



Porn in the UK
Version 1.0 - 27th April 2022

This is an open letter thing regarding porn in the U.K.

This is version 1.0 as I suspect I will keep updating it.

Feel free to pass it on to others.

I write this as often those who are against porn, do so not on facts but what they believe is true. Indeed often the case seems to be if they think it sounds true, then it must be.

In this I will cover several aspects about porn.

1. Age Verification

Age verification sounds simple and something sites could do with ease, yet it is not the case.

In truth if you go online then you have been age verified. As you have signed a contract for broadband. And my understanding is to sign a contract you need to be 18. Who uses your broadband is then your responsibility not the site owners. Just in the same way if you buy alcohol from a shop it is not the shops responsibility if you let others drink it.

It has been said gambling sites age verify people. I personally went on several and was never age verified.

Pay sites use credit cards and as such you need to be 18 to own one. However the talk seems to be some nonsense that people will need to be age verified even to go onto the site or to possibly go onto a sex blog or porn tube or whatever.

The problem is that it is impossible to age verify someone. They can use someone else's details and claim to be them.

The next problem is sites will be forced to use firms they do not know if they are trustworthy. Anyone could set up a site claiming to age verify someone but instead steal there bank details. Indeed one suspects if age verification was introduced then it would result day one of millions of people handing over bank details to criminals. One suspect there will be hundreds of fake sites set up to get peoples bank details and within a week millions will be taken out of accounts. Indeed age verification would be the greatest gift to criminals.

The next problem is that people will simply sell passwords online. So people will get age verified then sell the access to anyone or even give it away. We know this will happen as we already are seeing this with the fast food delivery firms. Where people have got delivery accounts and are selling them online for a lot of money.

A few years ago a website was set up as a demonstration of how age verification would work. I used a dead credit card and joined with no problems. Indeed I posted about it on a blog and a chap from the news (I think it may have been the Independent) contacted me to tell him how I did it. He then did an article as if it was him who had worked it out and I do not believe he credited me on the story (cheeky sod).

One problem with age verification is not every person has a credit card or passport or driving licence. So you may end up with people who cannot access sites because they do not have ID. One suspect this may be a human rights problem.

As most sites are outside the U.K. it is probable that most will ignore the UK law. Of course you could block sites. But then you become a Chinese style government.

The other problem is more you make problems for porn sites. The more they will just stick two fingers up at the government and move to the dark web and use such as bit coin for payment. In turn move the public into using the dark web more and in turn all other sites move to the dark web. At that point the government looks daft as it will have no piers (or one suspects they will not have any powers) over anything on the dark web.

2. Porn has killed not a single person in the last two thousand years

Most university studies I believe state porn has no harm. Indeed no real study seems to suggest harm is ever done with porn. It makes you wonder why politicians get obsessed with trying to ban porn.

Yet the same politicians seem at ease that you could loose all your money gambling or die from alcoholism. Smoke yourself to death. Die from being too fat. Yet they waste there time with something porn that has been around since it was first drawn on cave walls, written in books in Roman times. Millions watch each day on DVD or the internet. You would have thought that we would hear on the news someone dropping dead from porn every day if porn was so harmful. Strange how for all the fear talk, no one is harmed.

Perhaps politicians would be best to deal with life harms. For example walk past most U.K. high schools and you will see children smoking and smoking weed. Perhaps that should be more of a worry to parents rather than if a teenager sees a pair of boobs on the internet.

3. Women are victims in porn

Most porn today is made by women. Most porn is produced by women doing such as webcam or such as OnlyFans and other such sites.

The amount of porn made by males is low.

The anti porn people will say that women are trafficked to do porn. That sounds scary does it not. That is until you ask what porn sites have done this as I have seen none. Indeed why would you spend thousands to traffic a women and try to force her to do porn, when you can go on a model site and just book a model.

You start to quickly realise the only argument the anti porn people have is to make up lies.

Women are not forced or tricked or given drugs to do porn. I know as I also work in porn. Some will only do nude shoots. Some will use toys. And some love to do full sex.

One Labour person (I think she is in the House of Lords) stated she wanted women to be removed from a porn site if she later wanted to. This reminded me of the model who wanted to be removed and have all the content from a site she was shot for over ten years. I think she was paid over the years a vast amount. She did this as she wanted to set up her own site and did not want the competition and also wanted the professionally shot pics and vids for free. It would be nonsense too as often a site will hand out pics of a model for affiliates to use and so being removed from the main site would have no effect on her being removed from the web. Not to mention the fact members of the site will have downloaded pics and vids of her. To me this was just a stupid idea from someone who had no understanding of how the internet works and possibly presumes women are victims all the time.

4. Women watch porn and feminists (some) are pro porn

We know that women consume porn, both on the internet and books (did you see how well the shades of grey books sold).

It is often the mistake of many politicians, especially those on the left to presume women do not like porn and banning porn will be a vote winner. The truth is banning porn will loose you a lot of votes.

While not all feminists are pro porn, we do today have many who are pro porn and make it themselves.

Today we have a lot of women who film, write and obviously star in porn. Many own and run websites.

Again this is a mistake of many politicians who on one hand will claim to support gay, lesbian, bi, trans and so on rights, yet fail to understand that these are also in many cases the same people who are often pro porn and use it and produce it.

You only need to look at sites such as get life and see the huge numbers of members in the U.K. alone. If a politician did that ever they may consider twice about seeing banning porn as a vote winner.

5. Banning porn would create so many problems

Banning porn would not make porn go away. It would end up being sold on a black market on such as memory cards, usb drives and so on.

While at the moment if you run a porn site, all models need to prove they are 18 and sign a model release and so on. A black market of porn would mean no one would know if the models were under 18 or gave consent. Indeed criminals could make a fortune simply drugging and raping women to make porn on a mobile phone and sell it on a black market.

It is possible if not more than likely that children would sell pirated porn at School to each other using mobile phones as storage. This would be lily because we already have children selling drugs in many schools.

Of course you could only block the porn in the U.K. so porn sites would carry on regardless. If need be move out of the U.K. or at least pretend to move out of the U.K. to avoid problems.

6. ATVOD

It is worth talking about ATVOD.

A few years ago the U.K. government had Atvod. The idea was to regulate any U.K. web site that hosted vids. This was not just porn sites but all sites.

So if you have a single brain cell you will have worked out already that the U.K. government had put in place an organisation that put U.K. websites at a disadvantage to all other websites worldwide. It also possible put of any media firm moving to the U.K. to set up business.

The idea was that if you had vids on your site you had to pay a fee. To this day I have no idea what you got for your fee but if you did not pay there made up fee price then you got a huge fine.

The result was some sites moved out of the U.K. many pretended and claimed to have moved out of the U.K. Many just ignored Atvod knowing they could not be contacted.

Also many many site owners were not even aware Atvod even existed

If your porn site did not look like a U.K. site and you did not have your address on your site, it was almost I possible for Avod to know where you were based and as such contact you and send you a bill for hosting your vids.

After a few years, suddenly it was reported Atvod was no more. Just like that. To this day I am not sure if it has ever been said why they were closed down. One can only presume because it was not workable.

7. Gail Dines must be an expert in porn as she has a PhD in sociology

I will talk about Gail Dines as often she is on TV as the main anti porn person. And many on the left seem to drool over her and presume she is an expert on porn.

Now I do not believe she is.

I say this as I read a lot on line. And it is not clear how much she has contacted those in porn. Indeed I have spoken to many female models in porn in the U.K. who have told me she refuses to speak to them (they may be telling me lies). But the more I read the more I suspect that Gail Dines evidence is more to do with what she believes rather than spending years studying porn but I could be wrong).

I have watched many of her vids on YouTube and found what she has to say on porn, is often not about porn. For instance she talks a lot about advertisements in media. Or the term I believe she uses is pornification.

To make her points, she uses interesting techniques such as call men who do porn something like pornymen (it's a while since I have listened to one of her YouTube vids so I forget). These are great way to dehumanise men who make porn to make them sound evil in the minds of the listener.

I do love to go through her YouTube vids as it is fun to look up her evidence she quotes. In fact in my next updates of this I may do a few of her YouTube vids and go through each point.

But some of her points I remember she has made are:

In one vid she states that in one study it was shown that in most of the shoots there was violence on women. So I looked up this study. From what I remember is was done on DVD porn films by I think a feminist organisation (I may be wrong) and they used rude words as part of what they considered violence. Under such conditions one suspects most films made by Hollywood would be classed as violence against women. Me would presume most porn films have someone saying let's f####.

In some YouTube vids I believe she incorrectly states what Gonzo porn is. Gonzo is a term used in media, even in the news, often referring to being the point of view of the writer. Something basic that you would think an academic would know. But I think in some YouTube vids her version of Gozo is something completely different. So different you may conclude she has done not much in the way of any sort of study into porn.

8. Those who are anti porn blame porn for rape

One thing that is often interesting is that the anti porn people (often extreme feminists) seem to often blame men for raping women on porn rather than the man to be blamed.

You would think the last thing any feminist would do was to use women who have been raped as a tool to make a made up argument. I say made up as I am not sure there has ever been any university study that shows any connection with rape and porn. One suspects that most of the anti porn people know that, but are still happy to use rape victims for there own use.

Personally I would never dream of using rape victims as a tool to win an argument as to me it is disgusting.

It also is telling rapists that they are not at fault as it is the porn rather than themselves to blame.

9. Does porn addiction exist?

I suspect it is an addiction to masturbation rather than an addiction to porn

If any males claim I am wrong and they claim they are addicted to porn, may I suggest a tiny experiment and they get voluntarily castrated. As I suspect the so called addiction will stop instantly. If you still have an addiction to porn, then you have proved me wrong.

10. Porn is no different to horror and comedy

If you state porn is harmful then presumably so is horror and comedy.

They are all on film, or in books or just sound recordings.

The logic that looking at naked people even naked people having sex is going to harm you, is by the nature of things rather silly.

11. Religious nuts have no interest to me

If you have religious beliefs, then that is fine. But do not expect me to believe in the rubbish you believe.

And if your a Christian and against porn, I presume you have never read the bible as it is full of people having sex. In fact such is the smut in the bible, some of it I wonder if it is not illegal. The bible seems more extreme in porn than anything I believe that is legal online.

In the beginning we have Adam and Eve who presumably had children who had children with each other. A book that starts off with families having sex with each other, and they give this book out to children.

Perhaps that is why Christians get upset over porn, as they want less competition for there porn book.

It is probably why they have the bible in hotels, for guests to jerk off to.

They should sell the bible in a sealed plastic bag and only to those over 18 who can cope with such smut. To be honest it is far too extreme in parts for me.

12. The NSPCC “Porn Addiction” Study

This is an open letter regarding the NSPCC study, from:

<http://sexandcensorship.org/2015/04/open-letter-nspcc-re-porn-addiction-study/>

The letter below was sent to Peter Wanless, CEO of the National Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children, on Friday 10th April. It is signed by leading academics, sex educators, journalists and campaigners.

To: Peter Wanless, Chief Executive Officer, NSPCC

Dear Mr Wanless,

We write to express our deep concern about a report you published last week, which received significant press coverage. The report claimed that a tenth of 12-13 year olds believe they are addicted to pornography, and appears to have been fed to the media with accompanying quotes suggesting that pornography is causing harm to new generations of young people.

Your study appears to rely entirely on self-report evidence from young people of 11 and older, and so is not – as it has been presented – indicative of actual harm but rather, provides evidence that some young people are *fearful* that pornography is harming them. In other words, this study looks at the effects on young people of widely published but unevicenced concerns about pornography, not the effects of pornography itself.

It appears that your study was not an academic one, but was carried out by a “creative market research” group called OnePoll. We are concerned that you, a renowned child protection agency, are presenting the findings of an opinion poll as a serious piece of research. Management Today recently critiqued OnePoll in an article that opened as follows: “What naive readers may not realise is that much of what is reported as scientific is not in fact genuine research at all, but dishonest marketing concocted by PR firms.”

There have been countless studies into the effects of porn since the late 1960s, and yet the existence of the kinds of harm you report remains contested. In fact, many researchers have reached the opposite conclusion: that increased availability of porn correlates with healthier attitudes towards sex, and with steadily reducing rates of sexual violence. For example, the UK government’s own research (1) generated the following conclusion in 2005: “There seems to be no relationship between the availability of pornography and an increase in sex crimes ...; in comparison there is more evidence for the opposite effect.”

The very existence of “porn addiction” is questionable, and it is not an accepted medical condition. Dr David J Ley, a psychologist specialising in this field, says: “Sex and porn can cause problems in people’s lives, just like any other human behavior or form of

entertainment. But, to invoke the idea of “addiction” is unethical, using invalid, scientifically and medically-rejected concepts to invoke fear and feed panic.” (2)

Immediately following the release of your report, the Culture Secretary Sajid Javid announced that the Tories would be introducing strong censorship of the Internet if they win the next election, in order to “protect children” from pornography. The Culture Secretary’s new announcement would probably lead to millions of websites being blocked by British ISPs, should it come into force. We would point out the experience of the optional “porn filters”, introduced in early 2014, which turned out in practise to block a vast range of content including sex education material.

The BBC news website quotes you as saying, in response to the minister’s announcement: “Any action that makes it more difficult for young people to find this material is to be welcomed.” We disagree: we believe that introducing Chinese-style blocking of websites is not warranted by the findings of your opinion poll, and that serious research instead needs to be undertaken to determine whether your claims of harm are backed by rigorous evidence.

Signatories:

Jerry Barnett, CEO Sex & Censorship

Frankie Mullin, Journalist

Clarissa Smith, Professor of Sexual Cultures, University of Sunderland

Julian Petley, Professor of Screen Media, Brunel University

David J. Ley PhD. Clinical Psychologist (USA)

Dr Brooke Magnanti

Feona Attwood, Professor of Media & Communication at Middlesex University

Martin Barker, Emeritus Professor at University of Aberystwyth

Jessica Ringrose, Professor, Sociology of Gender and Education, UCL Institute of Education

Ronete Cohen MA, Psychologist

Dr Meg John Barker, Senior Lecturer in Psychology, The Open University

Kath Albury, Associate Professor, UNSW Australia

Myles Jackman, specialist in obscenity law

Dr Helen Hester, Middlesex University

Justin Hancock, youth worker and sex educator

Ian Dunt, Editor in Chief, Politics.co.uk

Ally Fogg, Journalist

Dr Emily Cooper, Northumbria University

Gareth May, Journalist

Dr Kate Egan, Lecturer in Film Studies, Aberystwyth University

Dr Ann Luce, Senior Lecturer in Journalism and Communication, Bournemouth University

John Mercer, Reader in Gender and Sexuality, Birmingham City University

Dr. William Proctor, Lecturer in Media, Culture and Communication, Bournemouth University

Dr Jude Roberts, Teaching Fellow, University of Surrey

Dr Debra Ferreday, Senior Lecturer in Sociology, Lancaster University

Jane Fae, author of “Taming the beast” a review of law/regulation governing online pornography

Michael Marshall, Vice President, Merseyside Skeptics Society

Martin Robbins, Journalist

Assoc. Prof. Paul J. Maginn (University of Western Australia)
Dr Lucy Neville, Lecturer in Criminology, Middlesex University
Alix Fox, Journalist and Sex Educator
Dr Mark McCormack, Senior Lecturer in Sociology, Durham University
Chris Ashford, Professor of Law and Society, Northumbria University
Diane Duke, CEO Free Speech Coalition (USA)
Dr Steve Jones, Senior Lecturer in Media, Northumbria University
Dr Johnny Walker, Lecturer in Media, Northumbria University

Added post-publication:

Dr Anna Arrowsmith
Tuppy Owens, veteran campaigner for sexual rights for disabled people
Eric Paul Leue, Director of Sexual Health & Advocacy, kink.com

Footnotes:

1) <http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/binaries/internet/explicit-material-vod.pdf> Page 15

2) Article published at sexandcensorship.org by Dr David J
Ley <http://sexandcensorship.org/2013/11/sex-porn-addictive-david-ley/>