belt entrains, should be even honorific in character; for she has done him honor

by consenting to wear the belt for him, and gratitude is an essential part of honor -- here in return for the honor she has done him. At bare minimum it must always be affectionate. Be it acknowledged from the first that this is a counsel of perfection, it does - and does well - for the holder of The Key to regard it as a talisman of honor to which always he must live up: This is the opposite of arrogance. (While the wearer is radically dependent exclusively upon the holder of The Key, a radical dependency upon a person who is arrogant or vindictive or both, is a morbid dependency -- a net dead loss -- for the dependent party to the relationship.) However the belt may have entered the relationship, the fact of its presence at once gives the wearer claim upon the honor of the holder of The Key, and gives him a measure of authority over the wearer. Authority is a privilege, hence strictly conditional; it carries corresponding and countervailing responsibility. If concretely literally The Key weighs only a fraction of the weight of the belt, in terms of responsibility it is heavier by far than is the belt. Such authority as comes with The Key should be regarded as only and nothing other than means to the end (as in goal) Of effective and orderly discharge of that responsibility, to be used conservatively -- i.e.: When it is not necessary to use that authority, then it is necessary not to use it -- and always as gently as possible.

C.I.c Between any couple who practice the custom of the chastity belt seriously, the Rule of the Belt is a personalized set of situationally appropriate variations on the theme of, "When it does not need to be off it needs to be in situ," or default to locked. But such words as "need" or "possible" as used in Part Two SSB.1 through B.5 are open-ended and dependent' upon context for their interpretation. In some circumstances -- e.g.: When the wearer and the holder Key are spatially separated -- it is obvious beyond reasonable question that the belt must be locked in situ. It is similarly obvious that in the presence almost any third party (one obvious exception to this being the wearer's physician, for examination and treatment) the belt must remain locked in situ - although as to at least some third parties, maintaining presence of the belt is necessary only for purposes of consistency of support of patterns of intrapsychic

9. See Karen Horney's monograph, *Morbid Dependency*, in *The World of Psychoanalysis*, edited by G. B. Levitas (G. Braziller: 1965), in toto.

behavior. However, where the wearer and the holder of The Key are alone together, in their residence or otherwise behind a locked perimeter or in secure isolation outdoors, need for the belt to remain locked in situ is nowhere nearly as exigent; further, for the holder of The Key to place his petty convenience above those extra needs for care and attention that the wearer incurs by the belt, is at most abuse by neglect -- and at best gratuitous ingratitude.

So even aside from the reasons far removal enumerated in Part Two SB.1 through B.5 supra, if the wearer requests the belt be released while they are thus securely alone together, there is no reason why this should not be done forthwith. Carrying The Key to a chastity belt that is used seriously is not for the lazy or petty in spirit.

C.2 By wearing a chastity belt under strict rule with authentic consent going in, the wearer entirely - and in virtue of authentic consent, honorably provided that both parties take it seriously -- transfers all responsibility for any consequences of all sexual activity to which she is party, exclusively to the holder of The Key, to the exclusion of even residual responsibility on her part, for the duration of the rule of the Belt. He in his turn accepts and assures that transferred responsibility in order to enable her fully honorably to take leave from -- to stand down from the alert and tension of -- requirements of self-control which are the identifying property of the responsible agent in matters sexual: Since she is under (comfortable and safe external) control she is therefore free to be out of (self-) control. The trust in service to which she had theretofore restrained and constrained herself, is honorably dissolved by her entry under the Rule of the Belt -- or perhaps, better still, never called into being in the first place -- and the wearer no longer needs to hang on like grim death to the emotional stake in being trusted for self-restraint in matters sexual. If responsibilities imputable to her remain in being, then either they are wholly met in form different than that postulated by autonomous chastity but wholly not nonetheless; or they are met by another, the holder of The Key, as an honoris causa gift of service to her. Thus she can and may relax in depth inconsistent with those requirements, for they no longer bear upon her: It is in all respects safe for her -- in far greater degree than it would be a similar girl or young woman who does wear a chastity belt -- to have a healthy (intact, unrepressed, vital, unsublimated, warm, active, and of natural

size rather than stunted) sexual appetite and to be psychically open to sexual stimulation, even to savor it regardless of its source.

SC.2+ (As an example -- extreme enough that it ought never be allowed actually to happen -- of what it means for the wearer of a chastity belt to be protected from responsibility, no longer held responsible, consider the following: Suppose that, a reasonable length of time after she has entered under strict Rule of the Belt, the wearer takes part in an act of intercourse out of bounds! Who, then, is culpable, and why? First and in the greater degree, the holder of The Key: He had power to render the trespass impossible before the fact; but he is negligent in failing to do so. Second, and in the entire remaining degree of culpability, the trespasser. But the wearer is unconditionally and absolutely saved harmless from any culpability whatsoever: The Key-holder's acquiescence the wearer's entry under strict Rule of the Belt constitutes implicit, if not explicitly agreed in so many words, exclusive assumption of all responsibility for any sexual activity to which the wearer is party, and far its every consequence, for the duration of the Rule of the Belt. Hence honor, in this case simple honesty, compels him to absorb and correct -- with the least possible transmittal of discomfort to her - - by his intervention after the fact, whatever adverse consequences might arise from that aforesaid act of intercourse out of bounds and not by word nor deed nor omission to punish her nor give her shame or guilt over it. What an example this extreme demonstrates -- by heuristically sharp highlighting and distinction for clarity of display -- is just how broad is the Key-holder's responsibility [although downward from above, in consideration of his authority over her] to the wearer for protection honoris causa from the requirements of the rule of responsible agent in matters sexual. Because, in virtue of her entry under strict Rule of the Belt, she is not a responsible agent in matters sexual she has permission to have a strong sexual appetite and to be psychically open without impulse control to sexual stimuli. To vouchsafe the honorific character of the wearer's relief from the requirements of being a responsible agent in matters sexual, the holder of The Key stands protectively between her and whatever consequences may be harmful to her, of any sexual activity to which she may be party while she is under the Rule of the Belt.)

SC.2.a While a girl or young woman who would consent to serious use of a chastity belt may be presumed knowledgeable in matters sexual, an essential part

of proper conduct by the holder of The Key is not to take this for granted: He must ascertain both that he and she have the same extent of knowledge and that this knowledge is accurate. So is it an essential part of proper conduct for him fully to take her into his confidence whereby she participates in his contingency planning against foreseeable misadventure -- which is, anyway, part of discussion aimed at formulating house rules between them - in order that should be designed for her greatest comfort and convenience, or at worst her least discomfort and inconvenience. While first protection and second are exclusively his responsibility in virtue of her transfer thereof to him and his acceptance of exclusive responsibility for all consequences of any sexual activity to which she is party for the duration of the Rule of the Belt, so is this an exercise of that measure of authority over her which comes with The Key: In order that this exercise of authority be felicitous to her it is necessary for him to know her preferences. (Another heuristic example: If, a year or more after she has entered under a serious and well-kept strict Rule of the Belt, wearer becomes infected with a sexually transmissible disease, there is but one possible source for the infection, so culpability can be laid squarely where it belongs -- without the ambiguity of openings for shuttlecock recrimination that the absence of the belt would occasion. By its function of banishing ambiguity, a chastity belt has its uses, the more serviceable to her in proportion as both its quality and its rule are better, to the intelligent woman.)

C.2.b If The Key gives its holder a measure of authority over the wearer of a chastity belt that is used in earnest, empathy sharpens his awareness of the corresponding responsibilities. Again, for the holder of The Key to put his own petty convenience ahead of meeting those extra needs for care and attention the wearer incurs by wearing the belt is, at worst, abuse by neglect, and at best gratuitous ingratitude: Carrying The Key to a chastity belt is not far the lazy or petty in spirit. Authority is power of rule ratified by consent, whether direct or indirect, of the ruled. This authority is a necessary, but not sufficient, means to the end of promoting more rapid and more even eventuation of the tertiary effect and of promoting her comfort under the Rule of the Belt; and much of its use will be giving permission to the wearer -- principally to jettison unnecessary baggage of intrapsychic cognitive and emotional behavior from a sexually negative upbringing, A man can replicate the experience of wearing a

chastity belt, sufficient to form an imaginative nucleus for extrapolation, by wearing a combat-cup groin protector under his clothing and at the same time wearing around his waist either a fully-equipped police patrolman's utility belt or a construction artisan's tool belt, all day for a week to a fortnight. But imaginative nucleus of experience whereon to ground empathy does not make it unnecessary to listen to her: This is always necessary - especially if his lady beloved has done him such honor as this. Finally, in the case of an unmarried daughter wearing the belt for her parents, a mother who also wears the belt can apodictically be trusted by the daughter for empathy, and in such a case it is the mother who carries The Key.

SC.2.c In discussion incidental to formulating house rules between them, the holder of The Key were well advised to make explicit to the wearer beyond possibility of her misunderstanding, that her Masturbation is -- beyond being merely permitted - something not forbidden because forbidding it would be grievously wrong. That is one very significant example of use of the authority which comes with The Key. That her masturbation is temporarily prevented is a side-effect of the belt. But it is good in and of itself because both it habituates, her to experiencing orgasm and it augments and strengthens her sexual appetite. Protection of her masturbation, done by someone having power to prevent this entirely, underscores and highlights and points up that she has permission -- and in action. Rather than merely in words -- from that most Significant of all Others in her life to have a strong sexual appetite and to be psychically open without inward constraint to sexual stimuli. Now someone for whom chastity must be autonomous or else it is inauthentic might object that the wearer, when out of the belt in a safe place and thus as free to masturbate as she is able to do, might accord stage center in her masturbation reverie to someone other than the holder of The Key; and this would be unchastity in spirit. That objection is as unrealistic as it is irrelevant and vice versa: This is only human, if all too human. To object to it were, at charitable best, foolish. It is copulation that is as serious as is possible for serious to be; but the chastity belt protects all rightful claims of the holder of The Key, and the wearer's consent to it is proof beyond all question of her loyalty to, and ultimate love for him. The holder of The Key must be both realistic and consistent if he is to keep the Rule of the Belt too comfortable to the wearer for the enduring good of any momental

impulses on her part to revoke that consent: If by serious use of the chastity belt he is vouchsafing to her, that for her the constraints and self-constraints of autonomous chastity -- i.e.: "Of character" or "at heart" or "in spirit" -- are unnecessary, he must limit his claims to the chastity of her body and let her spirit roam whither whim may lead it.

SD In S87 of his *Beyond Good and Evil*, Nietzsche reminds us: "Tethered heart, free spirit. -- If one tethers one's heart severely and imprisons it, one can give one's spirit many Liberties: I have said this once before. But one does not believe me, unless one already knows it --" Being no longer responsible for her own chastity, the wearer of a belt no longer needs to say, "No," because behind that barrier which says, "No," to all others than the holder of The Key she can -- she is enabled to -- relax: What is accomplished by constraining her entire person into projecting, "NO," as much of custom the world over requires of female responsible agents in matters sexual, when it simply is not possible to do "Yes," out of bounds? Giving permission for that relaxation in depth is a significant and necessary use of the authority which cares with The Key. When the lack of the necessity to project, "No," sinks down to the wearer's unconscious, it enables her to open herself to all ramifications of, "Yes:" Instead of tensing intrapsychically with the as if "reflex" of the inhibitory response, wearer may simply relax against the inside of her belt; and the giving of permission for such relaxation is, again, a necessary use of the authority of the holder of The Key. When she has become long enough accustomed thus to relax, to relaxing deeply enough, the intrapsychic response of inhibition deteriorates. This is in its turn beneficial to her sexual response and function because inhibitions are impairments thereof. Her consent transforms the barrier - which appears only externally to be confinement -- into a protective shield, within the gambit of whose Rule she can surrender sexually in perfect safety: Sexual surrender is neither submissiveness nor passivity; what it is, is non-resistance to sexual stimuli.

SD.1 Love and sexual activity are not necessarily the same thing: While they are different in kind rather than in degree, they can coincide -- and there are occasions when they must: Love is essential in a sexual relationship, to keep it symbiotic -- however either even or lopsided or anything between, it may appear to an incognizant outside observer -- and to prevent the relationship

from deteriorating into either parasitism or mere commensalism; but if love is essential in a sexual relationship, it is by no means sufficient. On the other hand, in so many more circumstances, love and sexual activity do not coincide and should not coincide; for if love is true in such circumstances, it acts as itself a bar to sexual contact: The best example of such is prohibited degree of common blood. However, in times of semantic confusion* and/or moral laxity, natural usage of at least: Western languages erroneously conflates the two. In times and/or places wherein either condition or both obtain(s), this (or these) disorderly condition(s) can present an insuperable barrier to a sentiment whose verbal expression would otherwise be entirely proper: In such a disorderly environment, to say, "I love you,," is all too open to grave misconstrual -- as solicitation for permission to use another's body wherefrom to obtain one's orgasm or invitation to another to use one's body whence the other can obtain orgasm - where nothing sexual is intended by implication or by even the remotest reasonable inference. Disorder of this kind constrains physical affection even more severely, by misconstrual of the same kind but even more intense in degree. Love can and should exist with no sexual overtones expressed or implied; and one can Love many people -- with whom sexual contact would be, to say the least, highly inappropriate -- in lesser degree than warrants sexual contact; but a disorderly environment imposes constraints on expression of that affection. However, those constraints -- made necessary for self-protection from the ramifications of environmental semantic and/or moral disorder, or both at once -- need not bind her who wears a chastity belt, nearly so exigently: She can demonstrate, with one permitted touch, that taking illegitimate advantage of her legitimate affection simply is not on. He who is her highest love of all carries The Key and her affection in lesser degree elsewhere, is not open to exploitation.

*For example, including but not limited to: 1. Using the phrase "[to] make love" as a synonym for "copulate," which many find clumsy outside a medical or academic context - or even for sodomy per os or per anum! 2. Using the term, "lover," to signify an authorized sex partner, even in relationships wherefrom love is absent, whether in both parties (which is equivalent to commensal) or in only one party (which is equivalent to parasitic, and the extreme expression whereof is a morbid dependency).

SD.2 At this writing, publicly strident feminists are herostratically self-exercised over the question of "sexual harassment," i.e.: unwanted sexual advances principally in academic life or the workplace; especially when these are actually or potentially extortionate -- such as, when the girl's or young woman's explicit refusal of a proposition could readily have disastrous economic, or equivalent social, consequences. Although legal and Administrative remedies exist, their scope is hardly all-inclusive; and even where these are readily or remotely available, other circumstances of a specific case may make their invocation problematic or pyrrhic irrespective of the difficulties of proving the offense, which can themselves be daunting or even insuperable. Hence, consider utility of the chastity belt as the perfect squelch for such: One permitted touch demonstrates to the opportunist that his efforts are predestined to futility! Further, the overtones of idealism consequent upon the belt being in place by gift of the wearer's consent -- for her, sexual activity is not a game in and of itself, howsoever enjoyable it is to her, nor a counter in another game -- should make the wearer, personal attractiveness and friendly manner notwithstanding, unattractive to opportunists; in even greater degree than does solely the inaccessibility that the belt gives: This girl or young woman is not "Something for nothing. " (It should be so obvious as not needing to be said, however, that it is incumbent upon the holder of The Key to confirm the wearer's statement that the belt is in situ in virtue of the gift of her consent: Failure to affirm the wearer's honor to any third party who calls this into question because of the belt [or to confirm her honor to her] is gravely abusive of her.) Furthermore, in such a circumstance the belt gives its wearer the opportunity to distance herself within herself: It is not she who here says, "No," explicitly, but rather the belt silently enacting, doing, "No;" if necessary, she need say, nothing beyond that it is in situ in virtue of the gift of her consent and she does not have The Key -- leaving the opportunist to draw whatever inference he will. And if the opportunist should profess to fail to understand, or refuse to believe, the wearer, and hypocritically* call her honor into question on grounds

* Sexual opportunists will join in praise from other sources for autonomous female chastity because they are confident they can charm their intended prey into a lapse. They will execrate the chastity belt, as instrument and as custom, because one cannot charm one's way past a shield: To get in requires The Key.

-- inapplicable to her -- Of the canons of autonomous chastity; it is probable that the belt in context of consent as an honorific gift, will give the wearer an even better vantage point for pursuit of redress, than an autonomously chaste young woman similarly situated would have.

D.3.a "Dating" in America is an ambiguous phenomena: Sometimes business is meant, sometimes all it is, is only making believe that the participants are in search of prospective mates, and other times it can be anything between either polarity; and, off that continuum, it is only a matter of two people of opposite sex taking in entertainment together with no further intention present in the mind of either. Often among adolescents it is unthinking -- at least - conformity to convention. "Going steady" is similarly ambiguous, and ambivalent beside: It may be fully in earnest, with honorable intentions present in the minds of both parties; or, at the opposite pole, it may be only an elaborate artifice to procure the girl's consent to sexual activity under false pretenses -- or, as often the case where neither party certainly knows his or her mind at the time, an ongoing fiasco building up to a crash. Part of the ambivalence or ambiguity of any degree of intensity of either phenomenon, derives from the male party being either chronologically adolescent; or, if he is of age to be a man, none the less an adolescent boy in spirit -- not a suitable lifetime mate for a girl or young woman. Still another source of ambiguity is the American sporting ethos --for many regard dating as a sport -- which rewards success in subtlety at cheating, bending rules just shy of the breaking point, as much as it rewards success by the rules, and whereby this subtlety at cheating exercises its influence in changing rules over time. To males who do make a game, here specifically a hunting trip, of it, the prize is fraudulent rape successfully accomplished without being caught and having to pay the penalty of commitment. (For the girl or woman who gives this "prize," the possible nearer sequelae range from diminished self-esteem to a broken heart [whether this is manifest by grief, not excluding depression, or rage, by anything in between, or any combination thereof) and the remoter sequelae is a cynical mistrust of anyone male forasmuch as he is male.)

SD.3.b The most honorable use of a chastity belt in context of an ongoing sexual relationship -- ideally marriage, but not necessarily limited to that - is as a protective adjunct to other means of purgation of the after-effects of

sex-negative upbringing, and afterwards protecting the rightful claims of her man without need on her part for sex-negative behavior in order to cooperate. The most honorable use of a chastity belt by parents with an unmarried daughter is to protect her from exploitation by others of the ramifications of a strongly sex-positive upbringing. There is more than one right way to get a daughter in a chastity belt; and when it is done right, the results are beneficial in the long term to all concerned. Forcing one upon her is not one of these right ways; and doing so will probably prove counterproductive in the long term. Using a chastity belt as a punishment is abuse -- of the wearer, and of the belt both as an instrument and as custom. So is using a chastity belt as an enablement or excuse to neglect a daughter, by way of psychic abandonment while both parents make careers out of having careers, abuse. Failing, or moving slowly, to any feature of the belt that occasions continuing physical discomfort to the wearer, is abuse. Using physical discomfort occasioned by the belt as pretext for lectures about the benefits of autonomous chastity, is abuse; but to call that mere abuse, is understatement: The chastity belt is an alternative, not an adjunct, to autonomous chastity, and its purpose is to eliminate. The need for the discomforts that autonomous chastity entrains. Similarly, using a chastity belt entirely to prevent the wearer from masturbating, for weeks or months or years on end, is abuse - especially in consideration of the effect of a correctly-fitted chastity belt in sexually arousing its wearer through congestion of the pelvic region and the pressure of the shield against the labia majors. (But because the chastity of a girl who wears the belt is heteronomous, her masturbation does not compromise its integrity.) The gravity of abuse inherent in any of the foregoing examples of misuse of the belt is multiplied if the so-called "offense" for which the wearer is abused by means of the belt -- and, incidentally, the belt is abused as well both as instrument and as custom -- is only imaginary, or suspected on terms of guilty until proven innocent. However, asking a daughter's consent to a premarital chastity belt by representing it as a barrier of safety behind which a shattered heart can heal and as a preventive-- by no means "infallible," but lengthening the odds in her favor -- of further misconduct against her, is fully consistent with the spirit of its most honorable use in this context: Her vulnerability is diminished physically with out need for corresponding diminution of her -- previously traduced -- sensitivity.

D.3.c The unmarried girl or young woman who wears a chastity belt seriously for her parents with authentic prior consent, enters the muddled waters of "dating" with the equivalent of a flotation jacket, reducing the odds she shall go under the surface. Disclosure of its presence means that she can give and show and accept, affection without the guardedness necessitated by fear she might be misconstrued. With it she can keep the unserious, uncertain, or merely momentarily-minded, in their place -- without need for cultivation of a posture of preemptive arrogance whereby to constrain her entire person into a frozen body-language stance projecting, "No!," with probable detriment to marital adjustment as habit patterns gain lives of their own. To be sure, with her it is "All or nothing but if a man offer her all in proven good faith, for her it is easier to reciprocate in kind and degree, whereby she shows the serious and knowledgeable suitor that here is a prize worth the good-faith effort to win: When this lass is won, she too can give all -- with abandon.

SD. 3.c+ (Many social forces in America actually encourage men, some covertly and implicitly and some overtly, to cling to the "inner child," the toy that a man was when he was a child, with the attitudinal differences which go with that: "Boys will be boys," it is said, with no upper age-limit either on the category or upon eligibility to regress. Complete discussion of the evils which follow from this attitude would fill a library; but it is a side-issue here. However, the girl or young woman who embodies the promise of the Gift of Agres of Navare and what follows from that as her bridal gift, has something to offer her prospective husband by way of incentive -- or reward -- for growing all the way up, i.e.: Irrecoverably and irretrievably outgrowing the little boy he had been when he as a child. Conversely, so has she reasonable and realistic grounds for limiting her market of prospective husbands, to those who already have done this. For if a man is an adult male human being; one is a man as counterposed to and as over against an animal, a female, or a boy: manhood is normative attainment dominantly overlaid upon mere biological maleness. That protective shield behind which one's prospective wife has been enabled to cultivate her femininity without stint -- because with reasonable grounds to be far less fearful that her vulnerability will be traduced - - also enables and those who stand with her to demand that her prospective husband be entirely a man with

nothing of the boy remaining.)

SD.3.d(1) That phenomenon whereby a father who had been physically demonstrative of his affection to his daughter when she was a child, diminishes, attenuates, even withdraws such demonstrativeness as she approaches puberty, is familiar and lamentable. So, unfortunately, are the reasons for this, familiar and reasonable, including but not limited to: Fear On his part of kindling wrongful lust in himself for his daughter, whom he is bound in honor and law never to touch with lustful intent. Fear On his part of kindling wrongful lust in his daughter for him. Fear on his part - and this is legitimate -- of any consequences of either of the foregoing, whether or not such consequences ever "get out of hand." And finally fear that a spiteful spectator might set nasty innuendo on foot, with the potentially catastrophic consequences this can entrain. This diminution or withdrawal of affection can hurt - especially as there are households all over America in which withdrawal of affection is customary and usual

family punishment! -- the more so as explanation is not forthcoming but rather this is left to speculation and conjecture, with their own adverse impact on her future mental health, because the parents are afraid of the consequences in and of themselves of telling the truth here. But the better of women like being and cuddled by those whom they love and by whom they are loved.

SD.3.d(2) Where the daughter has assumed the chastity belt, this diminution of demonstrativeness, with its consequent risk of present and future emotional harm to her, is wholly unnecessary: Handled properly, it makes eventuation of those fears impossible. It makes excellent sense here for the father to obtain agreement from his wife and daughter, that they simply shall not permit anyone male, other than its recipient in tender of the Gift of Agnes of Navarre (presumably as a wedding present), ever even to touch The Key to the daughter's belt, said article of agreement explicitly including him in its scope. (Indeed, as a parallel extension of this along a different Line by way of using the belt as external support for habits of intrapsychic behavior, in order to make her later marital adjustment easier still it makes sense for the father to obtain his daughter's agreement that she simply shall not appear without the belt in the presence of anyone other than her husband, who is male; said article of agreement explicitly including him -- for is he not male? -- in its scope, notwithstanding his obligations of self-restraint toward her in honor and law.)

SD.4.a It is legitimate beyond all question for parents to want their daughter to wear a chastity belt during her adolescence and unmarried young adulthood, and questions in any case are definitively answered by that girl's authentic prior informed consent. What is illegitimate is abusing her by means of a chastity belt; but risk of that is remote from loving parents, who never forget that their daughter has done them honor by consenting to the belt, and who take her into their confidence and listen to her. While this may be a counsel of perfection, that best of all ways to persuade a daughter to consent to a chastity belt is by a demonstration before her eyes -- her mother wearing the belt under strict rule and her father carrying The Key -- beginning with her first awareness and carrying forth to present time, of a chastity belt in daily use for the benefit of its wearer. To tell truth is good, but to show truth is better. Discussion of this with her should include -- but by no means be limited to -- the honorific character of the Gifts of the First Night and of Agnes of Navarre and both in combination, the utility of the belt as a test for the sincerity and maturity (Does he care for her enough for herself that he stays the course despite knowing that she is not: usable as means to the end of transitorily "getting Laid") of any given "boyfriend," and utility of the belt as perfect squelch for an unwanted sexual advance.

D.4.b Introducing a daughter to a chastity belt without the advantage of a parental demonstration is a delicate thing, and it would be best to proceed softly: To the contrary of doing this, so to speak, "overnight" -- suddenly introducing it as an idea as a surprise sprung on her -- best is to do it over a long lead time in order to, avoid creating a feeling of pressure, which could defeat the purpose. The best of all ways, though this is a counsel of perfection, is to hypothecate it to her as an option which could be made available to her if she so chooses; while at the same time, depending upon the state of affairs between the daughter and her parents, the parents either strongly implying or explicitly stating that her choice of this option would intensely please them -- and following through with seamless consistency. Strictly scrupulously it should be arranged that the daughter must reach out and affirmatively ask for it: Not to choose at all, being ipso facto to choose "No," by default.

SD.4.e The placement of the daughter's belt for the first time should be an occasion for celebrating her within the family -- indeed, especially the

younger she is when she enters under the Rite of the Belt, since the earlier the introduction, the longer the lead-time in which to overcome obstacles to a fully favorable adjustment to its continuing presence in her Life, and the deeper the habituation. A shower of gifts to mark this as a one-time extra-special occasion is entirely appropriate; and if family circumstances make this possible, it is suitable occasion for honorific advancement of her status within the family to do her honor in return for the honor she has done them. By such means as these, and others specific to what any particular pair of parents know about their daughter, the short-to middle-term objective is so to arrange matters that, while the lock is in place and operational, it takes second place to the girl's own pride in keeping the belt in situ; and the longer-term objective is to enlist, the better as it is deeper in degree, her active participation. While their instruction to, and discussion with, their daughter after she has assumed the belt, should continue from and build upon what was said beforehand; it can now proceed without those conventional constraints which would be necessary to raise her to autonomous chastity. She has set herself apart from and

above the herd of common equals: While on the one hand their shortsighted and merely adolescent concerns need touch her less exigently and less intensely demanding of emotional involvement, on the other hand she may be allowed to speak to adult concerns meaning business -- an being taken seriously-- while so doing. Discussion of matters sexual by the parents of a daughter who wears a chastity belt for them, can explicitly and exhaustively address interpersonal sexual activity without need for reticence, circumlocution, or misleading euphemism - and the bizarrerie that sometimes results from building metaphor upon euphemistic words or phraseology. They can be truthful about its joys -- and the prerequisite conditions for the safe eventuation of those joys -- without need for disproportionate unconditional overemphasis on its detriments and risks. (While those detriments and risks do continue to exist, they exist on the other side of -- and outside of - the protective shield which safeguards her: Because of that protective shield she lacks the need of her peer who does not wear one, of self-constraint as adaption to those risks.) Finally, although the Gift of Agnes of Navarre is more highly honorific than is the Gift of the First Night, when the two are given in the same act this augments the value of her virginity, since on her part virginity kept before marriage or other commitment

does not signify sexual chilling or dissociation or a sexual appetite impaired by an emotional stake in "being 'trusted'" (i.e.: That she shall not copulate) to which she is so closely tethered that she cannot surrender sexually.

D.4.c+ (Yet some adaptation remains necessary, even if in another direction: Although the parents of a daughter who wears a chastity belt seriously for them under strict rule, need not compel her to emit the overt behaviors indicative of autonomous chastity, it is necessary that the daughter should know what these are to enable her to mimic her inferiors' behavior: Noblesse oblige dictates pity for inferiors, and on the other hand this is necessary to avert poisonous envy. [Poisonous envy, or envy in the third degree, is that which says, "If cannot have this, then you shall not have it:" It is the motivation of a vandal where vandals act from motivation; it aims at destroying the object or the possessor or both, or, failing that, at destroying the possessor's equanimity in possession.] The gift of consent to a chastity belt worn seriously under strict rule, whether by the wearer's consent to the initiative of another or at her initiative in the Gift of Agnes of Navarre, is honorific: While it conveys honor over and above its substance to the recipient when it is authentic, so does it earn honor for the donor for the act of making the gift. Now adherents of autonomous chastity whether religiously motivated or old-fashioned, because either they refuse or are unable to understand; or feminists of whatever set of beliefs; or sexual opportunists for whom the belt spoils their "sport" shall at least profess to repudiate this: Pursuant to their professed[?] disbelief they may mock the wearer; and they shall call her honor into question, in order to undermine her self-respect. Since talking to so many adherents of autonomous female chastity is anyway only and nothing other than a tiresome exercise in futility, best is to deny them pretext by reticence as protective coloration a hiding behind those preconceptions of theirs that the wearer declines to disturb: What these do not know cannot harm them-- even though the "harm" in question is only and nothing other than manufactured within their own minds - nor agitate. But in the event of disclosure, failure - especially in a parental situation -- to give her however much emotional support is necessary fully to compensate for outsiders' misunderstanding and any psychic vandalism therefrom resultant, is gravely abusive of the wearer and dishonorable on the family's part.)

SD.4.d The further to clarify the consensual nature of a daughter's belt, she should be given closely restricted -- but within those restrictions guaranteed - access to The Key, and there are four reasons why this should be done: First is to impart to her a measure of participation in administering the Rule of her Belt. Second is partially to familiarize her with the other side of that care and attention she needs while under the Rule of the Belt in order that, by familiarization with the Key-holder's side of it, she may judge any prospective candidate for her as bed-mate as to whether he is equal to and congenial with those responsibilities which come with the Gift of Agnes of Navarre -- or, if not yet so, he loves her enough to attain to them. Third is partially to alleviate those responsibilities on the part of the normal Key-holder in a parental situation, the mother; and this goes back to participation in administering the Rule. And fourth is to make it possible for the lass, without either or coarsening her by requiring her to be more explicit about this than with which she is comfortable, to masturbate.

SD.4.d+ (The objection may be raised -- by advocates of autonomous female chastity, and/or by others who misunderstand the chastity belt, who persist to the threshold of perseveration in the unconditional belief that the presence of the belt means that the wearer "cannot be 'trusted'" -- that a daughter who wears the belt for her parents, given restricted access to The Key, could use that access to circumvent the belt, thereby turning it into a false symbol. In context of the preparations suggested above and the connotations thereby attached to the belt in her mind, it is further suggested that the consequences of an such breaching of the Rule of the Belt by circumvention be termination with reversion to the expectations which go with autonomous chastity, which are at once less honorable and more hour-to-hour day-to-day difficult. The difficulty of the expectations which go with autonomous chastity will be more readily apparent to her, after vacation from them while under the Rule of the Belt, than it would be to a girl who has been autonomously chaste all along. And if the parents have prepared the ground well, termination of the Rule of the daughter's Belt for a violation thereof on her part will be privately shameful to her before them. Trust remains but the belt shifts its focus: It should be made clear to the who would enter under the Rule of the Belt, before she does so and before any possibility of her misunderstanding, that under it her honor with her

5-7/96

Page 37 of 41 pages

parents in matters sexual is not self-restraint nor cultivation of an emotional stake in being trusted not to copulate but rather scrupulous participation with them in the Rule. Indeed, this expands trust between parents and daughter by making it bilateral, further than the parents merely unilaterally telling her that they trust her to abstain from sexual activity, without help and without relief, while she lives under their roof and eats their bread. In virtue of the shift in the focus of trust, the daughter has privileges that her peers, subject to the constraints and expectations of self constraint of autonomous chastity, lack, and she is better protected in the exercise of those privileges; but her corresponding and countervailing responsibilities are fewer in number and lighter in aggregate weight and otherwise less restrictive, than are comparable responsibilities of her autonomously chaste peers. [Too, the autonomously chaste peer will, in order to keep that trust with her parents, be cultivating habits of intrapsychic behavior which will impede her enjoyment of sexual activity this becomes permissible or possible for her.] On the other hand, in order the more clearly still to guarantee the consensual and participatory character of the daughter's belt, it is further suggested that at the beginning, or perhaps waiting until habituation has begin to develop, she be particularly reminded that she has permission to discontinue the Rule of the Belt -- once and once only, since once discontinued it shall not be reinstated. Analogy to this in the military life of men: Admission to the training to certain elite formations is honorific to those admitted, but the training is arduous and rigorous; hence a trainee may opt out of training at any time, but by so doing he loses more honor than he had gained by entering training in the first place, and he forfeits forever the possibility of re-applying.)

SD.4.e Parents who aim at raising an autonomously chaste daughter should fear their daughter's masturbation: It habituates her to experience of orgasm in the first place. It augments her sexual appetite, i.e.: Her basic level of demand for sexual stimulation and orgasm. It may lower her erotic threshold, i.e.: Increase her receptivity to verbal, visual and non-genital tactile sexual stimuli. (Autonomous chastity depends in part upon propensity to ignore sexual stimuli and to resist those sexual stimuli which surmount being ignored.) Girls who masturbate are more likely to enjoy coitus, caeteris paribus, when they participate in it. Rut a healthily strong (i.e.: Intact, unrepressed, vital, unsublimated

warm, active; rather than impaled upon an emotional stake in being "trusted, " or tethered, so closely to that stake she fears, or is not capable of, abandon) sexual appetite is an asset in a wife. (And the lack of it is a liability, especially if the lack cannot be corrected. But if the lack develops after marriage in response to the husband's misconduct toward his wife, then it, is "punishment fitting the crime." The lack of a healthy strong sexual appetite in a wife is less material in places where custom sanctions the husband taking his wife by force -- or to western husbands who are of rapist or adulterous disposition.) But for a daughter who wears a chastity belt seriously for her parents under strict rule by authentic prior informed consent, bizarreries of - and outright cruelties occasioned by -- parental masturbation-fear and stratagems aimed at inducing sublimation (diversion of energy which powers an instinctual drive, here sexual, into other channels) are the opposite of necessary. Because her chastity is heteronomous, masturbation does not compromise its integrity. As a general principle, where it is not necessary to forbid, it is necessary not to forbid: Specifically it is unnecessary to injure her sexual desire or freeze it with guilt at consciousness of transgression of a prohibition: Her sexual appetite is protectively externally contained until safe full satisfaction can be made available. But in the meanwhile by way of keeping clear the consensual character of the daughter's belt and guaranteeing that its Rule remains only protective to the exclusion of acquiring repressive characteristics, those Others who are most Significant of all in her life enact the rightfulness of her masturbation by enabling it where they possess the means of preventing it entirely: By this enablement, and by according their daughter time and protected space in which she can masturbate in privacy and comfort, they provide for partial satisfaction in full safety in the interim before interpersonal sexual activity becomes lawful for her.

PART FOUR

Forcible rape is the taking of a female in an act of intercourse by the equivalent of strong-arm robbery or armed robbery: Theft Of her sexual services by force actual or hypothecated. At the same time as it is an invasion of her person, it enacts denial by the rapist that his victim is a person. To call it "abuse" is entirely true but misleading as it is hardly all of the truth; and contemporary commonness of the term trivializes its impact upon the victim:

It is more traumatic, and produces longer-lasting trauma, than does trespass by an energetic vandal. Its psychological sequelae include, but are by no means limited to, feelings of abject vulnerability and helplessness driven deeply into the victim's unconscious by traumatic impact, embarrassment, humiliation (without logical, as opposed to "psycho-'logical' " foundation); and broad, enduring, hypersensitive fear -- that can take as its secondary object anything erotic forasmuch as it is erotic, anyone male forasmuch as he is male. Thus the phenomenon of forcible rape as aetiology of frigidity; and thus the phenomenon of the rape victim afterwards as if imprisoning herself in her residence -- or, if not actually doing this, wishing that she could -- for her own protection by what seems to her then and there the best means immediately available; because she is subject to recurring attacks of terror triggered by random and vagrant stimuli which, while objectively having nothing to do with her, have acquired terrorizing connotations for her from her trauma. Eventually this terror subsides to the degree that its remnants are vulnerable to reason; but, depending upon the individual victim and her circumstances, "eventually" can take a long time. In some (only some, not by any means all; perhaps less than a majority of) such cases, as -- and only as -- only and nothing other than part of a comprehensive program of after care is a chastity belt, The Key carried by the wearer herself or hidden where only she can find it, can help restore her confidence in the sane way as a cane carried for a few days after one has severely sprained an ankle. (Three major impediments to acceptance of this in the United States come immediately to mind: The first is that this is by no means -- indeed the opposite, limited in its application -- any kind of "universal panacea and American tastes prefer that which is or represents itself, as in "One size fits all," as universal in its applicability ¹⁰. The second is an "urban ..legend, " as Bruvand* uses the term, to the effect that a rapist who has subdued

* Jan Harold Bruvand is a Professor of English at the University of Utah whose special interest is urban folklore- He has written both formally, *The Study of American Folklore*, New York (Norton: 1986), and popularly: *The Baby Train*, 1993, *The Choking Doberman*.(1986), and others.

10. C. Charles Hardenluzer and Alfs Trompenaars, *The Seven Cultures of Capitalism*, New York (Currency/Doubleday: 1993), page 20.

his victim and then finds the cay in barred by a chastity belt, will act out his rage at being thus frustrated by doing her grievous bodily harm or by killing her. The third is that many providers of after-care to rape victims are intensely all-around feministic, and the chastity belt is as if reflexive anathema to feminism.)

PART FIVE

On the other hand that narrow sector of society called variously the Sadomasochistic (S/M) and/or Bondage-and-Discipline • (B-&-D) and/or Dominant-Submissive (D-S) Milieu, or the Fetish-interest subculture, or simply "the 'scene,' " contains within it a hardy perennial minority of aficionados of the chastity belt as instrument. Instruments favored range from the historic to the contemporary to the outright fantastic; from futuristic designs that would be the nightmare of anyone trying to fabricate a functional realization from a picture alone, to the nadir of village blacksmith's unschooled crudity, to leather web-works of bewildering complexity and dubious practical utility, to the elegance of stainless steel shaped by a maker of the Genuine Article; and where it is the Genuine Article that is favored, the instrument -- and its wearer - will not seldom be festooned with up to the full complement of its maker's catalog accessory options, practical utility left far enough behind to be lost from sight. Quality of interest varies from the scholarly, to the instrument itself rather than the wearer's person as sexual object, and anywhere between those polarities. Similarly practice varies from blatantly ironic use as merely a fashion accessory to the opposite polarity of entire seriousness under strict rule with duly and properly respectful treatment accorded to the wearer (though where parties to this mode of practice eschew practice of other customs particular to "the 'scene'" -- e.g. including but not limited to: Extravagant and capricious corporal punishment in fact Lighter than it looks, as signally representative example -- and cease to use particular artifacts such as herocratic leather clothing, they cross the ill-defined boundary into seriousness). But if the enthusiasts of the chastity belt are a small minority within the minority that the Fetish-interest subculture or "scene," on the one hand many "adult toy" makers at least offer chastity belts in their mail-order catalogs, and erotica (from high Literarity to that aesthetic nadir which is "'hard'-core" pornography and any quality of writing or pictorial representation between the poles)

aimed at "the 'scene'" occasionally features use of the belt; on the other-hand, orders from this quarter do increase the revenues of makers of the Genuine Article. So on balance, serious believers in the chastity belt should be grateful for the existence of these people -- even the bizarre clowns! -- for their activity keeps the idea of the chastity belt from slipping beneath the threshold of public awareness.

ENDNOTE

Those who are not signally antipathetic to the chastity belt, whether as instrument or as custom or both, are sexually opportunistic males on the one hand and feminists on the other: Each pursues an ultimate goal incompatible with realization of the other's ultimate goal, but they concur ' (not agree) in their enmity to the belt, although they sometimes differ in their terms of attack (and like other sets of allies, they are antipathetic to each other underneath their enmity in common). One attack common to both is to execrate the belt as an artifact of puritanism. (Semantically strictly they probably are mistaken: The authorities about the belt, few as they are and scant as their work is, cite no cases whatsoever of its use in XVIIth Century C.E. England nor among XVIIth Century C.E. English Calvinists elsewhere situated. Too, Calvinism in general and that variant of Calvinism in particular advocate and emphasize autonomous chastity so exclusively that to them chastity either must be autonomous in nature or else it is nonexistent. Metaphorically, however, is another matter.) If by lower-case-"P" puritanism is meant "[At worst it is] a Manichaeian condemnation of the body and the body's activities as such ¹¹, yes, when the chastity belt is misused -- and abused by pressing it into service as one among many ways of abusing a girl or young woman -- it can rightly answer to that execration. But one person's pejorative is another's honorific: "Puritanism at its best [emphasis supplied] is an attempt to preserve the sexual act from vulgarization, trivialization and ultimately blasphemy. 11"

11. Both quotations in the Endnote come from (page 68 of the 1974 Vintage paperback edition of) *Zen, Drugs & Mysticism*, by Robert C. Zaehner. (Chapter 3: "Mysticism and LSD." Zaehner is Spalding Professor of Religion at Oxford.)

All rights reserved. (1996.)