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Abstract. This essay explains the prevalence of porn consumption by modeling it as a form of simulation. According to simulation theory (Gordon 1986, Goldman 2006) people predict and explain other’s behavior by using their own mind to model the mind of a target individual, much like an engineer might use a model aircraft to simulate the behavior of an actual aircraft. However, the cognitive mechanisms required for simulation have application outside of psychological interpretation. For example, it is plausible that while consuming pornography individuals simulate the actual activities as depicted by the pornographic material. On this construal, viewers of pornography think and feel as though they are truly having the depicted experience: from the psychological and phenomenological perspective of someone watching a pornographic video, they really are being sexually pleasured by others, and in just those specific ways. The goal of this essay is to develop the pornography-as-simulation model and examine both its social and theoretical implications.

Introduction

Consider the following scenario:¹

Mr Crane and Mr Tees were scheduled to leave the airport on different flights, at the same time. They traveled from town in the same limousine, were caught in a traffic jam, and arrived at the airport thirty minutes after the scheduled departure time of their flights. Mr Crane is told that his flight left on time. Mr Tees is told that his flight was delayed, and just left five minutes ago.

Now answer the following question: Who is more upset, Mr Tees or Mr Crane?

Like 96% of people, I suspect your answer to this question is “Mr Tees”. In this chapter I aim to convince you that the cognitive process you just underwent in order to generate this answer is the very same cognitive process that one employs in order to engage pornographic

material. In fact, the parallel between what your brain is doing when it contemplates Mr Tees’ scenario and what your brain is doing when it watches, say, *Debbie Does Dallas*, offers the only plausible explanation for how the porn industry managed to gross 97 billion in 2006.

Here is a more detailed description of the plan of this essay. In part one I discuss the everyday activity of “folk-psychology” with particular emphasis on what cognitive scientists term “mental-simulation”. In part two, I describe how the consumption of pornographic material places the simulation-heuristic in the service of a purpose that is radically different from that for which it was designed. The final part of the essay explores the implications of the pornography-as-simulation model and offers comparisons to actual sexual experience.

1. The Tools of Folk-Psychology

Human beings are prolific psychologists. By this I am not suggesting that individuals typically interpret one another in clinical terms such as “projection”, “avoidant disorder”, or the “phallic stage”. The sense in which humans are psychologists is rather more pedestrian. What it means is that people have an ability to interpret others in terms of beliefs, desires, intentions, emotions, etc., and people also understand something about how these mental states interact and cause behavior. For example, suppose you are in a betting parlor and witness Jones shake his head, crumple his betting stub, and toss the stub in the trash. Quite automatically you explain this behavior by attributing to Jones the desire that a certain horse win the race and also the belief that this horse did not win. Or, suppose you select for your Aunt Ginger a birthday card filled with puppy pictures because, attributing to your aunt the belief that all small cuddly creatures are
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2 Throughout this essay I will use the expressions “folk-psychology”, “mind-reading”, and “mentalizing” interchangeably.
wonderful, you *predict* she will enjoy it (note the recursive structure of folk-psychology: Aunt Ginger will later *explain* why you chose this card by attributing to you the belief that she would like it).

Two competing proposals for how we perform this mind-reading activity are prominent in the literature. The first maintains that individuals mentalize on the basis of a *theory* about psychology. According to one version of this view, “beliefs” and “desires” are theoretical entities that we posit in order to explain behavior – in the same way that astronomers posit black holes to explain gravitational forces – and we know a set of theoretical principles that causally link these entities to one another and overt behavior. A common example of such a principle is the “belief-desire law”: if you desire x (beer), believe that doing y (going to the fridge) will bring about x, then all things being equal you will do y (go to the fridge).

1.1 *Mental Simulation*

Many philosophers and psychologists find the above “theory-theory” approach to folk-psychology a bit too, well, scientific. This group favors what they believe is a more natural and parsimonious explanation of folk-psychological ability. Applying this second proposal – broadly called “simulation theory” – we simply imagine what *we* would do in another’s situation and then use the results of this exercise as the basis for a prediction or explanation of behavior. For example, if I want to figure out how Holmes will react to a decrease in the size of his pension, I simply “put myself into his shoes” in order to see how *I* would feel about it. After discovering that *I* would not be happy about a loss of retirement funds, I project the result back onto Holmes and predict that *Holmes* will not be happy. Note that I do not need a theory about how people
react to decreases in pensions; I just need to figure out how I will react (and to do this I just react, I don’t have a theory about reacting that tells me when and how to do it).

The most widely accepted account of mental simulation is the “off-line” heuristic.\(^3\) The heuristic begins with feeding “pretend inputs” into one’s practical reasoning system in order to engage the target’s perspective. The reasoning system then processes these inputs according to whatever principles and laws govern the functioning of the system, e.g., the belief-desire law. The process is off-line in the sense that the interpreter will ascertain the output of the reasoning process but stop short of converting this output into overt action. Instead, the interpreter projects the outcome onto the target in order to predict or explain the target’s behavior. Returning to the example of Mr Tees, the process might go something like this: (1) generate pretend inputs for Mr Tees’ situation (caught in traffic, arrived 30 minutes late to the airport, flight was delayed by 25 minutes); (2) feed these inputs into your reasoning system; (3) determine your reaction to this situation – e.g., recognize that you would be upset; (4) project this attitude onto Mr Tees.

This process will yield accurate mind-reading data about Mr Tees because your mind and Mr Tees’ mind operate roughly the same. But more important for our purposes, the process is accurate because there is a correspondence between your mental states during an actual experience and your mental states when you simulate that experience. Off-line reasoning on the basis of imagined states produces approximately the same sequence of cognitive and affective states as on-line reasoning on the basis of actual experience.\(^4\)
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4 Folk-psychological ability *qua* simulative skill is a mundane and often unconscious process rather than an expert proficiency. This is an important point, because it helps makes plausible the claim that we unwittingly and effortlessly bring this skill to bear in other areas (i.e., pornographic consumption). To get a feel for the degree to which folk-psychology penetrates our lives consider the phenomenon that is reality television. Here is a sample piece of dialogue from MTV’s *The Hills* (Season five, Episode five), replete with mental attributions and behavioral explanations/predictions:
1.2 The origin of simulation

Before we examine the pornographic appropriation of mind-reading skill, it is worthwhile to remark on the origin and purpose of mentalizing ability. Animals, with possibly the exception of a few primates, do not have the ability to think theoretically or simulatively about other minds. While it is true that many species are social (just think of ants and bees), the interpretive skill that underlies this sociality is behavior-reading and not mind-reading.

Probably, natural selection favored the development of mind-reading skill for two reasons. First, it was advantageous for our ancestors to predict each others’ behavior more accurately than what was possible by behavior-reading alone. Second, it was advantageous for our ancestors to avoid deception from adversaries and have the ability to return it in kind. Because deception involves exhibiting behavior that is at variance with true intention, a special “Machiavellian” mind-reading ability may have developed for the purposes of detecting deception. Supporters of the simulation account fill in the details of this story by claiming that natural selection first targeted forms of emotional contagion and empathy, and these basic
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Brody: Listen man, I messed up. I cheated on my girlfriend.
Frankie, Doug: [Laughing, clapping encouragingly]
Doug: I would have put that down like a sick dog! [meaning: he also would have cheated] Come on, dude! Come On! So how do you think Jade is going to feel?
Brody: How’s she going to feel?
Doug: I mean, do you think she’s going to be upset? Do you think you’re going to have to like tell her?
Frankie (interjecting): Of course she’s going to be upset!
Doug: Are you gonna call her today and be like “hey you know I…I...(trails off)
Brody (stumbling over words): No man! There’s nothing to… What?! Are you kidding?
Frankie: I wouldn’t doubt Audrina going and telling the other girls that something happened.
Doug: She wouldn’t do that, I don’t think.
Frankie: How do you know?
Doug: I mean I don’t…
Frankie: Dude, girls are evil.

To the extent that folk-psychology is simulative, Brody, Frankie, and Doug are inexhaustible simulators. It is also quite plausible that the reason people tune in to watch this drivel is because they want to see folk-psychology in action – to see how other people do it and to determine if they themselves are deviant (but this is another story, perhaps better left for “Reality TV and Philosophy”).
abilities later developed into the cognitive simulation routine that we examined in reference to Mr Tees. The implication is that the biological purpose of simulation – its *raison d’être* – is to predict behavior and avoid deception.

Enter the porn industry, which is perfectly yet unintentionally crafted to take advantage of mind-reading capacities. The porn industry, I’m quite sure, could care less about the phylogenetic history of porn-processing neurons.

2. The Modern Perversion of Mental Simulation

2.1 *Why porn is like NutraSweet*

It is not altogether uncommon for there to be some mechanism (M) that was designed for a job (J) but now regularly performs some different job (X). For example, the broken-down Ford Escort in my front yard was designed for traveling paved roads, but now it provides safe harbor for several mice and at least one nest of bees. More interesting is when a mechanism “runs normally” – functions mechanically as it ought to – but systematically achieves an end for which it was not designed. Technology is a regular manipulator of mechanisms in this respect. Consider what happens when you sip a Diet Coke. The biological purpose of your “sweet-taste mechanism” is to indicate and encourage the ingestion of high caloric foods. How it *does this* is by sending pleasurable sensations to your brain in response to a sweet taste. However, non-caloric substitutes such as aspartame (NutraSweet) are specifically designed to trigger this same orosensory operation. Thus when you drink Diet Coke your orosensory mechanism operates normally but works in the service of an end for which it was not designed.⁵
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⁵ The calorie ratio of Coke Classic to Diet Coke is 97:1.
I propose that something very similar occurs when the mind processes pornographic material. Pornographic material is designed to co-opt the simulation heuristic in the same way that aspartame is designed to co-opt the sweet-taste mechanism. This does not imply, of course, that porn-film directors have detailed theoretical knowledge about the simulative process. The creators of porn may have considerable know-how when it comes to invoking viewer simulation, but they need not have propositional knowledge about the process through which their films successfully highjack the specialized cognitive routine (similarly, the folk-psychological prowess exhibited on MTV’s *The Hills* does not command an advanced academic degree in psychology).

The idea that a medium of communication could act to stimulate an audience’s simulative involvement is not entirely new. Several researchers have advanced a simulationist approach to fictional engagement. On a strong version of this view when someone watches a film they simulate the perspective of the protagonist. This thesis has come under considerable fire, however. A more tempered claim is that viewers simulate the perspective of a “hypothetical observer” of the narrative rather than the perspective of an actual participant in the narrative. So instead of simulating Luke Skywalker, for example, we simulate someone who currently observes the inter-galactic events that comprise *Star Wars* (like some futuristic, quasi-omniscient news reporter).

### 2.2 How not to watch porn

Whatever the outcome of the debate over viewers’ simulative relationship to films rated by the Motion Picture Association of America, I maintain that the status of viewers’ simulative
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involvement in pornographic films is clear and definite. Before providing detail on the simulative model of porn consumption let’s first consider a non-simulative way to watch porn. For the remainder of this essay my discussion of the consumption of pornographic material will focus on the target porn audience and the dominant pornographic medium – men and videos (internet and DVD format) respectively.

One method for watching porn is to objectively admire naked body parts and the sexual configurations and rituals they execute. This would be similar to the manner in which an artist thinks about a figure model. Such an artist might contemplate the relationship between a glancing shadow and the curvature of hips, or the angle at which hair falls across a back. In all probability the artist does not imaginatively reconstruct the perspective of the model or the perspective of someone interacting with the model. It is possible that a porn viewer could achieve a similar objectivity by taking a third-person perspective on the sexual players and events depicted on-screen. On this construal, there is no sense in which porn viewers think or imagine that they are involved in sexual activity.

Maybe some people watch porn this way. Or maybe most people occasionally watch porn this way. As with many psychological processes, individual differences must be taken into account. Any attempt to discover necessary conditions for porn consumption is therefore misguided. Instead, researchers should target a theory that explains the staggering popularity of pornographic videos. Such a theory would explicate the central dynamic between porn and its audience rather than the necessary dynamic. In this respect, the third-person explanation of porn-consumption fails. It fails for the simple reason that people would rather have sex than watch sex. When people watch porn they do not actually have sex, of course. But if they simulate having sex then they recreate (to some degree) the cognitive and affective states that occur when
they actually do have sex. Even if the simulated experience lacks complete verisimilitude, it is vastly closer in its approximation to actual sex than passive sex-watching. I now develop this idea in more detail.

2.3 Simulating a day at the office

In the popular video series “Naughty Office”, corporate executives discover that the true desire of their demurely dressed secretaries is not to provide administrative assistance but to engage in heroic sessions of on-the-job fellatio and vaginal/anal penetration. Said bosses are themselves eager to indulge the sexual appetites of their secretaries.

Suppose in rural Nebraska somewhere a dude named Max is watching Naughty Office from his couch. Max has never had a secretary – he’s never even worked in an office before. But he can simulate being a boss with a secretary, and he can simulate the things that bosses and secretaries like to do in the “Naughty Office”. For example, Max can simulate the activity of hastily clearing his desk of official documents so that he and his secretary can more comfortably perform sexual maneuvers.

It is helpful to compare Max’s simulation of the Naughty Office to the simulation of Mr Tees. The first step for the simulation of Mr Tees is the generation of pretend inputs. While the script about Mr Tees that prefaced this essay prompts our imagination, it does not do the actual imagining for us. Cognitive capacities such as visual imagery (e.g., seeing ourselves in a limo stuck in traffic) and memory recall (e.g., that particular anxiety we’ve experienced in past traffic jams) are used to produce the facsimile mental states that locate the simulator “in the shoes” of Mr Tees. On the other hand, one of the tricks of pornographic video is to eliminate the cognitive work and creativity that is typically required for this initial imaginative step. While engaging
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9 Produced by Naughty America, (2007).
porn the viewer does not have to visualize a secretary because the secretary is right there on the screen. Nor does the viewer strain to imagine the secretary seducing him because again, she is right there, ostensibly disrobing and discussing her carnal intentions.

When Max feeds the pretend secretary-seduction inputs into his reasoning system the system will run off-line and produce further mental states. For instance, Max may believe that he is receiving fellatio, that the secretary desires him, that their behavior is risky, and so on. Certainly Max sees these things to some extent, but he also believes them and believes they are a consequence of his behavior. Also, Max’s beliefs are about himself (and the secretary), but nowhere is Max presented on-screen. These cognitive states, then, must be explained by simulation and do not reduce to mere audio-visual stimulation. On the other hand, it is the visceral power of pornographic video that most directly explains how the off-line process is enforced. If Max’s mind were left to its own resources (provided no sensory stimulation) it is unlikely that Max could maintain the off-line succession of mental states that occurs during a secretary-seduction. Fortunately for Max the audio-visual narrative of Naughty Office 8 functions to continuously enforce the off-line processing and suppress potentially contradictory beliefs (e.g., the belief that the secretary’s desire for him is grossly implausible).

Simulation can also produce affective states, or mental states that have an emotional component. Perhaps during a production of Romeo and Juliet we simulate the lovers and generate an emotional state that replicates (to some degree) the genuine emotional state that accompanies love-loss. Now, to the extent that Max is able to simulate surrogates of the cognitive states that attend a secretary-seduction, he should also experience affective states (i.e., desire, lust, affection, disregard) according to the way that his affective system responds to his beliefs. As I discuss below, this is a potentially worrisome result.
So far I have discussed the simulation of cognitive and affective states. But perhaps the most intriguing modes of simulation that underlie the consumption of pornographic video are a form of mirroring called “tactile empathy” and the production of motor imagery. Tactile empathy occurs when someone views another person being touched. Keysers et al. performed functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies of subjects in two different conditions. In the tactile condition subjects’ lower legs were brushed back and forth with a glove. For the visual-stimulation condition subjects viewed videos of actors having their lower legs brushed. The results of the fMRI indicated that being touched and watching someone being touched produced a similar pattern of activation in the secondary somatosensory cortex. Additional evidence indicates that tactile empathy generalizes to other body parts and other types of tactile stimulation. Quite plausibly, watching pornography produces activation patterns in this somatosensory cortex that are similar to patterns produced during actual sexual activity. (No doubt porn consumers also deploy auto-erotic behavior in order to more accurately replicate genuine tactile sensations).

I suggest that porn-consumption also involves the closely related but distinct cognitive production of motor imagery. Motor imagery is the imaginative reproduction of mental states that accompany bodily action. For example, before a foul shot, basketball players often “make the shot in their head”. Several empirical studies show that the neurological regions activated during actual bodily movement are also activated during the imaginative enactment of bodily movement. Putting this all together, we return to Max. Not only is Max’s somatosensory cortex mirroring the somatosensory cortex of the porn actor, but Max is also actively imagining himself
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executing the motor movements of the porn actor. These subconscious forms of mental mirroring likely anchor the more controlled cognitive reenactments as described above.

One clear difference between the uses of simulation during mind-reading versus porn-watching is that only the former employs the final projective step. In no sense does Max want to exit the simulation heuristic (“come back to reality”) in order to ascribe a mental state to the naked stranger on the screen! Rather, Max wants maintain the affective, imagistic, and cognitive states that encode him as that person (the boss), with that person’s attributes, and undergoing that person’s activities.

2.4. Money, Lesbians, and Woodsmen

I submit that the simulation model of pornography has a number of explanatory merits that are not available on other accounts. First, I believe that it offers a highly plausible explanation for why pornography is staggeringly popular. We already know that actual sex is very appealing and that the attainment of the mental and physical states that accompany sex is, to put the matter mildly, highly motivating. If pornography serves as an audio-visual prop that allows viewers to create surrogate mental states that are phenomenologically and cognitively similar to mental states experienced during actual sex, then it follows that pornography should also be very appealing and highly motivating.

The pornography-as-simulation model also explains the central importance of the “money shot” – the literal and figurative climax of nearly every porn scene. The money shot is the successful filming of the male’s ejaculation, where said ejaculation always occurs visibly and directed towards some female body part. It is curious why the money shot is so important to the structure of a porn scene. After all, the porn industry is constantly experimenting and changing
existing forms. Yet the money shot persists, unwavering and unrestrained. This all makes sense if the money shot is an essential audio-visual prop for viewer simulation. If the money shot is absent, then the viewer may question whether the sexual activity is “really” happening. But in order to question the authenticity of the sexual behavior, the viewer would first have to exit the simulative mode (inhibit their off-line processing) so that they could make an objective analysis. The invariable inclusion of the money shot, then, functions to preserve the simulative connection between viewer and video.

More generally, an account of porn consumption should be able to explain why, given a largely male and presumably heterosexual viewing audience, porn exhibits a preponderance of penises and male ejaculate. It is easy to draw the wrong inferences from this fact. Take for instance the following author’s claim: “Pornography highlights the penis; men watch pornography; therefore, men must be watching the penis.” From this the author concludes that “pornography exists as a conduit for male homoerotic interaction,” and that “porn’s central taboo is homosexuality.” This gets it completely wrong, completely backwards. The author’s argument assumes that people watch pornography objectively, in the third-person. If this were the case, then perhaps it is reasonable to wonder why so many presumably heterosexual men are watching so many penises. But it is not the case, because viewers are simulating the actor rather than watching the actor. From the simulative perspective, the viewer is watching their own penis and the sexual contact it receives/provides. This is also why large endowment is common in the
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12 The insider slang of the porn industry reflects the central role given to the male performer’s erection. As David Foster Wallace decodes in his essay Big Red Son: “Wood is a camera-ready erection; woodman is a dependably potent male performer; and waiting for wood is a discrete way of explaining what everybody else in the cast and crew is doing when a male performer is experiencing wood trouble, which latter term is self-evident.” (from Consider the Lobster and Other Essays. 2005. New York: Little, Brown. fn18, p. 23)


14 Ibid. pg. 55

15 Ibid. pg. 60
porn industry: *ceteris paribus*, men prefer to imagine themselves as well-endowed and to simulate the effects there-of.

During lesbian scenes there is no male actor that serves as a location to which the viewer can imaginatively project himself. This may seem like a potential problem for the simulation approach to porn, but several responses are available. First, recall that I am not advancing any necessary condition for porn consumption because I don’t think there are any. Second, it is possible that men are simulating the women’s perspective. Third, and most likely I think, the viewer is simulating the perspective of a “hypothetical observer” to the women. The fact that many lesbian scenes are set up such that it is possible for there to be a secret observer (e.g., the women are in tall grass somewhere) supports this claim.

3. Conclusions and Assessments

I now examine some of the implications of the simulative model of porn consumption. I hope to show that there are some clear benefits for the porn-viewer and perhaps society at large but also some significant worries. I end on a theoretical note, arguing that the model advanced here opens up new directions for empirical research.

3.1. *Even better than the real thing?*

The world of actual sexual relationships can be a dangerous and cruel place: Sexually transmitted diseases are more common and lethal than ever; sexual rejection and unfulfilled sexual desires are par for the course for just about everybody; acts of intimacy interact unpredictably and sometimes undesirably with other non-sexualized elements of people’s lives;
and so on. The world of pornography offers an escape from many of these unwanted contingencies. If pornographic experience *qua* simulation approximates actual sexual experience, then why bother with any of the problems that are only endemic to the actual sexual world? Sure, there is the argument from Nozick that people want to be *actual* people with *actual* experiences. But in the context of sexual experience this is often the very problem, namely, that the activities which exist in the pornographic milieu are not readily available in the actual world.

3.2 *Two worries*

Here are two concerns that arise if porn-viewing is simulative. (I have several other concerns, but I’ve been given a word limit). First, the disconnect between pornography and actual sex is exacerbated by the remarkable proliferation of porn categories. Internet sites can have literally thousands of alphabetized categories of sexual fetishes and interests that range from *Braces* to *Anal Fruitshakes*. Many of the activity-types and partner-types featured in these categories are unavailable in the (relatively speaking) prosaic world of real sex. However, I do not believe that the growing population of porn categories exists in response to people’s antecedent desires. Rather, these categories *create* desires, and these new desires may conflict with standards of well-being and moral behavior.

What I have in mind here is similar to what Ian Hacking calls “dynamic nominalism”, in which a category is initially empty but eventually comes to exist on the basis of labeling practices. My specific worry is that through simulative exposure to obscure porn categories, during which people vicariously experience the satisfaction of these desires, they will actually develop these desires in reference to non-simulative and non-pornographic contexts. Such desires
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16 The objection comes from Robert Nozick’s analysis of why people would choose not to live an “experience machine” that could give them any experience they desired.

then create unrealistic expectations in the non-pornographic world that are potentially harmful for real relationships.

Second, the content of mainstream (as opposed to fetish) pornographic material is increasingly defined by aggressive and degrading behavior towards women. This suggests that porn viewers are simulating aggressive and degrading behavior. Given the layers of simulative reenactment described in the previous section, the concern is not only that viewers simulate the belief that, e.g., they are dominating women, but also that they experience the attendant affective states (e.g., derision) in reference to women. If the simulative character of these mental states causes them to persist or have any efficacy in the non-simulated world, then that is a deep problem.\(^{18}\) Note also that this problem interacts with the problem just described. Even where there is no antecedent desire for domination and degradation, simulated experience of actions on the basis of such desires may foster their development.

3.3 *Simulation as a research program into the effects of pornography*

The vast majority of empirical research on pornography is directed at the *effects* of viewing pornography. In particular, researchers investigate possible correlations between exposure to pornography and violent behavior towards women. To date, this empirical data is inconclusive. But researchers have largely neglected the cognitive processes that occur during the consumption of pornographic material. This is an important oversight because a model of consumption will make specific predictions about the effects of consumption.

Simulation theory is an established empirical research program. Thus the model of porn-consumption set forth in this essay has important empirical implications. Consider that

\(^{18}\) What I am suggesting here is an elaboration of MacKinnon’s well known criticism of pornography, but I am developing that criticism in the theoretical and empirical context of simulation theory. See MacKinnon, C. (1987). *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on life and law*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
researchers have converged on a pattern of data that links the simulation of an action to future performances of that action. Here are two examples. Yue and Cole compared subjects who physically trained (contracted their muscles) to subjects who only mentally trained (no muscle contraction).\(^{19}\) Subjects who actually trained increased muscle strength by 30 percent and those who simulated training increased strength by 22 percent! In another study, Coffman determined that the mental rehearsal of a piano chordal piece was effective in improving the speed at which performers could subsequently play the chordal piece.\(^{20}\) This study is consistent with the general finding that mental simulation can improve one’s performance in the conceptual demands of a task in addition to the motor demands.\(^{21}\)

Given this body of research, the simulation model of porn-consumption offers a mildly amusing prediction and also a generally disturbing prediction. The mildly amusing prediction is that the school-yard notion that watching pornography will improve physical, sexual skill may actually have some merit. The disturbing prediction is that the motor and conceptual processes that occur during engagement with mainstream, aggression-themed pornography will likely facilitate one’s ability to transfer these processes into the real world.

