

or where I'd kiss her next. I even let her stand untouched for periods, while I undressed piece by piece. She got so excited, I should've left a bucket below her pussy.

Colin S, Norfolk

A HORNY DILEMMA

Where are all the horny women looking for horny guys? What's happening with all these bi-curious women, and what's with all this 'husband to watch/participate' business.

If you were to create a Gay/ Bi-curious section, then us poor guys wouldn't have to face the disappointment of reading through an ad only to find 'no single guys'.

Stephen E, Co Durham

Come on, Stephen — get real. It's all a question of supply and demand. Unfortunately for 'poor guys', women are generally far more choosy when it comes to sex. Unless a woman's looking for a specific attribute in a man (say, a big dick), or a certain sexual predilection (ie dominant/ submissive, etc), she doesn't really need to advertise — though of course many still do. Rather, she need only go down the pub in a short skirt and she can take her pick. It's the way of the world and the contact ads reflect this.

As for bi-curious sections: certainly some women advertisers are looking only for other bi-females — maybe with husband to watch, but if you read through the women's section in this issue, you'll find that many women advertise as bi-curious but are not just looking for other females. Their bisexuality is just a part of their sexual make-up and not the defining characteristic. Therefore, they might not welcome being ghettoised in a 'bi' section.

The sexuality and desires of advertisers in this magazine are very diverse, and once we set up a sub-section for bi-curious, then surely by the same logic we'd need sub-sections for subs, doms, transvestites, watersports enthusiasts, etc. Instead we keep things simple for everyone, and what could be simpler than Men, Women and Couples?— Ed.

BUSTER GONAD & HIS UNFEASIBLY LARGE TESTICLES

With regard to your article 'Terms of Endowment', I myself think a lot about cock size, and find that girls I go with like mine (so they say) as it's so fat. It's only 6" long, but it's also 6" in circumference and I also have massive bollocks. Nevertheless, I think everyone is able to give something to a woman, regardless of cock size.

As for my own again, I get told that it's so thick it stretches a girl's cunt really wide, though it's difficult (but not impossible) to fuck the arse. However, when I am up someone's shitter, the advantage of having huge bollocks is that the woman can reach underneath and rub them over their wet piss flaps and clit (*Nice! — Ed*). Once even, a girl once put my left ball (the biggest one) up her twat as I fucked her arse.

Steve S, Cheshire

PORN AGAIN

I lived in Holland for six years and was initially taken aback by the freedom afforded to the public there, although after six months I thought nothing of taking two or three porno videos up to the check-out girl in the video shop (videoteek), and hiring them. What a shock when I came back to the UK.

I agree with your editorial in issue 19 — abolish all censorship. Attitudes seemed to me to be a lot healthier in Holland, and I found no evidence of sexual depravity or corruption during my entire stay. In fact, a Dutchman once asked me how come we're allowed to have mirrors in our bedrooms in Britain, because if we aren't allowed to watch porno videos, then he couldn't see why we would be allowed to watch live sex (*Ho, ho, ho! — Ed*).

Would it be possible for *Desire* to go into what exactly is illegal when it comes to pornography? For example, can I possess it? Can I bring it into the country for my own use? Can I lend my videos to friends? It would be reassuring to know.

Kevin Z, Somerset

'Fraid this is quite a complex issue, Kevin, so it's best handled by David Webb, Honorary Director of the National Campaign for the Reform of the Obscene Publications Acts:

"In UK law, 'pornography' as such is not illegal. It only becomes so if and when it qualifies as being 'obscene' according to the provisions of the Obscene Publications Act 1959. The legal test of obscenity in that Act, is the notorious 'deprave and corrupt' yardstick. This is the test the authorities apply, though nobody can demonstrate that anybody has ever been depraved or corrupted by a particular 'obscene' article.

In practice, what this means is that police and customs officers simply apply their own idiosyncratic, subjective and inevitably inconsistent standards — even though they always claim that their decisions are based on what they know to have been successfully prosecuted in the courts in the past. But this measure too, is deeply flawed because the courts themselves are notoriously inconsistent in their judgments. For

example, an item found 'obscene' in one court will often be found to be 'not obscene' in another. No-one can therefore state categorically that a particular item is obscene in the eyes of the law, and the outcome of any prosecution is effectively a lottery.

However, mere possession of 'obscene' material is not in itself an offence, but could be so if illegally imported. Moreover, the showing of any 'obscene' article in one's private possession, to another person, whether a friend or not, has incredibly been interpreted by the courts as 'publishing'. So, strictly speaking, this is an offence under the 1959 Act, whether for gain or not.

However, with material involving or depicting children under the age of 16, the criteria applied, according to the Protection of Children Act 1978, is quite simply that of 'indecent', which is not subject to the 'deprave and corrupt' limitation of the OPA's obscenity test, and as such it is interpreted by the courts much more broadly, and often recklessly. Furthermore, under Section 160 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988, mere possession of such 'indecent' material (of under-16-year-olds), became a criminal offence, which has recently allowed the police to concern themselves with even the most innocuous material. What's more, the onus is on any defendant charged with possession of material in which those involved 'appear' or 'seem' to be underage, to prove otherwise (quite often an impossibility).

With regard to the importation into the UK of allegedly 'obscene' material, although the provisions of the Customs Consolidation Act (dating back to 1876!) still apply, which prohibit the importation of 'indecent' or 'obscene' material, customs officers now apply only the obscenity test of the OPA. Not that this gives much cause for comfort.

HM Customs and Excise officers are given frighteningly wide powers to deal with 'obscene' material, possibly rivalling those of the Third Reich! Their main weapon, where a small number of items is concerned, is the confiscation of the offending material (again often depending on the idiosyncratic and subjective whims of their officers).

But if they suspect you of being a commercial importer, carrier or dealer, you will almost certainly be arrested, strip-searched and taken under escort to your home which will then also be searched.

If you wish to challenge a so-called simple confiscation order, you can do so within 28 days. The case (which is a civil, not criminal, hearing), will then be heard before magistrates, where again the onus is on you to show that the material is not obscene, is not therefore illegal and consequently should be returned to you. Not an easy task, because in practice magis-

trates invariably rubber-stamp customs seizures — and you may be liable for costs, too.

Customs officers are now permitted to exercise a 'personal use tolerance' clause which instructs them not to seize small quantities of 'obscene' material (so you're allowed up to three books or magazines), providing none of the items depict children, and there are no duplicate items, and there is no suspicion that the individual is a regular visitor abusing this tolerance.

(And note that this 'tolerance' clause also excludes video tapes, films, laser discs and computer disks which will still be seized.)

However, in the supposedly free West where freedom of expression is rightfully taken for granted, such big-hearted concessions to us repressed Brits are hardly likely to fill us with paroxysms of joy. Effectively, British state nannyism and hypocrisy still prevails."

If you wish to support NCROPA, please send an SAE for membership details to them at PO Box 7744, London SW3 5YT.

TOP DOM

I must take issue with Iain M, of Brighton, who in *Desire 20* lamented the lack of 'genuine' dominant mistresses in the UK. Surely he need look no further than his own home town to find several superb doms, such as the redoubtable Aunt Jennifer, whose vocation is the disciplining of miscreant and masochistic males.

If however, by 'genuine' he means genuinely sadistic, then he'll search in vain, for such women, where they exist, would quite probably turn out to be dangerous psychopaths like Myra Hindley or Rosemary West.

Iain should remember that female domination (as practised in the Other World Kingdom) is nothing more nor less than a perennial male fantasy. The vast majority of ladies who offer this service do so for purely pecuniary reasons. However, this does not mean that they do not enjoy their calling and give the punter good value.

I advise Iain to shop around a bit more, and he'll soon discover that an increasing number of working girls are specialising in catering for his particular fantasy — not merely because it's highly lucrative, but because there's an ever-growing demand for it among the male population.

John E, Surrey

There's a couple of the latest erotic books for every letter we publish here. Your full name and address will be withheld. Please write by post, fax or e-mail to Moondance Media (Editorial), as detailed on page 3